



the **CALVIN**
orum

Progressive Liberalism
Bankrupt and Impotent

Ambassador of Christ
Fearless and Bold

Wage Disputes
Basic Considerations

Archaeological Inscriptions
and Canonics

Genuine Education
Divine Controls

Voices

News

Reviews

Verse

VOL. XI, NO. 8

**TWO DOLLARS
A YEAR**

MARCH, 1946

THE CALVIN FORUM

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Editor-in-Chief.....CLARENCE BOUMA
Associate Editors.....HENRY SCHULTZE
 HENRY J. RYSKAMP
 MARTIN J. WYNGAARDEN
Managing Editor.....LAMBERT J. FLOKSTRA

CALVIN FORUM CORRESPONDENTS

ARTHUR ALLEN.....*Australia*
 LOUIS J. BOLT.....*Christian Education*
 J. CHR. COETZEE.....*South Africa*
 SAMUEL G. CRAIG.....*Presb. Church, U.S.A.*
 FRANK DE JONG.....*California*
 PAUL DE KOEKKOEK.....*Edmonton, Canada*
 E. C. DE KRETZER.....*Ceylon*
 CHR. DE WIT.....*London*
 BURTON L. GODDARD.....*Boston*
 WILLIAM GOULOZE.....*Ref. Church in America*
 EDWARD HEEREMA.....*Orthodox Presb. Church*
 JACOB T. HOOGSTRA.....*Ecumenical Calvinism*
 S. LEIGH HUNT.....*London*
 FRED S. LEAHY.....*N. Ireland*
 EGBERT LUBBERS.....*Cairo, Egypt*
 W. MARCINKOWSKI.....*Haifa, Palestine*
 J. MOODY MCDILL.....*Jackson, Mississippi*
 PIETER PRINS.....*Netherlands*
 ARTHUR V. RAMIAH.....*South India*
 W. STANFORD REID.....*Montreal, Canada*
 WM. C. ROBINSON.....*Presb. Church in the U. S.*
 JOHN F. SCHUURMAN.....*The Northwest*
 JENO SEBESTYEN.....*Budapest, Hungary*
 JOHN N. SMITH.....*New Zealand*
 RAY W. TEEUWISSEN.....*France and Belgium*
 LEONARD VERDUIN.....*Ann Arbor, Michigan*
 CHARLES VINCZE.....*Hungarian Reformed*
 JOHN W. WEVERS.....*Princeton*

Address all editorial correspondence to Dr. Clarence Bouma, Editor THE CALVIN FORUM, Calvin College and Seminary, Grand Rapids 6, Michigan. Address all subscription and circulation correspondence to: THE CALVIN FORUM, Calvin College and Seminary, Grand Rapids 6, Michigan.

THE CALVIN FORUM is published monthly, except from June to September, when it appears bi-monthly. Subscription price: Two Dollars per year.

Entered as second-class matter October 3, 1935, at the Post Office at Grand Rapids, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

The CALVIN FORUM

Published by the Calvin Forum Board of Publication

VOLUME XI, NO. 8

MARCH, 1946

Contents

Editorials

A Damaging Admission 155
 The Missing Note 156
 That University Project 157
 Christ for China and Japan 157

Articles

The Boldness of the Ambassador of Christ.....
Adam Persenaire 158
 The Problem of Wages.....Henry J. Ryskamp 161
 Biblical Introduction and Its Increasing Evidence.....
Martin J. Wyngaarden 164
 Education With or Without God.....Bastian Kruithof 166
 What's In a Name?.....Ala Bandon 169

The Voice of Our Readers

Christian Schools in Canada..... 170
 As to Strikes and Revolution..... 170

From Our Correspondents

Calvinism in North Ireland..... 172
 From South India 173
 Australian Voice 174
 From Michigan's University 174
 Reformed Church Letter 175

Book Review

A Catholic Dutch History..... 176

Verse

Reminiscence 163

EDITORIALS

A Damaging Admission

IN a recent convocation service at the Divinity School of the University of Chicago one of its professors, Dr. William A. Irwin, presents a remarkable analysis of the spiritual ineffectiveness of the theological training offered to the prospective minister in a liberal school such as his own.

Speaking on "The Liberal Graduate" he introduced his subject by telling about Jeremiah, his trials as a prophet, and his unconquerable faith in Jehovah despite the sneers and opposition on the part of his contemporaries. He then startled his audience by continuing as follows: "Yet at the risk of seeming facetious in a serious moment one may comment that for such steadfastness Jeremiah possessed one great advantage over modern youth: he had never attended college; still better, he knew nothing of formal theological education!"

And then begins the analysis of the typically modern young man's preparation for the ministry. Those who survive the ordeal of passing through the modern college and have not lost the dream that first lured them (as many of them do) are then subjected in the seminary to a stern testing. "Modern liberal training in religion is analytic and critical. The student is required to take things to pieces; he must appraise the parts. He finds that religion is a social phenomenon profoundly shaped by conditions of time and place. He pushes back and back in the quest of ultimate religious meaning, and if he escapes being diverted down the path of purely humanistic values, he comes at length to competing statements, even to contradictory accounts of the mystery of man's life—and, little by little, out of the confusion of what and why and how he arrives at a complete uncertainty. And about that time the dean gives him an impressive parchment done up in a pretty ribbon, tells him he is educated—and sends him out to save the world."

And lest his audience—or the reader—should think he is speaking facetiously or half in jest, he continues: "I speak feelingly. I recall my own predicament when with a nice fresh degree I imposed myself upon a group of unoffending folk as their spiritual leader! May the Lord have mercy upon me! I had nothing to give them—nothing whatever; all had been dissipated in my years of college! I could only talk to them about a very thinly diluted moralism, until I, their religious guide, learned afresh from their honest faith the reality of religion and slowly regained what I had lost . . ."

Returning from this note of personal confession to the analysis of modern liberal education, he lays bare the spiritual poverty of the training which the modernist schools offer the theological student. "Liberal education, as matters stand, is not a process of confirmation of the student's faith and of enrichment of his life with deeper religious insights and experiences. It functions to arouse questions. With too little provision for satisfying answer, these harden into doubt, in the old-fashioned religious connotation of this word. Our curriculums stress intellectual equipment and training; we engross the student in history and criticism and movements of thought; we fit him out with methods—that sanctified word, with techniques! We give him a jargon of hideous socio-psychological terms for realities that have always been known by religious people and described in words of dignity and not inferior clarity. But through it all the springs of his life are drying up. God becomes no more than a remote echo of a once happy realization; religion is reduced to certain quite secular drives; righteousness—perish the word; it is only ethics!—is the way respectable folk behave. And what is there in it all for a cultured man to get excited about?"

He then reinforces his own analysis by quoting from a letter written by a young minister recently returned from service in the fighting forces. Says this young pastor of souls: "What I want is a theology that I can preach, be enthusiastic about, and that will carry conviction. I did not know the difference between salvation by grace and salvation by good works . . . The churchmen that I have met have been fine men . . . They have vision and energy but they are full of defeatism. There isn't one of them that can talk like the only liberal conservative I have ever known—a Mennonite. There is not one of them that has the self-assurance that the hell-fire Southern Baptist has. The churches are reflections of the ministers. We who claim to be the custodians of the most progressive liberalism in America—and that is what we claim—are going to have to pass it down to our members and make it a part of their lives. We are going to have to find a modern method of revival that will turn a comparatively irreligious frontier into a stronghold of faith . . . I want a theology that can make men enthusiastic, that will set them on fire with the determination to bring God and his Kingdom here on earth. I want a theology that will be so interesting that people will seek it, talk it, and not listen dully. We are fools to ask people to follow the bread and milk we put out . . ."

"There is the predicament," so the speaker continued, "of our liberal theological education! And while many liberal ministers are doing work of such high worth that my poor words of praise would be an impertinence, yet on the whole the notable feature of liberalism has been and continues to be its mood of unconcern. We do not lack convictions—we have deep convictions as to the fallacy of other systems!—but we do stand in need of religious earnestness. The fire of evangelism has gone out. The urgency for the salvation of souls—rebaptize it with whatever insipid modern equivocation you will—is dead . . . All alike we have lost ourselves in analytical pettiness. Bunyan's old metaphor has been all too apt in its relevance to our work as educators of the church's leaders; we are the men with the muck rake, too engrossed in analysis to see the angel with the crown just above us. We have loved facts and have forgotten truth."

What damaging admission!

What penetrating analysis!

What confession of spiritual bankruptcy!

"I had nothing to give them!"

"I did not know the difference between salvation by grace and salvation by good works!"

"We are fools to ask people to follow the bread and milk we put out!"

But let not the reader be deceived.

This is not the confession of a repentent "liberal."

In the closing paragraphs of the address he still claims that "the liberal minister is in possession of a message that should set the world on fire." With a few "Barthian overtones" these damaging admissions of this liberal professor are apparently advanced by him only as a pedagogical device to catch the attention and hold the interest. Harry Emerson Fosdick started this sort of thing some years ago when he delivered his sermon entitled "Beyond Modernism," in which, after numerous startling criticisms against the old liberalism which he confessed himself "at one time" to have embraced, he led his audience and readers (the sermon was published at the time in the *Christian Century*) right back into the bog of Modernism from which he claimed to have emerged.

But the damaging admissions of these men stand.

They are eloquent.

Their confessed impotence is a powerful indictment of the entire anthropocentric movement in modern theology from Kant, Hegel, and Schleiermacher to the present.

And what a challenge all this presents to those seminaries and churches that still know the glory, the beauty, and the power of the supernatural Gospel of God's infallible Word!

C. B.

The Missing Note

RECENT editorials in the *Reformed Church Herald* have repeatedly evinced clear thinking and courageous testimony in reference to the great issues at stake in the church today.

For some years the editorial columns of this denominational weekly of the Reformed Church in America seemed to be suffering from the spiritual anemia which inevitably results from too much flirtation with the inclusivism and anti-doctrinal religious activism which the intelligent Christian associates with the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Louis Benes, the new editor, has apparently not yet been bitten by this pernicious bug, and those who love the great verities of the Reformed Faith, both within and without the Reformed Church in America, may well hope and pray that he never will.

We greet with joy his recent editorial "The Missing Note in Missions," and gladly re-echo some of its sentiments in our editorial columns. Says he: "There is a missing note in a great deal of present-day missionary literature. For the most part we are treated to the whole scale of its music. And how lovely to the ear are the songs that tell of Zion's advances. Under the theme of missions we are informed of the customs and beliefs of the pagan religions. The interesting travels of the missionaries and their unique experiences are headline news. The program of mercy to the masses of those in physical suffering comes in for its just share of attention. And about the pre-eminent note in our day is that the Christian missionary enterprise lies at the heart of our ideals of democracy and freedom, and our hope for peace and international order. And while we insist that this is true, we know that the Gospel is far more than a means to even such ends as democracy, peace and freedom. St. Paul did not journey from Jerusalem to Rome to promote democracy, or even human freedom. He traveled under the dynamic of a life-changing experience and a Divine commission to "open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." And that is the missing note in missions. It sees beyond the interesting travel experiences of the missionary to the reason why he is traveling at all. It is not so much interested in the customs and beliefs as in the message which all men need. It is only very incidentally concerned with changing custom, but mightily concerned with changing hearts."

How true that characterization of certain missionary speakers in whose address the missionary message has been almost completely eclipsed by the travel experiences of the missionary and the description of customs and practices of the heathen to whom the gospel is to be brought. Nor is it the

avowed liberals only who indulge in this sort of thing! Neither is it a weakness that is restricted to missionaries. In different form and under a different guise the same noxious plants often flourish luxuriously among ministers and other spiritual leaders in the Church. It is a popular form of "worldliness" among those who are ambassadors of Christ. It is losing the heart and harping on the periphery. It is in line with the externalizing trend everywhere apparent in our American activist atmosphere. And it is but another subtle way of having the messenger eclipse his message and the theocentric emphasis displaced by one that is essentially anthropocentric.

C. B.

That University Project

IN CERTAIN quarters there appears to be misunderstanding as to the stand of the Christian Reformed Church on the projected "Calvinistic University" in Philadelphia. That stand has been officially formulated and adopted by the Synod of the Christian Reformed Church in June, 1945. Reaffirming its adverse stand of the previous year in reply to an overture favoring support from one congregation and from one classis (presbytery), Synod gave a further account of its attitude in the following statement, which we copy literally from the Acts.

"Synod declare further that, while agreeing with the proponents of these overtures as to the desirability of a Calvinistic University, as has been proposed, it is Synod's opinion that the brethren in back of the University movement at Philadelphia are very far from being ready to establish a university. At best they can hope to start a Calvinistic College on a small scale within the near future, which, together with our own Calvin College and other similar institutions might serve as a feeder for a Calvinistic University in years to come. And seeing that they have not even begun to establish such a college, the possibility of a university, however desirable, still lies in the quite distant future. To recommend this movement to our people at this time would amount simply to our helping a group of fellow-Christians from our own and sister denominations to establish another Calvinistic college in addition to our own.

"Synod declare that even though it may be contended that the establishment of another college should not be regarded in the light of competition with our own Calvin College, especially in view of the fact that this college would be expected to draw its students largely from other circles than our own, Synod would not raise any objections to the establishment of such a college but rather hail it as a very commendable undertaking, were it not for the fact that many of the leaders of this movement are from our own Church and that it may be expected that the financial support for this movement will therefore also be sought to a certain extent from our own membership. And this again would not be objectionable if we ourselves had built up our own college to a full-fledged college such as we hope to see it become some day. As it is, however, our students must still go elsewhere to pursue their courses in many cases because of our failure to offer them what they need.

"That Synod reply to the Overture of Classis Chicago North which contends that with regard to the Calvinistic University movement we can say with Peter of Amiens, "God wills it." And then adds: "If He wills it, a Calvinistic University will be possible," that Scripture also teaches us emphatically that no one builds a tower without first considering the cost thereof. Our people have shouldered great financial burdens in recent years, especially in the field of Christian education. They will

be asked to contribute still more for the very necessary expansion of our Calvin College. However desirable a Calvinistic University may be, therefore, we could not expect our people nor encourage them to offer any worth-while financial support to such a movement at this time.

"That because unfortunately there are indications of internal dissension even at this early date within the ranks of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, whose leaders are the chief proponents of the Calvinistic University (witness the Clark case) Synod declare that we must therefore naturally be hesitant in lending support to the establishment of a so-called Calvinistic University when the leaders of this movement are not thoroughly agreed among themselves as to what constitutes true Calvinism.

"That Synod declare to find the greater reason for hesitancy on this score in view of the fact that some of the leaders of this movement prefer to speak of a 'Christian' rather than a 'Calvinistic' University."

C. B.

Christ for China and Japan

NO ONE can afford to be dogmatic about the far-reaching changes effected by the recently concluded world war in the mission pattern of the Far East. For one thing, great damage appears to have been wrought to missionary personnel as well as property in the beautiful and populous island of Java. Early predictions that this war might have a decidedly adverse influence upon Christian missions in such a country as Japan, may prove to have no basis in fact. To be sure, during the war the Nipponese have succeeded in largely liquidating American and European missionaries from their land. But now that the end of hostilities has come and the score is being settled, it appears that things missionary in the land of the rising sun may take a turn in a direction not anticipated.

Whatever that direction may prove to be in the future, it is certain that the abolition of state Shinto, which took place by official imperial rescript on New Year's Day, 1946, will have a tremendous effect upon the future development of Christian missions. Surmises and suggestions that Hirohito might soon officially embrace the Christian religion are, to put it mildly, slightly premature. Neither the Nipponese nor the Chinese are people of profound convictions. There is much adaptation and utilitarianism in all their religion. Did Hirohito view the prescribed shrine worship as chiefly a political and patriotic act, so that by the order of General MacArthur it is now perfectly natural to abolish it? How much of a religious person is Hirohito anyway? And is he a Buddhist as well as a worshipper of Shinto? Will his religious preferences (assuming that he stays in office—which is more than probable) follow his political and international predilections? If his inclination toward American ways of life should prove to be permanent, all this may indirectly exert a great influence on the opportunities for the spread of Christianity in Japan.

Also in China the missionary situation appears to be in a plastic state. Admiration for things American is quite general in the land of Chiang-Kai-Shek just now. Readiness to welcome American political and international guidance may prove to operate favorably in the cause of Christian mission endeavor. Chiang's favorable attitude toward the Christian religion is a hopeful factor in the future picture of missionary strategy among China's 440 millions. All this would be strengthened if General Marshall should succeed in effecting a lasting union between the two great factions in China with the

present Generalissimo in control. Already favorable reports are coming to this country as to prospects in both Japan and China for the rehabilitation of the missionary enterprise in the coming years. May neither the old pagan religions, nor the modernized paganism which some European and American educational institutions have already transplanted—in such a leader, e.g., as Hu Shi—to China's intellectual centers, but the gospel of Christ become the dominant spiritual force in China.

God grant that a new day may dawn for the cause of the Gospel in the Far East. C. B.

The Boldness of the Ambassador of Christ

Adam Persenaire
Minister Christian Reformed Church
Eastmanville, Mich.

Graduates of the Class 1946 . . .

IT IS in a bewildered and fearful world that our sovereign and unchangeable covenant God is sending you forth. You are to meet the challenge of our stirring times with the age-old message of His Word, with the gospel which is still "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." To go forth in implicit obedience to your Sender, and to faithfully proclaim His message, will require a heroism on your part which is comparable only to the needs of the age in which we live. A spineless mouther of platitudes, a cowardly compromiser with current opinions, an ambitious seeker after popularity is less fit for the ministry to-day than he was in the gilded eighteenth century. What the world desperately needs is preachers, worthy of the name, men who are conscious of their divine calling, who have a living message to bring, preachers like Luther, Calvin, Knox, Niemöller. From the Atlantic to the Pacific our churches are crying for preachers, true ministers of the Word of the Lord. The age of power in which we live calls for men of power—power, not human, but divine. It calls for bold, fearless men, uncompromising men.

In view of this crying need, the subject which I have chosen for this occasion is: **THE BOLDNESS OF THE AMBASSADOR OF CHRIST.**

Let us consider: its character, its source, and its need.

The Character of this Boldness

When I say that the ambassador of Christ should have boldness, I do not at all mean that we must

have, what is ordinarily understood to be "a bold minister." Such a man is a disgrace to his profession and a stumbling-block to the church. For, if there is anything that should characterize the bond-servant of Jesus Christ, it is the meekness and gentleness of his Master. Fact is, I do not even mean that we should have ministers with manly courage. True, such men may deserve our admiration. But the boldness to which I refer is that which the apostle Paul speaks of, when he writes to the Thessalonians: "We waxed bold in our God, to speak unto you the gospel of God in much conflict." This boldness is therefore a spiritual virtue, and thus a gift bestowed by God. To preach boldly, therefore, means that we shall speak the Word of God with freedom, with plainness, without concealing or holding back anything. That is the boldness required of you as you enter the ministry. It is the fruit of an unflinching fidelity to your commission as an ambassador of Christ, and a token of your absolute sincerity in the performance of your task.

The Source of this Boldness

What is the source from which this boldness is obtained? Observe that Paul states that his boldness was found in God. He did not have it of himself; but he had derived it from his firm conviction that he was divinely appointed to preach the gospel. In other words, his boldness was wrapt up, as it were, in the consciousness of his calling as an ambassador of Christ.

There is no more noble word to indicate the preacher of the gospel than this word "ambassador." An ambassador is clothed with all the dignity and authority of the government he represents.

Any neglect, insult, or injury done to him is not a personal offense, but an offense to the sovereign who has commissioned him. To send him away is to break off relations with the government he represents; for the ambassador speaks wholly for his ruler, he is his ruler's mouthpiece. In the performance of his office he never utters his own thoughts, promises, or demands, but only those of his sender. His own person lends no weight to what he says; but they to whom he is sent must see and hear in him only the king who sent him. Truly, if we apply all these ideas associated with the term "ambassador" to ourselves, as ministers of the Word, then we shall realize what this boldness is that is required of us. We may never act as if we are dealing with men. We may never let men think that they are dealing only with us. But we are responsible to the King of kings, and the Lord of lords. His word we must speak, His demands we must make, His promises and invitations we must present. As Paul says in 2 Cor. 5: "But all things are of God, who reconciled us to Himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation. We are ambassadors therefore on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating by us: we beseech you on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God."

Again, our boldness as ambassadors of Christ finds its source in the message we bring. That message is the Word of God. With Paul we must be able to say, "I am not ashamed of the gospel; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Paul was not boasting of his own power as a preacher, but he was glorying in the power of the gospel which he had received from God as a sacred trust. Paul might apologize for the form and manner of his preaching; as he writes to the Corinthians, "I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling." But the apostle never made any apologies for his message, for he knew that was "the power of God unto salvation." To appreciate fully the significance of what Paul said about his gospel, we must try to listen to his bold words with the ears of a Roman. Here was a little, insignificant Jew, living in the Ghetto in metropolitan Corinth, who had his head and his heart full of a certain man, whom a Roman governor of Judaea had nailed on a cross, but whom he himself claimed to be risen from the dead, and Lord of all. Did that despised Jew think that by his preaching of this crucified Jesus he could shake the throne of Caesar and conquer the mighty Roman empire? Any Roman who would have seen Paul, the travel-stained prisoner, the "ambassador in chains," walking along the Appian Way that led to the eternal city, would have looked down upon him with contempt. Was this the man who intended to conquer Rome, and make it obedient to his cruci-

fied Messiah, whom he acknowledged as his Lord? Did he think that his fantastic religious ideals were more powerful than the sharp swords and the iron spears of the mighty Roman legions? Paul's answer to this proud Roman would have been, "I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

Graduates, prospective ministers of that gospel, this answer of Paul is the same answer that you must give to the proud and unbelieving world today. Let us never be ashamed of the gospel; but rather, let us boldly proclaim that it is still the power of God that is able to transform the world and to solve all its problems. The gospel contains the only philosophy that presents to mankind the ultimate truth; it is the only science that can teach individuals and nations to practise right and noble conduct; it is the only remedy that is able to save men and women from the greatest evil and to bestow upon them the highest good. That word is powerful in its simplicity, able to do what no other word is able to accomplish. That word of God is the only hope of the world: applicable to all circumstances, sufficient to dispel all doubts, capable of shedding light on all the problems that face us at this present time. Let us never say, Here is a situation in which the Word of God can give us no guidance, or there is a sphere in which the gospel does not apply.

Sometimes such voices are heard, even in our own circles. For example, some men will say, In the sphere of education, or in the sphere of social and industrial relationships, the Christian principles, derived from the Scriptures, do not apply. There we are not in the realm of redemption, but in that of common grace. Such an antithesis is utterly false! True, we do recognize general revelation and common grace; but when we are called upon to counteract the results of sin in any sphere of human life, there is only one remedy, and that is the gospel, and the righteousness of God that is revealed therein. Again, some men, who are philosophically inclined, will tell us that we can have an ontology or an epistemology independent from the Scriptures. This, too, is a deadly error. For, even though it is true, that the Bible is not couched in philosophical language, yet it teaches us clearly that the only ultimate Reality is God, and that the only true epistemology must be based on His revelation. "This is life eternal that they should know thee the only true God, and Him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ." (John 17:3.) And "in Thy light shall we see light." (Ps. 36:9.)

But where shall we obtain this boldness to proclaim the gospel as the only remedy for all the world's problems and ills? The answer is: in the audience-chamber of our King. The ambassador must receive his inspiration and authority from his sender. If at any time he is in doubt as to what his position is to be on a certain matter, he must seek

guidance from him who has commissioned him. This implies that the ambassadors of Christ should constantly resort to prayer. An ambassador who is shut off from communications with his sender, is at a loss what to do. So is the Christian minister who neglects his personal devotions. Only as we are filled with the Spirit, who is given in answer to prayer, shall we be bold in our testimony to God's truth. This was plainly indicated in the preaching of the apostles. When Peter and John, filled with the Holy Spirit, gave their testimony before the Jewish Sanhedrin, these rulers marvelled at the boldness of these men, "and they took knowledge of them, that they had been with Jesus." (Acts 4:13.) But these men themselves realized that their boldness was not of themselves, but came from God. For, no sooner were they released from the council, or they organized a prayer meeting, wherein they unitedly uttered this petition: "And now, Lord, look upon their threatenings: and grant unto Thy servants to speak Thy word with all boldness." (vs. 29.) And they received what they asked for. "When they prayed, the place was shaken wherein they were gathered together; and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and they spake the word of God with all boldness." (vs. 31.) They had been speaking with boldness all along. But now they had been put to the test, whether they would allow the Sanhedrin to intimidate them. In the same way, you will be tested. Situations will arise in your ministry when you will be tempted to conceal the truth of God. Men will seek to silence your testimony in all sorts of ways: by flatteries, by threatenings, by ignorements; and the devil will tempt you to seek your own ease and popularity. But pray that the Lord may give you strength never to hold back any part of the truth, and that He may grant you boldness always to proclaim the whole counsel of God.

The Need of this Boldness

This boldness is sorely needed in our day. It was needed at all times; for the world into which Christ sent His ambassadors is not on friendly terms with the court of heaven. It is a sinful world, in which the prerogatives of Christ our King are often ignored and even denied. Fact is, sin dwells even in the hearts and lives of God's elect people who are willing to recognize the claims of Christ's ambassadors. Yet, at no time was this boldness more needed than in our own day. For we are living in a time of moral and spiritual laxity. The world round about us looks upon the Christian moral standards as antiquated and outmoded. The terrible happenings of the last few years, and the uncertainties regarding the future have made men cynical and skeptical of the ultimate triumph of good over evil. This has resulted in a spirit of indifference towards moral and spiritual ideals. Men's

moral sensibilities have been blunted. People are determined to get all they can out of the present, regardless of the consequences for the future. As ambassadors of Christ we must present the claim of Him who said, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

Again, we are living in a time of indifference to eternal verities. Sneeringly many are repeating the question of Pilate, "What is truth?" Doctrinal indifference has invaded even the Church of God. Modernistic preachers are still repeating the fatuous doggerel:

"For forms of faith, let canting bigots fight;
His faith cannot be wrong, whose life is right."

As Christ's ambassadors, you are to proclaim that life and doctrine cannot be thus divorced. Let us not be preachers of good morals only, vainly seeking to inspire people to right living, while we fail to bring them the gospel, which alone can lead them to the source of power to live such a good life.

Once more, we are living in a time in which many are willing to compromise the principles of the word of God with those that are guiding the people of the world. Expediency, so-called economic necessity, social prestige and affluence are tempting many confessing Christians to give up the struggle for the right, and to submit to the anti-christian forces which are seeking to gain control over the whole of life. Against this tendency toward secularization and fraternization with the world, you are to raise your voice in protest. You must be ready to preach the antithesis, come what may. Never become a chameleon. For example, when you are convinced of the necessity of a Christian school for our covenant youth, be prepared to come out for your convictions, even though you should be in a church whose people are lukewarm or hostile towards that cause. Do not try to please all men, but be true to your Sender. Dare to mention pet sins! Dare to uphold and defend good, but unpopular causes! And, above all, so live and so labor, that men may not see you, but your Master.

The story is told that centuries ago, in the public square of an Italian city, a certain wandering friar preached to the people about Christ and Him crucified. He did this so eloquently that all were moved to tears. And then he went his way. As the years passed the story of that sermon was handed down, until it became a tradition. At length the devout people of that town decided to erect a shaft in honor of that preacher. But after it was finished they wondered what name they were to inscribe on it. For no one knew his name. None could remember ever having heard it. They searched the archives of the city; but to no avail. Yet in due time the shaft was erected; and it still stands there, inscribed with only one single word, a name, but not the name of the preacher. The word is "JESUS"—the name which is above every name. Thus may it be in your ministry. May it ever exalt the Christ

only. For then, too, it will be a fruitful ministry, from which God will not withhold His blessing. We are living in an age of confusion, of unrest and fear. But the ancient promise of God still holds: "For as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it to bring forth and bud, and giveth seed to the sower and bread to the eater; so shall My word be that goeth forth out of My mouth:

it shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."

"He has sounded forth the trumpet that shall never call retreat; He is sifting out the hearts of men before His judgment seat; O be swift, my soul, to answer Him! be jubilant, my feet: Our God is marching on."

[This commencement address was recently delivered at Calvin Seminary, which, as an after-effect of war-time acceleration, graduated its Class of 1946 on January 29.—EDITOR.]

The Problem of Wages

Henry J. Ryskamp
Professor of Economics
Calvin College

NO ONE who can read can have missed the significance of the present dispute concerning wages. Employers and others have expressed their impatience with Labor for its "highhandedness" in daring to demand more at so critical a time as the present. Labor is furious with Management for refusing to share a little more of the great gains which Management has made and which it rather confidentially expects it will make in the near future. The public is greatly concerned about the struggle, apparently a struggle for advantage between the greatest concentration of economic power the world has seen, modern large scale industrial organizations on the one side and skilfully organized unions with hundreds of thousands of members on the other. The issue is one that is fraught with possibilities of serious consequences for society. Yet it is one that may be settled in such a way that society as a whole may gain.

Are Wages too High?

"Wages are already too high," some union critic is likely to protest. The total take-home pay was very high in many instances during the war. But that was not true in every instance during the war and that certainly is not true of all wage earners today. Some current wages are simply not high enough. With large numbers of returning veterans as well as discharged war workers in the market for jobs, why is it that prominently placed advertisements for workers seem to go unanswered? Is it, as some think, because men refuse to work and prefer to be on relief or to receive unemployment insurance? When unemployment insurance pays an individual \$20.00 a week and a full time job of 40 hours of work at 65c an hour pays him \$26.00 is it strange that an individual may prefer the insurance benefit, plus some additional income from

odd jobs? Can any one honestly say that \$26.00 is a living wage under current conditions?

Wages of many laborers were extremely high during the war. The cut back to lower paying jobs and to shorter hours has, however, reduced take-home pay greatly in large numbers of cases. This is true in unionized industries and especially true in non-unionized industries. It is to be expected under the circumstances that men will do what they can to force wages up.

Are not most Workers Contented?

But, it is claimed, many of the workers are contented with the incomes they receive and are opposed to the aggressive tactics of the union leaders. How true this contention may be is rather difficult to determine.— Large numbers are satisfied at present and loathe to engage in any action that may involve loss of work and privation. The union leader would, however, insist that that has always been the case in collective action on the part of Labor. Leaders must stir up their followers even when the need for action is urgent. Men who claim to be enlightened leaders say that they must anticipate conditions which their followers do not realize they may have to face. Such leaders insist that they must strike at a time which they think is opportune, even if their followers do not immediately realize that such a time has come.

Although the ostensible purpose in these strikes is a wage that will match the increased cost of living, it is apparently an attempt to improve the position of labor as compared with the positions of other classes, and also an attempt to consolidate the power which Labor has gained in the last few years. Management's opposition to these strikes has obviously been strong and in some instances very bitter. In general it would seem, that Management's purpose has been the checking of Labor's increas-

ing power, and, whether or not it could pay higher wages, to check the gains the unions have been making. Whether the attitude of Management encouraged Union leaders to strike or whether Union leaders' brashness evoked Management's attitude would be difficult to determine.

Work stoppages caused by both sides

The delay in production caused by the strikes for higher wages is deplorable to say the least. Some would insist that the delay is unpardonable. It should be remembered, however, that the most widely publicized strikes have taken place in industries which would have required considerable time in any case to reconvert to peace time production. The delay, although it has become more serious than was at first anticipated, was not considered so very important at first. Indeed some industrial leaders were inclined to chuckle at the poor "timing" of the General Motors strike. It must be remembered too, that though the delay in production caused by strikes is the more dramatic, the delay caused by industry's waiting for the lifting of the tax burden and for higher prices has also been serious. Such stoppages of production or "withdrawals of efficiency" have not been so widely publicized.

Strikes are a part of the Wage determining process

Disapproval of the strikes has been widely expressed and public criticism of them has at times been bitter. Yet resort to the strike is but one of the inevitable steps in our generally accepted method of determining wages. If an individual is not satisfied with the wage that is offered him he holds off before accepting it, and if he is so minded he refuses it altogether. In bargaining with one of our large scale industrial establishments, however, the individual has little to gain by holding out. If he does some one else will soon take his place. Bargaining collectively, with the assistance of his fellow-workers, the individual can strike a harder bargain. If the employer is not willing to meet the workers' demands the strike may be very effective, certainly far more effective than the "hold-out" of the individual employee. As the people of the United States have learned, Labor is now far more powerful, because of its collective bargaining strength, than ever before in our history.

Large scale manufacturers have always had great bargaining strength, especially in times when an increase in unemployment is imminent. It seemed for a time in the case of one of the current strikes that Management was willing to test its strength in a long drawn out contest with the Union. Considering the strength of the parties to the strike, particularly the hundreds of thousands of people who

would have been affected directly, such a fight would have been ruinous. It would have settled as little as wars usually do, and would undoubtedly have left the country with other problems as serious, if not more serious than the one which caused it.

Wages fluctuate between two limits

Under conditions of competition wages may fluctuate between two limits. The upper limit to wages is a point at which the cost of labor to the employer is so high that it becomes prohibitive, so high that, if the condition is long continued, the employer has no other alternative than to quit. The lower limit is a wage so low that it does not permit the worker a decent standard of living. Where the wage is determined between these two limits is obviously the result of the bargaining strength of the two parties. Because Labor is as a rule not the scarcest factor in production, wages do not very frequently approximate the higher limit. To keep wages from falling to the lower limit Labor must make itself scarce, must resort to collective bargaining.

Should bigger profits mean higher wages?

An interesting question, posed by management in one of the current strikes, is this: Should a manufacturer pay higher wages than his competitor simply because he is able to do so? Would it not be as unfair to ask a manufacturer to pay a higher wage than his competitors do as it would be to ask a person, who can afford it, to pay more for a loaf of bread than others are asked? The employer has a point here, without a doubt. He should not be penalized for his efficiency. If he were compelled to turn over all of the income attributable to the greater efficiency of his plant to his employees he would have little inducement to continue in business.

The employer would prefer to have his wage determined by the wages paid in the plants of his less efficient competitors. But in these plants the wage earners may actually be penalized or handicapped by the inefficiency of their employers. They may work as diligently as do the employees in more prosperous establishments. Their employers do not have to pay them more than they do, because if they refuse to work for the wages offered, others will soon take their places. The wages of laborers are determined not only by their productivity but by their relative scarcity. Since laborers have as a rule been relatively abundant they have not always been able to bargain effectively enough to get their rightful share of the product. It is not a foregone conclusion that the greater profits of the more prosperous concern are attributable to the work of

the employer only. They are quite certainly the product of the coöperation of the employer and his employees.

It is often said that if employees desire to share in the profits of a plant they should be willing to share in its losses. Is it not true, as a matter of fact, that they do? Periods of business failure and losses do not leave employees untouched. Consider periods of depression with their tragic unemployment and their sharply reduced wages. Employees generally do not have the reserves to fall back upon in times of business losses that their employers have built up to meet such contingencies.

Employers who can should pay higher wages

Competition may not compel the more efficient employer to pay higher wages. Should he? If he raises wages he may encourage even greater and better coöperation on the part of his employees, and thus further increase his profit. By increasing wages prosperous employers increase the amount that consumers have to spend. By increasing purchasing power they increase the effective demand for their own goods and those produced by others. In times when business is improving they may both by bidding up the wages of labor and by underselling their less efficient competitors, compel their competitors to be "on their toes" or to go out of business.

Wage agreements by competition and arbitration

"Give the laborer a finger and he will grab the whole hand," it is often said. The laborer is, how-

ever, worthy of his hire and, given fair treatment, is no more likely to be grasping than his employer. The lesson of "taking the whole hand" is often unconsciously taught by those who are so afraid that it may be practiced by others.

Wages should be high enough to enable employees to enjoy a decent standard of living. They should be high enough to permit individuals to realize themselves and to give expression to their abilities. They should be high enough to encourage free exchange of goods and services. Employers' incomes should be high enough so that they can maintain and expand production, so that they are stimulated to fuller exploitation of the resources available to them. Incomes of both employers and employees should be high enough so that together they more fully develop the resources of this earth, more fully reveal the abilities of man, and more fully reveal the glory of their God. To achieve such a distribution of income requires something in addition to the operation of the forces of competition, something more than obstinate bargaining between two hostile parties. The pressure of the needs of both employers and employees must point the way to the establishing of a just wage. If the wage is to be just, however, it will, under such strong pressure as organized Capital and organized Labor can exert today, have to be arrived at by men who are capable and willing to see not only the needs of Capital and Labor but of society as a whole. Where such a solution cannot be reached by representatives of the two parties to the struggle arbitration is the best way out.

REMINISCENCE

"My boy, you want to hold this board
And help me just a bit?"
I held the board, but oh, the way
I took ahold of it!

The old board-fence unfinished stands . . .
A dream-ideal that's broken;
And many years have vanished since
His kindly words were spoken.

"My boy, you want to hold this board
And help me just a bit?"
I held the board, but oh, the way
I took ahold of it!

O voice that made those days so sweet,
Call me again, I pray!
But . . . just a haunting silence now . . .
And gone that summer day!

The nails have rusted in the wood
And vines are clasping it.
The old board stares and stares at me;
It seems I hear him yet:

—ALBERT PIERSMA

Biblical Introduction and Its Increasing Evidence

Martin J. Wyngaarden

Professor of Old Testament Interpretation
Calvin Seminary

HERE is an increasing scope of objective evidence available for the interpretation of Canonic, which is also called Biblical Introduction.

This is true first of all of general canonic dealing with the Scriptures as the canon or rule of faith and practice.

We find an increasing scope of evidence touching the general canonic of the Old Testament. This general treatment deals with the Old Testament as a unit and not with each book separately. There are many ancient lists of the books that belong to the Old Testament. These ancient lists have increased through discoveries even in modern times. For instance, Ben Sira's Ecclesiasticus, coming from late post-exilic times, is a rather recent discovery, for it was lost many centuries and then came to light again. Its study has fascinated many scholars of the last century interested in the canonical authority or the canonical recognition of the Old Testament. Thus the scope of the evidence in this field of investigation is on the increase.

Again the general argument for the grounds of our faith in the canon has come in for fresh study. This faith rests upon the testimony of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of believers, as is indicated also in Article V of the Belgic Confession which is still one of the favorite Protestant symbols.

However, Dr. V. Hepp, in his thesis on the Testimony of the Holy Spirit, advanced the position that there is a general testimony of the Holy Spirit to the unsaved and a special testimony of the Holy Spirit to the believers, both of which he subsumes under the *Testimonium Spiritu Sancti*. On the other hand, Dr. K. Schilder does not subsume both under this one head but limits the *Testimonium Spiritu Sancti* to the believers.

To some this may appear to be a quibbling over terms or classifications. To others it will seem to be a search for increased clarity. To still others it is a challenge to see what the Biblical usage of the term actually is. In any case, it is evident that Biblical science is not standing still, but on the move for increased evidence, widening the scope of the inquiries and challenging the Christian scholar to broaden the scope of his data.

Be that as it may, certainly it is the fact that there is a testimony of the Spirit through the Word,

whereby the Spirit convicts the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment. We believe the convictions thus wrought by the Spirit to be true and not merely similar to the truth.

Agrippa felt some such testimony when Paul asked him whether he believed the prophets, and Paul testified that he knew that Agrippa believed them. Meanwhile, Agrippa had been brought under the convictions of sin, righteousness and judgment.

Balaam felt a similar testimony of the Holy Spirit to the truth of the Word of God when he uttered his famous scriptural predictions,—prophecies that have received increased attention, also from the Liberals, in recent years.

This testimony or conviction given by the Holy Spirit to the world through the Word means that light has reached the consciousness of the sin-darkened world, light from the Holy Spirit, even if the world loves darkness rather than light.

And the light and testimony from the Holy Spirit to the worldling concerning sin, righteousness and judgment is no darkness but light, reflected light one might say, like the light of the sun upon a black automobile, but light, nevertheless.

It is the light of common grace, and Calvin calls the ignoring of the light of common grace a sin against the Holy Spirit.

Even Modernists and Liberals will reflect convictions concerning sin, righteousness and judgment. Reinhold Niebuhr spoke on the rediscovery of sin to an attentive British audience, when German bombers deepened the conviction as they soared overhead.

In conclusion, we may say that increasingly we find our faith in Scripture vindicated by the testimony of the Holy Spirit, testifying with our spirits that we are children of God and testifying thus through God's gracious words of Holy Writ, as these are applied to our hearts by the Holy Spirit, and as the Scripture thus comes to be recognized through the Spirit's testimony as the very Word of God.

But our faith in Scripture as the Word of God is also progressively vindicated by that action whereby the Spirit convicts the world of our enlightened twentieth century of sin, righteousness and judgment.

In special canonic or the introduction to the several books of the Old Testament, we wish to refer to just an example or two,—illustrating the increasing scope of objective evidence available for the scientific interpretation of the Old Testament.

The Book of Chronicles was formerly regarded as unhistorical by the higher critics of the now somewhat retrenching Wellhausen School of criticism. In fact it is quite characteristic of this view that Chronicles should be regarded as a gross misrepresentation of the Old Testament history, as that history is reconstructed by the critics,—at variance with much of Scripture.

But a noted Assyriologist, Dr. Olmstead, who has written a large work on the history of Babylonia, made a study of Chronicles, comparing especially the parts not found in the O. T. Book of Kings with the Babylonian inscriptions. Were the Chronicles materials unhistorical, as the critics held? What did Prof. Olmstead find? He found the investigated parts of the books of Chronicles to check with the Babylonian inscriptions where evidence was available. It was my privilege to hear Dr. Olmstead read his paper on this subject at one of the learned societies studying the Old Testament.

And was Dr. Olmstead relegated to the back-ground? Far from it. He was given a larger sphere of usefulness, by going from the University of Illinois, at Urbana, to the great University of Chicago, where he served as an honored member of the Faculty for years. Even critical scholars are quite ready to admit that the Wellhausen school itself has retrenched from various positions that are now regarded as extreme.

Among the many items that illustrate the advance in available evidence in the sphere of Old Testament introduction, one more illustration may be cited.

Wellhausen claimed that incense was not used for sacrificial purposes as early as Moses. In the light of this claim, he boldly redated the laws concerning incense to a later era than that of Moses.

There was a time when Wellhausen's bold claim could not be refuted, for lack of evidence. But since then an altar of incense was found in Northern Palestine, near Taanach, from the days before Joshua, the son of Nun. One of the leading scholars of the Wellhausen school has admitted this. It was my privilege to see this altar of incense in 1931, at the great museum of Constantinople, the museum that used to get one-half of the archaeological discoveries made in the Bible lands that were then under Turkish rule. This altar of incense is carefully described by many a writer on archaeology.

In the light of archaeological inscriptions and artifacts, and especially in the light of the Scriptures themselves, the positions of the Biblical-believing scholars have been given an increasing vindication because of an increasing array of objective evidence, right up to our own day.

Many a critical hammer has been broken upon the anvil of Holy Scripture. The process will probably go on until the end of time and the final judgment day, when the convictions of sin, righteousness and judgment will come into their own.

Meanwhile the just shall live by faith, for it is neither by good works nor by intellectual evidence that the victory is won. This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.



Education With or Without God

Bastian Kruithof
Minister First Reformed Church
Holland, Mich.

“ . . . But let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me . . . ”

IN THE last decades we have seen education for slavery and death. It has had its reward. There is bitter eloquence in the rubble of cities, the chaotic furrows of country side, lives that are no more, and lives irreparably twisted. The evidence is telling that man has wandered far from divine controls.

If man made by God and in His image is to answer to his highest calling, he must be educated for God. When all the objectives of education have been expressed, the one that should sum them all up is this: to understand and know the Lord God. If anyone has a quarrel with that, the answer is:

“Thus saith the Lord, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might; let not the rich man glory in his riches; but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth; for in these things I delight, saith the Lord.”

Mistaken Educational Ideals

In the course of his education, formal and informal, man has made terrible mistakes. Our text enumerates them. There is man glorying in his wisdom. Now wisdom is surely not to be despised. We must seek it as a most precious treasure. But man's wisdom is often not wise enough. Man without God is not wise enough to know and to do good. His intelligence often boomerangs because it is not weighted with the right kind of wisdom, and the result is destruction that overshadows blessing.

There is man glorying in his might. Israel looked to political and military alliances, and in the end it crumbled before Egypt and Babylonia. Jeremiah, immersed in a nation's tragedy, could speak from experience. Contemporary Jeremiahs can do the same thing.

There is man glorying in his riches. Covetousness, plundering individuals and nations, prosperity and its cradle songs, and the dreams of empire readily become “one with Nineveh and Tyre.”

Genuine Education

Over against these mistakes of all our yesterdays and of today the way of genuine education is still understanding and knowing the Lord God.

Such education begins in the home where parents must be teachers and leaders. The failure of parents in this respect results in the neglect of that essential training which is basic to the welfare of man and his world. J. Edgar Hoover, predicting a rising crime wave on the basis of present facts, blames the home for much of our actual and potential woe. Aware of the spiritual implications of the problem, he calls for appropriate religious training in the churches. Homes without religion and its discipline become the poison centers of society and state. Religious instruction at father's and mother's knee is vital to the individual and to mankind. It seems to have gone out along with education across father's and mother's knee.

Parents may not leave religious education entirely to the church and possibly to the school. They are responsible not only for rearing the child as an animal with emphasis on vitamins and calories but also for bringing up the child as a human being under God.

The right kind of education is also shared in by the Church. There are the Sunday services which children should attend. Parents can set an example there by attending and by making kind but firm demands on the children. There are the Church schools, catechism classes and Sunday Schools, and the young people's organizations. These all demand the co-operation of fathers and mothers. But again, the Church can not do it alone.

The institution with which we usually associate education is the school. The child spends most of its concentrated time in the school. For that reason its formal education should be permeated with religion. How illogical it is to insist on religion in the home and in the church but to ignore it in the institutions of learning. How unreasonable it is to catch up the child when it is a few weeks old into the Cradle Roll and desire it to stay in the Church school until death, but to expose it to indifference five days a week.

We are fully aware that the matter of religious education in the schools of the land is a controversial subject. My admiration has always gone out to those brave men who dismantle mines and time bombs. Sometimes there is an explosion, and they pay with their lives. If you listened to the advice of some people, you would leave this highly controversial subject alone. But that would not be showing faithfulness to the Word of God nor to a high calling. It is unfortunate that there is controversy on this subject, but it is more unfortunate

still if one succumbs to a "hush-hush" policy for the sake of a peace that is no peace. The facts of the critical situation are before us and the Christian must speak.

That matters are critical becomes evident when we get the national picture in regard to education. In line with our general subject, "Wake up, America!", we are concerned with that. It is never wise to be provincial. There are localities in this country where the situation is rather ideal as in our town. There are Christians on the school boards and on the faculties, and most of the children come from Christian homes. But these instances are rare, and they may not blind us to the national scene. A wave of strikes in Detroit disturbs us in Holland. A crime wave in Chicago disturbs us in Holland. So also the trend of American education weighs heavily upon us where we are.

Secularism in American Education

The philosophy undergirding American education has in the last decades been definitely non-religious, if not anti-religious. Moreover progressive education, which we hope has seen its day, has done a great deal of harm in making the child the author and finisher of its development or lack of development. Paul Mallon in his book, *The Ease Era*, refused publication in New York, has exploded the fallacies of the "progressives." And Jacques Maritain in his work, *Education at the Cross Roads*, has in more scholarly fashion laid bare the weaknesses of a bankrupt education.

American education has succumbed more and more to secularism. This charge is made by many voices in an authoritative manner. Trueblood gives a profound analysis in *The Predicament of Modern Man*. He says: "In our public schools we teach our children many things about our modern world, such as our system of manufacture and distribution, but we make almost no effort to give them a living knowledge of the spiritual sources of our civilization. We deliberately cut them off from their heritage. In America we actually work, in many states, on the preposterous theory that it is illegal to teach our children the faith on which our democracy rests. The public school teacher can tell all she likes about Nero, but she cannot tell about his distinguished contemporary, St. Paul. In any case she cannot tell what the open secret of St. Paul's life was. In most of our universities there are hundreds of young men devoting themselves to careful preparation in engineering or the natural sciences as against one devoting himself to careful preparation in philosophy or theology. A similar unbalance is shown in university curricula and budgetary allotments.

"The sober truth is that, as a people, we do not believe we are engaged in a race with catastrophe."

Dean Willard L. Sperry of the Harvard Divinity School said recently: "The generation of youth going to our schools and colleges in the last 30 or 40 years, to all intents and purposes, are religious illiterates. The English Bible is an almost unknown book. This religious illiteracy is the price paid for freedom of religion. Public schools and state universities, by virtue of our separation of Church and state, are prohibited from any but the most minimal religious practices and are denied the opportunity for anything like sober instruction in these matters, even as history and literature. Religious instruction in the home has become ineffective. The majority of parents do not know what to teach their children because they themselves do not know what they believe."

The report of the Harvard committee, just off the press, and entitled, *General Education in a Free Society*, has many excellent things to say for the rebirth of a liberal education, but it also states that "religion is not now for most colleges a practicable source of intellectual unity." When fair Harvard says that without any appreciable lamentations we prick up our ears and are pricked in our very souls.

Charles Clayton Morrison, editor of "The Christian Century," addressing the Missouri State Teachers Association several years ago, said some very startling things. Here are a few quotations:

"I am bound to lay on the doorstep of our educational system the prime responsibility for the decline of religion and the steady advance of secularism in American society."

"For religion, American education has what might be called a blind spot."

"The time has come to break the taboo against religious instruction in the public schools."

"It is just as much the function of public education to teach religion as to teach any other subject."

John Baillie, the Scotch theologian and author of that delightful book, *Invitation to Pilgrimage*, lecturing at Princeton last summer, pleaded for Christian schools.

These men are not crack pots. They cannot be labeled as sectarian. They see the tragic situation, lament it, and propose remedies.

There are other facts which bear out what these men and others say. "A questionnaire sent to 18,000 high school students revealed that 16,000 of them could not name three prophets of the Old Testament, 12,000 could not name the four Gospels, and 10,000 could not name three of the twelve apostles."

The reason for this is quite apparent. The American Bible Society tells us that eleven states of the Union require Bible reading; three prohibit it; and thirty-four allow it but do not require it.

Add to this indifference the statements we have quoted from responsible men, and can we still swing in the hammock of provincialism and neutrality with our hat over our eyes?

What has been done to bolster a losing cause?

Inadequate Remedies

Well, we have put the Bible in some schools. But that is quite worthless unless the Bible is read. And the reading of the Bible is rather insignificant unless it is interpreted. I must approach the Word with my head and my heart, and I cannot see how others can do anything else. Neutrality stifles the voice of the most positive book under heaven.

Something else has been done in some sections of the country. It is the matter of released time for religious instruction. Such time has been granted by some school boards and has been denied by others. In the background there always hovers the question: Is it legal? As long as there is no protest, the instruction goes on. But what can happen is evident from two cases in this country at the present time.

Released time has been banned in a section of New York state because of a protest by the Rochester Freethinkers Society. As a result hundreds of children are deprived of religious instruction.

Then there is the case at Champaign, Illinois. A woman who professes to be an atheist, and her husband who maintains that "religion is a chronic disease of the imagination contracted in childhood" are incensed that their little boy is "embarrassed" because he is the only one not attending the religious training course. The little boy comments, "As far as I am concerned, there just isn't any God." Well, these parents have brought the issue to the courts, and a decision is to be handed down this month.

There you have it. An atheistic mother and father with a spoiled child can perhaps stop other children from having the training needed and wanted. I ask in all fairness whether this is freedom of religion or freedom from religion.

Whether released time, if permitted, is the answer is, of course, also debatable. What is better, to pack religious instruction into one hour or to let it permeate all the concentrated hours of the school week?

Someone may say at this point: "You have given us the diagnosis, but what is the cure?" That is a good remark. In answer it can be said that the diagnosis is part of the cure. To lay the problem open before us is very important. Not to do that may mean our muddling through in ignorance, or indifference, or resignation.

Because America is a melting pot, we may not be able to do what England and Finland have done, but it is worth looking into their actions. In England co-operation by churches and the National Union of Teachers has resulted in an outline for religious training in the schools. The excellent considerations are that every child should become familiar with the Bible, that every child needs spiritual and moral training, and that all this is neces-

sary to the development of western civilization. Wake up, America!

According to "The Religious Digest" of August, Finland also has a great program. Listen to this: "In all the schools from the elementary to the college level (but not in professional schools) instruction in Christianity belongs to the regular curriculum, being compulsory and provided by the State or the counties. In the curriculum there is Bible history, catechism, Bible, Church history, and elementary dogmatics. Elementary school teachers receive training for the teaching of Christianity in the teachers' colleges."

The protest may arise that in America we are heterogeneous and democratic, and therefore we cannot do what these countries are doing. We should be careful, however, that our praise of democracy does not also become a praise of folly and a chant for paganism.

In the address of Morrison from which we have quoted he has two solutions. He wants teachers trained in religion to teach in all public schools. And he adds this: "If the inclusion of religion in the curriculum of public education cannot be worked out, I see for Protestantism only one conceivable alternative. I see nothing for the Protestant churches to do but to establish their own schools, somewhat on the model of the Roman Catholic parochial schools, and to withdraw their children from the public schools."

As to his first suggestion, that may be the way out for our country although it would not find favor with some of us. We are still concerned about how Christianity is interpreted for our children and for ourselves, and of course, we will be promptly called sectarian for that stand.

There is another way especially in those sections where the situation is still rather ideal. There Christians can insist on the appointment of Christian teachers or ministers to train their children. Adherents of other religions may do the same thing. In these critical times it is worth making as many test cases as possible.

Practicable Solution

The other solution of Morrison, which he prefers to place second, is perhaps the only practicable one after all. Some groups have established their own schools. They have done it at the expense of being called sectarian, but they have done it while the majority is satisfied with fiddling while America burns.

Perhaps the best solution will prove to be a Christian school sponsored not by one denomination for its own perpetuation but by several denominations agreed on the fundamentals of Christianity. Even such an institution might be called sectarian and un-American, but the charges would

be as absurd as they are false. There is a lurid sky over the world and over our country, and we had better do something and do it soon and well for the Christian education of youth. With thirteen and a half million children under twelve in America growing up without any religious education, is it necessary to ask what we are headed for? And is it wholesome to lose the main issue in provincial bickerings?

We had better translate some of that zeal America has for the Sunday School and some of that zeal too few of us have for the Christian college into the channels of grade school and high school education. Without that our inconsistencies stand out, and our lamentations will continue.

It may be we do not have all the answers, but that should not prevent our serious discussions. We do not have all the answers in regard to the problems of peace and war, crime, management and labor, and liquor, but that has not curbed the urgency. The problem of religious education is not only as vital as any and all of these; it is basic to them. It is too bad so many minds are taken up with the peripheral, forgetting the center. Or are we ready to agree that religion is not central?

We are not.

Knowing and understanding the Lord God is still the primary concern of genuine education. Education deals with the development of the whole man. Therefore, religion, and for us Christianity must be not a sprinkling or a dusting process but a regenerating power leavening the whole of life. "Thus saith the Lord," and "I am the Lord" must be the motivating truths in this matter. We must bow in all things before the will of Jeremiah's God who is also our God. He exercises lovingkindness, mercy, and patience, and His pleading may not be in vain. He exercises righteousness and judgment, and it will go either well or ill with us as we respond. It is up to us to glory in His revelation. The training of our children must be shot through with that revelation and must issue in their glorying in it. We have the Word of God and we have the Word made flesh, Jesus Christ. What God has made known must be interpreted and applied in the home, the Church, and the school. Neglecting that means glorying in our wisdom, might, and riches. The past decades make clear what that has done to man and the world. All the white crosses in other fields than Flanders, all the bodies tangling with sea weeds, all the tragic pile from Warsaw to Nagasaki do not make man's crooked paths straight. Only knowing the Lord God and doing His will can save the lost children of men.

"For in these things I delight, saith the Lord."

Do we also delight in them? Is His Word our seedplot, our garden? Is it the chart and compass of all our pilgrimage? If so, our education is with God.

[This sermon was preached in the First Reformed Church of Holland, Michigan, on November 4, 1945.—EDITOR.]

What's in a Name?

THE glib question that serves as our title has been used again and again as the final blast that throws over the most superb confidence.

What's in a name? Everything is in a name!

Suppose a child of yours is sick, hovering precariously on the thin edge between life and death. Nothing can save him but a certain medication. You rush to the drug-store, call out your order. The druggist reaches for his shelf. You glance at the bottle and are satisfied that you have what you need. You toss down money and run out of the store and home. The child still lives. You breathe more easily, and administer the medicine. The child recovers. What saved him? The medicine? Your haste? Yes, all that, but what saved your child was your confidence in a name. You know nothing about chemistry. You do not know the contents of that bottle. But on it you saw a name that you knew and which inspired confidence. Your only linkage to the curative power of that medicine was a name.

Christian preachers for centuries have stood side by side with Peter in his firm avowal, "There is no other name under Heaven, given among men wherein we must be saved." We must be saved in a Name. That is clear.

"What's in a name?" quips the modern, but the preacher is not taken off his feet. Everything is in a name. We live by confidence in names. Not the sheer sound or number of syllables, of course, but in what the name denotes. Behind every name on the druggist's shelf, stands the whole complex of medical science and pharmaceutical reliability. We can't test that reliability or rework that science. We live by the names.

No one is saved from sin by the sheer name of Jesus, repeated like a fetish. But everyone who is saved is saved by the name of Jesus because behind that Name stands the Person Whose Name it is, and behind Him stands the loving eternal purpose and unchanging faithfulness of God Whose Son He is.

We are actually and literally saved by a Name!

—ALA BANDON

The Voice of our Readers

CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS IN CANADA

Neerlandia, Alberta,
Canada,
January 22, 1946.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

WOULD you kindly place the following comment in THE CALVIN FORUM?

In the FORUM of January appears a letter from the hand of the Rev. P. De Koekkoek from the Canadian north. In this letter it is stated that there is a Free Christian School at Lacombe, Alberta.

As I am acquainted with the school laws of the Province of Alberta, I would like to know what the correspondent means by that term "Free". As far as my knowledge goes, the Free Christian School of Lacombe is bound to the same curriculum laid down by the Department of Education as are the Public Schools. Also the pupils will answer the same examination questions as the pupils of the Public School.

What puzzles me is that when a teacher teaches in one school she is taken for a Christian teacher, and when she teaches exactly the same subjects to the same covenant children in another school, everything being exactly the same, she is not. I therefore am driven to the conclusion that what is called a Free School is nothing but a Public School in a Reformed jacket. If these Free Schools had their own text-books and a system of education thoroughly permeated with Reformed principles, I would agree that we need a school of our own. But when we have to abide by the ruling of the Department of Education, and have no say nor choice regarding the text-books used, and are given every co-operation by the Divisional Board and the Department of Education in procuring the teachers we wish to have, I cannot see where anything is to be gained but that of having our children separated from those of the world, and that is what we have at Neerlandia.

Sincerely yours,
P. TUINGA.

Neerlandia, Alberta,
Canada,
January 21, 1946.

Dear Editor:

THAT Neerlandia may not appear in an unfavorable light by the letter of Rev. P. De Koekkoek printed in the January issue of THE CALVIN FORUM, we would be pleased if you would enter the following in the next issue of the FORUM.

In his article entitled, "Christian Schools in Canada," readers will get the impression that Holland Marsh, Lacombe, and Edmonton are setting enviable examples by erecting their own Christian schools, while Neerlandia, lacking initiative, is trying to christianize the public school.

This is not an accurate picture and calls for an explanation.

We are all agreed that what is taught and practiced in a school determines its Christian or non-Christian character. To have a Christian school we need therefore God-fearing teachers who by walk of life and teaching lead our children to God and a godly life, and also a God-centered curriculum.

The building, as such, has no bearing on this whatsoever. Only, to gain freedom to teach Christianity in our schools, we are sometimes compelled to build our own schools, because some unbelievers living in the same district and sending their children to the same school, disallow this Christian teaching; and

also to separate our children from the children of unbelievers. In this respect Neerlandia is very fortunate to have all people of Christian Reformed persuasion attending the same school with a few exceptions, who are not opposed to Christian training in our school. But Lacombe and Edmonton are forced to have their own school to gain this end.

However, we are all bound by the same laws, separate and public schools alike being bound to our government-approved curriculum and allowed only one-half hour daily for Christian instruction, if no one objects.

Now let us compare these schools. Lacombe has her own school with a Christian teacher and has a "Christian School." Neerlandia has a public-owned school, with Christian teachers under the same laws, using the same books, and we are "trying to christianize the public school." Anyone can see that that is not a very fair comparison. Surely, no one would expect Neerlandia to invest a lot of money to have her own "Christian School" while she is actually accomplishing nothing by doing so. Would any sincere Christian teacher refuse to teach in our Neerlandia school but go to Lacombe's "Christian School," seeing we are under the same laws, having the same liberties? We do not believe in idol worship; surely not in building worship.

The real fact is, however, that Lacombe and Edmonton and also Neerlandia are doing all they can for Christian education for their children, but we are all trying to christianize the public school system. Now let us be honest in judging these schools. Is Lacombe's school more Christian than Neerlandia's? Let the readers judge.

We are fully apprized of the evil effects of public school books and a neutral (?) teacher, and therefore we deem the action taken by Lacombe and Edmonton as very praiseworthy. But let us not rest until we have our own Chr. Ref. text- and library books and above all teachers. Indeed, "The Lord has done great things for us"; let us then also show our humble thankfulness in a life that is truly God-fearing, which includes bringing up our children as God-fearing children in home, school, and church.

Yours sincerely,
CECIL W. TUINGA.

[These letters shed an interesting sidelight on the Christian instruction situation in one of the Canadian provinces. Perhaps our correspondent will wish to make reply. We welcome an intelligent discussion. Meanwhile it is gratifying to note the live interest in all the Canadian settlements mentioned in these letters in the cause of Christian education in the school as well as the home and the church.—EDITOR.]

AS TO STRIKES AND REVOLUTION

1929 Collins Ave., SE.,
Grand Rapids 7, Michigan.
February 8, 1946.

The Editor,
THE CALVIN FORUM,
City.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

I'VE noticed that seldom do your subscribers take exception to controversial items appearing in the FORUM. I suppose delicacy of subject-matter is one of the deterrents; and, if done too often, it makes one appear in the role of a cracker-barrel spouter. But February's issue contains an article which should fetch a few protests from readers. So one-sided was it, the writer by putting horns on the one, conferred a nimbus on the other.

I found the anatomy of "Authority, Government, and Strikes", too sprawling, too indefinite, and its contents quite anemic, if not bloodless. I had difficulty dissecting it. I did notice, among other things, the use of platitude is Gerrit Hospers' charm. He begins by giving us a vague idea of what constitutes proper authority and government, bolstering it with quotations, then winds up by implying that Unionism is Sin and Strikes are the Revolution. Reading the article through the first time, I was nettled trying to learn just what was the clear-cut issue. Re-reading it, I sniffed suspiciously at the preliminary steps which served artlessly as a cover-up for his heated brand of censure on the present administration and the Unions.

His introductory paragraph has a hint of the unknown quantity. He points out the only solution to our dilemma lies in a specific choice. He doesn't elaborate on the "two alternatives", nor is he very clear in one or the other. In dogmatic style he states that governments must be rooted either in the sovereignty of God or in the sovereignty of man. That's all. Obviously one can't be a complement to the other. There must be no half-way measure. This leaves me bewildered. There is usually much ado about men who prescribe modern Utopias; I wonder if Hospers felt quite secure in presenting a rather protected one.

He tags this questionable point with a brief personal sketch of a Dutch statesman, and a few of his sage deductions. It strikes me that the lint of native sentiment clings too much to Hospers. The article proceeds with quotations from the HONORABLE Groen Van Prinsterer; a man whose very position as the King's secretary would determine his bias. Could it be expected of this dignitary to be impartial? He [Hospers] says: "... They [Holland's political parties] all rest more or less on religious ideas. The Roman Catholic Church definitely organized themselves as a party in 1865 . . ." (This is commendable.) Then there was formed the Liberal Party, and because the "... conservative element did not feel at home with it . . . Groen (as an anti-Revolutionary) stood alone with his orthodox opinions . . ." His opponents taunted him with being a general without an army. A neutral observer might have seen him as a private out of step, for the King's employe received "... poor support from such people who like him were known for their old-fashioned piety . . ." Notwithstanding, Groen emerged triumphant because he and his adherents grew until his became one of the major parties. The Liberal group finally got mixed in with the Socialist. This left Holland with two great religious Parties: the Catholic and the anti-Revolutionary, and, incidentally, the majority control. What strange bedfellows politics make!

Although some distinction in the word is made by Hospers, through Groen and Stahl, Revolution in its malignant form and world-historical concept, received its inception from the French Revolution. From that time on, Stahl saw it as an entity, a cancer which, undying, eats on down through history and men's minds. To quote Stahl: "... The Revolution is the history of the irreligious philosophy of the past century; it is, in its source and results, the doctrine which, freely developed, destroys Church and State, society, and the family . . ." In the same hand we have the anti-Revolutionary principle which "... opposes anarchy, in the name of religion, of right, of progress, and of liberty . . ." From this it isn't impertinent to assume that prior to the French mess there were left no anarchistic tendencies or manifestations of systematic unbeliefs following great human stirrings. And yet history is saturated with the blood of peoples who rebelled against political despots and Catholic imperialism. But apparently it didn't leave posterity with any serious dislocation of thought. Despite this dangling thread, neither did Stahl, nor Groen, nor Hospers, allow any consideration for the French Revolution as an inevitable end of a long trail of tyranny and abuse. The feud was to come to its own bloody climax. (Hospers might do well to read Dickens's *Tale of Two Cities*.)

Up to this point several questions came to my mind: Would Hospers say that our own Constitution was inspired and estab-

lished from findings of the Ten Commandments—equality for all? Or was it written with a provoking eye to certain material and secular advantages? Either way he looks at it, had America a right to revolt against the mother country? England had a most worthy Constitution, even though variable. Still the Bostonians went ahead with their tea-party and the Green Mountain Boys defended their own brand of religion with musketry. These were Revolutionaries, with subversive intentions. But there is no evidence to support the belief that the French received an evil philosophy from the Colonists' rebellion.

Further on in the article we read that the political parties of the United States are not founded upon religious principles. Taking a heterogeneous nation like ours, could a candidate for high office, say, a Catholic, corral a majority vote on the platform of his faith as against an opponent without any? Would Hospers vote for the former? In one place he tacitly gives the nod to the Catholics' aid in an abortive strike. In 1903, when the Netherlands was threatened with a nation-wide railroad strike, the anti-Revolutionary Party, aided by the Roman Catholic Party, squelched it. "... The Cabinet took strong position on the ground of Divine authority." Whose brand of grounds? The Catholic's or the Protestant's?

Now we come to the heart of the article: "Unionism and Governmental Authority." Remember, Hospers earlier quotes Groen about revolutionary ideas—as somewhat sanctioned. "... Principles of freedom and equality . . . which are honored as the corner-stones of state-right and state-structure." Remember, also, our own government is ruled by a two-party system, neither of which is religious. And yet it is this unreligious coalition which the Unions are accused of wanting to overthrow or dislodge. Now, mind, Hospers doesn't say, either by implication or otherwise, that Union members are godless, so that there is a possibility of preponderance of religious men among them. Therefore they could be a bulwark for setting up a government that had Christ's dictum as a basis: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you. No, the Unions' only intentions are toward insurrection, revolution, and *insubordination to the legally constituted authority*. So, where are we now? The confusion grows. Oh, yes, Hospers goes on by castigating ex-Governor Murphy (a devout Catholic Christian) for permitting the sit-down strike, in the same breath besmirching the late President Roosevelt's name by calling him a Revolutionary.

In the right-or-wrong question of the sit-down strike there is of course a vital matter involved whether or not labor has an inherent moral (all other things being equal) right to its job. At the time, the State of Michigan delivered its opinion on this: Labor has. That is our *legally constituted authority*. (Hospers' reference.) Christ didn't actually sit down in the temple when he drove off the money-changers from their own property, but he certainly used a whip because he had a moral and divine right to do so. How is this to be interpreted in the modern way?

But there is a solution for our present and impending political crises. Again we are made to read Groen's quotation about Unionism's growing power and demanding everything—unrestrained license, etc. So to remedy the insufferable situation, the opinions as laid down by Groen, Stahl, Guizot, Vinet, Burke, Gladstone, etc. (This last must include Hospers) should apply. Simple, and *simple*, isn't it?

There is through the entire article a veiled labeling of anybody and everything as radical that is connected with our present government or Unions. It is an irritating device. By just branding so-and-so a Red, one gets rid of a problem-child. It is less embarrassing, really. Members of Congress are fond of using this tag on a colleague when they find he doesn't agree with his or her opinions.

In the present tug-of-war between Capital and Labor I take the stand of a sideline observer. What I've said herein doesn't mean I like Labor better. But from what I've seen, read, and deduced from happenings during the past twenty-five years, I like Capital less. When Hospers said that picketing was an act

of lawlessness I couldn't help but think of the "picketing" Capital does in legislative chambers, bribing the law-makers with their offensive and expensive lobbies. Labor hasn't that kind of money. They've got to stand in the cold.

I have nothing to suggest for strike-prevention. I view a strike as I do a war: it is there, deeply disturbing and costly. And because they are thrust upon us, neither can I subscribe to any screwball notion that they are a distillation of perverted thought dating back to somewhere in 1789. For, the comparative progress and prosperity of the last 150 years gives it the lie. The living standard of America has been upped, not by Industry's benevolent hand, but because the Unions, through numbers and strength, fought for reforms. Perhaps progress slipped back meanwhile, but in many cases more was gained by the realization of hidden values revealed by Labor's explosive charges. If Hospers can show me, logically and concretely, that the world is worse off for having had the French Revolution, I'll then believe some of his unsupported statements.

The time is past when Labor is going to be whipped into behaving like nice little boys. While the submission lasted it was unembarrassing and comfortable; and during the interims of revolt it is going to be unpleasant and inconvenient. But maybe in the long run the *genus homo* will be better off for it. I don't know.

Now regarding the world's mess which Hospers sums up in conclusion, I have nothing to offer. I do know we have another more serious matter to consider than our own internal affairs. The anxious eyes of 10 Downing Street and of the White House are looking to a greater threat to our respective economic systems. Talk about competition as we know it: in the life of

trade! That will be insignificant compared to the competition of the giants: NATIONS. To think that one day we may have to abandon the present phase of our economy will be a tragic and trembling contemplation. No sober-minded economist will deny the possibility.

Capital, as an integral part of our economic structure, has proven itself unstable even for our limited requirements. Witness the periodic depressions, each worse than the previous one. Our Capital is petty cash compared to the unrestricted means which Russia can make of her unlimited resources. Russia's economy is fluid, apart from private investments. She doesn't need to wait on money-powers; her reserves are great; she needs no legal money-machinery to set her going full blast. She hasn't the equipment yet, but she is rapidly making progress. Can England and the United States, with their broken-up industrial systems and consequent waste, keep up production with a country which has the green light for full speed ahead and no stoppages for depressions and strikes? Time will give the answer.

Yankee inventiveness and ingenuity will undoubtedly consider all angles, and may find a way. If not, we'll go down in defeat before the greatest Revolutionary nation the world has ever known. And not necessarily through a war either. Certainly no Anti-Revolutionary Party will stop them. Perhaps realism will yet be forced on us. In case Hospers doesn't know it, it might be well to inform him that at present Washington and London can't make up their troubled minds, not what to do with Russia, but how to compete with her.

Yours very respectfully,

EDWARD RODENHOUSE.

From Our Correspondents

CALVINISM IN NORTH IRELAND

Dr. C. Bouma,
Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Belfast, Northern Ireland,
2nd January, 1946.

Dear Professor Bouma:

CALVINISM in Ireland does not constitute a large force, but it can claim to be very active. The majority of the Protestant people of Northern Ireland know nothing of Calvinism, and those who do, often look upon it as a harsh and out-of-date doctrine. The Arminian views are firmly implanted in our province, and the man who stands up for such doctrines as Predestination or Total Depravity is met by much opposition. Therefore I think I am quite safe in stating that the atmosphere in Northern Ireland is not favourable for Calvinism. Because of this the need of propagating it is brought home to us daily; we feel that the spirit of Calvinism here must be aggressive and not merely defensive. Many Christians in our province who have heard nothing but the Arminian side from their childhood have accepted Calvinism as soon as it was clearly presented to them. We feel that if the presentation was on a grander scale, still more would rally behind the great doctrines of Scripture. Ignorance is one of the greatest obstacles in our way.

A Calvinistic Bookshop

The Evangelical Bookshop can claim to be the only Calvinistic book-room in Ireland. One may purchase there most of the Evangelical works published in the British Isles, and many Christians of varying denominations avail themselves of the opportunity. It is indeed heartening to behold people buying up good literature, as there is so much bad literature for sale in our city. This bookshop, however, does more than circulate Evangelical writings; it also propagates the great Reformed doctrines, commonly known as Calvinism. Thus the works of

Dr. Loraine Boettner, Prof. Louis Berkhof, and men of such calibre are to be obtained. Occasional publications of the Sovereign Grace Union, a body of English Calvinists, are also on sale. Many people come in contact with Calvinism for the first time by entering our Bookshop, and the amount of good done by it would be hard to estimate. The only pity is that we have not more like it in various parts of the country.

This book-room also exists as a protest and counter to Modernism. Other shops in the city sell the writings of unbelieving critics and downright modernists. Thus it is encouraging to see people buy such books as *The Five Books of Moses* by Dr. Oswald T. Allis, works exposing the inconsistencies of the Evolutionary theory, and others replying to the Modernist attacks on Holy Scripture. Besides these bigger works, there is issued a host of pamphlets and articles by scholarly men of Calvinistic views. A colporteur brings many of these publications into the country districts, and visits anywhere from five hundred to seven hundred homes per month. In the month of November, 1945, out of a total of 745 homes visited, 65 were Roman Catholic. The good influence of this book-room is not confined to Northern Ireland, but also extends across the border into Roman Catholic Eire. During the war it was necessary to have a permit in order to post printed matter from North Ireland to Eire. We succeeded in obtaining one, and so the flow of sound teaching was not blocked in this quarter.

When we look at other book-rooms in the city selling a flood of Modernistic teaching, we feel very thankful for our little witness, a light in the midst of great spiritual darkness. May the Lord continue to bless our work; we covet your prayers in this respect.

An Interesting Book

Calvinists in Ireland have just received a treat in the form of a book by Rev. W. J. Grier, B.A. *The Momentous Event* is a small volume, yet deals with the Second Advent in a masterly

fashion; there is not a dry page in the book. The second chapter bears the title "Post, Pre or Non," and briefly yet clearly sets forth the three main views concerning our Lord's return. Mr. Grier supports the Non-Millennial view. In his short Introduction, Mr. Grier gives his reason for publishing this book—"there is no book now easily obtainable in the British Isles which sets forth the viewpoint here presented. There are similar works issued in the U.S.A. written by ministers of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and the Christian Reformed Church, but these are extremely difficult to obtain owing to present conditions." This book, then, comes to us as a real boon, especially as there are so many of what Mr. Grier terms "fanciful views as to the Lord's second advent." In Northern Ireland the Pre-millennial view seems to be most popular amongst Christian circles, and books have been circulated supporting this view; therefore we are more than glad to see this fine work being issued, and we trust that God will bless it to many in the province.

Yours in His Service,
FRED S. LEAHY.

FROM SOUTH INDIA

Telugu Village Mission,
Adoni, Bellary Dist.,
South India,
Nov. 28, 1945.
[Rec'd Feb. 4, 1946.]

The Editor-in-Chief,
THE CALVIN FORUM,
Grand Rapids, Mich., U.S.A.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

YOUR admirable August-September number, packed with even better fare than usual, reminds me of a pleasant, but so far unfulfilled duty towards yourself and the Editorial Staff of the FORUM. Let me, therefore, begin by sending you gentlemen my tardy, but none the less sincere felicitations on having passed your tenth milestone of service to the Christian public. The consistently high standard of your purposeful, God- and Bible-centered editorials and the scholarly quality of most of the contributed articles appearing in the pages of the FORUM cannot but be regarded as a particularly useful "service" to a large circle of readers, among whom one would very likely find many shades of cultural and religious thought. I am personally proud to be numbered among your foreign correspondents, thereby being in a position to help swell the volume of Christian world voices which are heard in these columns from time to time. May God bless your labours and continue to extend the thrust and scope of the FORUM's influence in the new decade on which you have entered.

A U. S. Gift Library

A fresh link of culture and friendship between India and the U.S.A. was forged on Nov. 10th at the Memorial Hall, Madras City, when Mr. Roy Bower, the American Consul, handed over on behalf of his Government a library of children's books for use in educating the juveniles of South India. This friendly gesture on the part of the U. S. Government was greatly appreciated by the citizens of Madras, most of whom, a correspondent writes, were much impressed with the high quality of the books in their contents and general get-up, and at the tremendous progress attained by Americans in the science of child education. India, I may add, knows little about catering for the literary needs of her children apart from the text books supplied to schools, and, save in the homes of a few well-to-do westernized families, the average Indian parent has little or nothing to offer his children in the way of stimulating, recreational reading.

The volumes, which were displayed in sections, comprised studies in reading, special readers, writing and grammar, arithmetic, geography, music, special studies in history, geography, civics and science, books for parents and teachers, reference and library books and childcraft, handicraft, and social studies. This splendid new library, which is in charge of the Madras

School books and Literature Society, recalls a gift by an American-born ex-Governor of Madras, Elihu Yale, to the place of his birth. Describing the gifts and its implications, *The Mail*, a leading Madras daily, writes: "Yale served in India for 20 years, being Governor of Madras for five years (1687-92). When he returned to England he sent to Yale university a library valued at Rs 7,500 (\$2,250). America has repaid that debt to Madras very many times over. Her immense and continually growing contribution to the spread of enlightenment in this country through her missionary, educational and humanitarian foundations, has taken many forms. And among these her latest munificence in the shape of children's books deserves a place as it brings more joy to children in reading and learning. The introduction of these books, illustrating highly evolved American aesthetic principles, literary forms and methods of study, marks the beginning of a new and more wholesome influence in the education of our children."

Of Peace and War

The Thanksgiving broadcast heard from New York City a few nights ago was a solemn reminder to all Christendom of a merciful deliverance from the most sinister tyranny in history. It is also a matter for satisfaction that Goering and his grisly gang at Nuremberg, and Yamashita and his fellow sadists at Manila are actually being tried for the unspeakable atrocities they have perpetrated on thousands of innocent men and women. One is forced to the conclusion, however, that, V-E and V-J day celebrations notwithstanding, few people, if any, can feel jubilant over the uneasy, turbulent peace which the world is "enjoying" today.

The civil war in China and the distressing armed strife in Indo-China and Indonesia, not to mention the political upheavals in the Middle East, must cause even the most optimistic of our international leaders much justified cause for disquiet. America and Britain have been having their fill of labor disputes and the latest strike of more than a quarter of a million operatives in the plants of the General Motors Corporation cannot, one supposes, but result in a gigantic headache for those responsible for the smooth running of industry over in your great country. Perhaps the only people conscious of inward peace and calm are those who study their Bibles and believe that it is only the Prince of Peace Who can induce tranquillity in the hearts and lives of men and Who can bring real peace to this anguished, sorely tried world.

India and Its Christian Community

India, meanwhile, continues to present the usual paradox: outwardly calm and well ordered but inwardly in a seething political ferment with the bureaucracy, brown and white, striving feverishly to preserve the constitutional *status quo*, and our political pundits the while hurling defiance at the powers-that-be and stirring up the inert masses to cry, parrotlike, for *Swaraj*, or self-government, which the majority neither understand nor desire. The intellectuals, however, have no illusions left concerning the rapid spread of communism throughout the Orient and the fact of India's peculiar vulnerability to its appeal. The political balance is indeed very critically poised and it is realized that the slightest false move on the part of the administrations in London and New Delhi might have the effect of upsetting the unstable equilibrium, precipitating the country into internecine conflict or unpredictable magnitude and consequence. Further, the trend of events in neighboring countries farther East is definitely not reassuring to students of current affairs, interested in the spread of Christianity.

And how will Christian India fare, you might ask, in the coming political set-up, seeing she forms but two per centum of the total population? It is a pertinent query as Christian America has spent and is spending liberally in the work of extending Christ's Kingdom here in India. I shall let a godly American missionary of long experience and very wide contacts among Indians of all classes answer. Dean among Western missionaries in South India and with a half century's work to his credit as educator, evangelist, and author of many theological books in the Telugu language, Dr. W. L. Ferguson of

the American Baptist Mission and lately President of the Northern Baptist Seminary, Chicago, in the course of a recent personal letter to me, writing on the future of the Indian Christian community, said, "We have witnessed many great changes since we arrived, fifty years ago yesterday. The whole Christian community in India is on a different footing from what it was. The community is not yet past its 'growing pains'; but I believe that it will survive the difficulties of the present and the future, though, perhaps, not without some losses. The Lord Himself has planted love in thousands of hearts in this land. That love will survive and transmit itself in and through the gospel to the India that is to be."

I believe that this mellow octogenarian *Guru* (teacher) from the West, revered and loved by so many of his Indian friends, is right:—that if the Church in India accepts with humility the sovereign will of God, honours His Word, and seeks by every means to proclaim the Good Tidings and the unsearchable riches of Christ—she will not only survive the hostility of a largely non-Christian *Azad Hind* (free India) but will actually prosper and increase.

We hope to be able to visit the U. S. next year and, if suitable steamer passage is obtainable, we expect D.V. to sail by the spring of 1946—possibly even before the issue of the *FORUM* containing this South India letter reaches me! We look forward also with keen pleasure to recontacting our many American friends and helpers.

With greetings to yourself and my readers for a New Year full of blessings,

Fraternally yours,
ARTHUR V. RAMIAH.

AUSTRALIAN VOICE

Sydney, New South Wales,
Australia,
December 20, 1945.

Professor Clarence Bouma,
Calvin Seminary,
Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

DAY by day ships of all types steam into the bay carrying troops and ex-prisoners-of-war. Thousands of men are being discharged from the armed forces each day. This army returning to civilian life has accentuated the problems created by six years of war-time restrictions and regimentation of man power.

The shortage of housing and the continued rationing of clothes and certain food stuffs together with industrial unrest has given rise to the usual "forgers of lies and prophets of no value".

Communists, who represent a very small minority, by their usual methods of subtlety and untiring efforts, have gained controlling positions in two or three of the largest trade unions. They seek to, and are aggravating the situation. Roman Catholic Action appears to be concentrating her efforts to meet the threat of Communism, creating fertile soil for all the weeds of social ideologies that germinate in the unregenerate mind.

Liberalism is in the field with its panacea for our social ills. Methodism in this state is concentrating on Community Centres and Boys' Clubs. The idea is to guide the mind of youth at the most impressionable age. The whole trend is socialistic, individuality is suppressed and independent judgment must be subordinate to the mass.

Community Centres form a definite threat to family life, as the centre undertakes to fulfil the responsibilities that belong to the family. Scarcely anything could be more serious than the deterioration of the family responsibilities. Yet such a breakdown in family life is being advocated by liberal church leaders. The brave new world is to be built by human endeavour, and we hear the usual chorus of parasites call: 'Not creed but conduct'. The Reformed doctrine of the Atonement is a prison of modern thought, and therefore discarded.

In recent months Presbyterianism has given much attention to Church Union. At the last general assembly of the Pres-

byterian Church of Australia, the question of union with the Methodists and Congregationals was put to the house and carried by 143 in favour, 53 against. The finding of the General Assembly will now be passed down to the state assemblies for further consideration. An association has been formed by the conservatives in the church to oppose union.

At the close of the Assembly, and before a thin house a motion was put to admit women to the ministry. The motion was carried.

Warmest regards, yours,
ARTHUR ALLEN.

AT MICHIGAN'S UNIVERSITY

218 N. Division,
Ann Arbor, Michigan,
February 4, 1946.

THE CALVIN FORUM,
Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

SHALL I write about the housing situation here, with veterans tramping the streets looking in vain for some sort of shelter? I know of one couple that lives in a little cubby hole, with a card table, an electric plate, a wash basin, and a few odd chairs—and sleeps several blocks down the street in a little attic. Some of these people feel they are not getting a square deal. And the end is not yet, for we haven't begun to reach the maximum enrolment that is sure to result when the servicemen are all back. An enrolment of fourteen thousand is seen for next year.

Michigan is still a very liberal center. But one can see an appreciable change during the past five years. In the religious world liberalism is plainly on the defensive. One sees it in the ministers' conferences held from time to time. A really enthusiastic liberal is hard to find of late, even though it would be too sanguinary to think that this indicates a return to the faith of the fathers. To exchange a theology of achievement for a theology of "revelation" is a metamorphosis that cannot be accomplished by degrees.

A series of colloquiums on "Religion in Higher Education" were held recently, in the Upper Room at Lane Hall. (If the persons attending had been less dignified these meetings would have been called bull sessions.) These meetings were held under the chairmanship of the Provost, Dr. James P. Adams, a man who has done some clear thinking on the matter in hand. And some highly interesting things were said. One of the speakers, Dr. Arnold Nash of McCormick, and author of *The University in the Modern World*, threw some hand grenades right into the camp of the liberals. He asserted that if education is to be sound and truly liberal, teachers should teach their convictions, and in such a way that their persuasions become evident to the students, who may then accept or reject. Dr. Nash was especially unmerciful in his criticism of "unbiased" education, and he made it plain that they who sing its praises most loudly are frequently themselves more biased than most.

Father J. Ryan Beiser of the School of Religion at the State University of Iowa gave some illuminating information as to how the problem of religion in higher education is solved in that State.

Paul Tillich gave a series of lectures recently in the palatial Rackham Hall. He had much to say in connection with "the Protestant Principle". Man is not autonomous: it was the error of traditional liberalism that it thought he was. Nor should man submit to heteronomy; all groups that have assigned infallibility to any item that is "of the created", whether Pope, Church, or Book, have erred at this point. Man should live theonomously: that is the "Protestant principle". The careful listener detects a Barthian overtone here. Tillich's "De Sacra Scriptura" is not that of the Protestant Reformation.

Even the local ministers' conference has roused itself out of its complacent liberal lethargy. We are to listen to a paper on "Just What is the Church?" Doctrine and credal concept do seem to matter after all!

As ever, your fellow soldier,
LEONARD VERDUIN.

REFORMED CHURCH LETTER

Holland, Michigan,
Feb. 12, 1946.

Dear Editor:

INSTEAD of giving items of news from various sections of the denomination, I intend to devote this letter to information about Hope College, one of our educational institutions. The Reformed Church is proud of two Seminaries and three colleges. At a later time I shall give information about these institutions. This will acquaint our friends in this and other countries with our institutions. It will also remind members of the Reformed Church reading THE CALVIN FORUM of the facts and figures so easily forgotten or lost in our nearness to them.

It might be well to name the several institutions of the denomination at the outset so the over-all picture will be clearer. We have two seminaries, the New Brunswick Theological Seminary at New Brunswick, New Jersey, and the Western Theological Seminary at Holland, Michigan. We have three colleges, Hope College at Holland, Michigan, Central College at Pella, Iowa, and Northwestern Junior College and Academy at Orange City, Iowa. We also maintain the Pleasant Prairie Academy at German Valley, Illinois.

This letter deals with Hope College. Its beginning may be dated at 1850 when the first interest was recorded. In 1850 the Dutch settlers in Michigan, then organized in the Holland Classis, joined with the Reformed Church. At the time the Reformed Church was found mainly in New York and New Jersey. The Holland colonists felt the need of educating young men in preparation for college training offered at the time in Rutgers College at New Brunswick, New Jersey. Van Raalte, the leader of the Michigan settlement, gave five acres of land and secured Principal Taylor to begin instruction in 1851. Van Raalte said, "This is my anchor of Hope for this people in the future." This statement designated the name for the new school, Hope College.

The school was placed under the General Synod in 1853, and was incorporated as a college in 1865. The first commencement was held in 1866 when eight young men graduated. Seven of these young men were students for the ministry.

Various buildings were built, and the campus was gradually enlarged. At the present two buildings are used for class room work, Van Raalte Hall, and the new science building. The library and administration activities are housed in the same building. The president's home is on the campus. The young ladies are housed in Voorhees Hall, Van Vleck Hall, Columbia Cottage, and various other large homes near the campus converted to cottage residences. The men are housed in the enlarged Seminary dormitory just across the street from the college. A beautiful memorial chapel seating fifteen hundred is an asset to the college and the city. Its beautifully stained windows, its marvelous organ, its large choir loft, and its first

floor accommodations for the departments of Bible and music make it the pride of the campus.

For the past fourteen years Dr. W. Wichers served as president of the College. He resigned last year to join the faculty of Western State College at Kalamazoo. Great accomplishments were made under his administration even through the years of depression and war.

The new president of Hope College is Dr. I. J. Lubbers, who came from a very successful service as president of Central College for the last eleven years. More will be stated about this in my letter about Central College.

Dr. Lubbers is a graduate of the Wisconsin Memorial Academy, Hope College, Columbia University, and Northwestern University. From the last named institution he earned his Ph.D. in the field of College administration. Dr. Lubbers was English Instructor in Voorhees College, India, Professor of English in Hope College from 1923-1929, Instructor in Education in Northwestern University, 1930, Associate Professor of Psychology and Education at Carroll College (Wisconsin) from 1930-1934, after which he went to Central College to serve as president.

Dr. Lubbers has written and spoken extensively on college administration and Christian education. He is at present serving as chairman of the National Commission on Christian Higher Education of the Association of American Colleges.

A few figures about the graduates of Hope College will be of interest. During the years a total of 2,824 were graduated from the college. This represents 1,776 men and 1,048 women. The following professions are represented in this number. Business 386, medicine and dentistry 155, Education 750, Law 30, Ministry with charge 526, Missions 114, and professional studies 216.

The enrollment at Hope is normal at present with 550 attending. This number includes 200 veterans, of which 125 enrolled in the second semester beginning Feb. 4. Many of these veterans are former Hope students.

The housing situation remains a problem. Recent approval of 25 family units or dormitory facilities for 50 persons have been promised under the FPHA regulation.

Under the leadership of President Lubbers great things are in store for the college. The first building project is a men's dormitory. The faculty has already been enlarged.

This does not tell the full story of Hope College or of any Christian college. The heart of the Christian college is the Christian faith in the chapel, the class room, and in the lives of both professors and students. Such experiences and expressions cannot adequately be recorded on paper.

I trust this form of reporting on the news of the Reformed church will give a better acquaintance with the expression of Calvinism in the denomination and in the world at large where graduates of a Christian college translate Christian training into Christian living.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM GOULOOZE.



Book Review

A CATHOLIC DUTCH HISTORY

EVOLUTION OF THE DUTCH NATION, by Bernard H. M. Vlekke.
Published by Roy Publishers, New York, 1945. Pp. 377.
Price \$3.50.

HERE is a very interesting history of the Netherlands. The author who is secretary general of the Netherland government Historical Institute in Rome, and who was during the writing of this volume a refugee scholar and lecturer at Harvard, has first produced a history of the Dutch East Indies under the title of *Nu Santara*, and has now written a most informative work in English on the Netherlands. The other up-to-date works contain only sketchy reviews of Dutch history, and are rather short. This textbook is well-stocked with the most recent information especially on the Middle Ages, on the so-called Golden Age, and on contemporary history. It contains a wealth of material that is brought to light by research of the last fifty years. It has sidelights on Dutch economics and culture that are refreshing. It is on the whole written in a graphic style and with attractive detail. It brings out the many characters of Dutch history in forceful lines. And it places in full relief the desperate struggle of the alliance of the Calvinist and Catholic political parties under Kuyper and Schaapman for the subsidizing of the Catholic parochial and the free Christian schools, for a share in the government of the nation, for a clerical policy in the Dutch East Indies, and for the betterment of social and economic conditions in the homeland. All together it is a book which will be consulted by many, we hope, who want to get a well-digested review of any period of Dutch history.

Influence of Calvinism Minimized

This volume is of special significance for Calvinists of Dutch descent, because it gives a sympathetic slant on Kuyper's statesmanship and on the political achievements of the Dutch Calvinists in alliance with the Catholics. Yet, Dr. Vlekke puts forth a deliberate effort to minimize the influence of the Calvinists who established the Dutch Republic, won the Eighty Years' war, and created a modern culture in science and art in the Golden Age. He mentions the Calvinist Groen and the Liberal Fruin more than once as men who have given old Calvinism too much honor, and put the old Catholics in a forgotten corner. Cleverly the author marshals his facts (and omits others) to bring out that the Catholics made their patriotic contributions, and that the liberty allowed to dissenters was the work of Erasmian influences among Catholics and Humanists. He takes occasion to call the Calvinists a strong, serious and determinate group, but void of tolerance. He sings the old song of Wagenaar when he states that Oldenbarneveltd was removed by "political" murder. He omits the share of Marnix in 1572 and 1576 to establish freedom also for the Catholics. He blames the Calvinists for the Iconoclasm of 1566 and neglects to speak of the differences between the Precisions, the Moderates and the Latitudinarians in the Reformed Church. He does not neglect any opportunity, however, to diminish the glory of Calvinism as a cultural movement, and to cast certain reflections on some of its leaders, e.g. Usselinx, Groen and Kuyper. He puts the state party and John de Witt, defenders of oligarchy and "drip system", on a pedestal and calls them liberal-minded! He labels—in old liberal fashion—the Christian political parties and the Christian schools denominational, without quotation marks, though every one knows that they are

not controlled by the church like the Catholic party and schools. But he lauds the Modern Calvinists because they brought honor to the suspected and uninfluential Catholics, and then utters the hope that the future will do away with the political antithesis of Kuyper and Schaapman, and bring about a regular array of Conservatives and Progressive Liberals, which is more to the author's liking.

Appraisal of Main Theses

The author, it is plain, and he states so deliberately, has two axes to grind. He wants to show that the idea of Groen and Fruin that Calvinism put its stamp on the Dutch nation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is mistaken, and that Dutch history, like all history, is mainly determined by geographical and economic factors.

No one will deny that the contrast between the coastland with centers like Amsterdam, and the land provinces with centers like Groningen, has had a great deal to do with Dutch sympathies and developments. The present theological struggle is a proof of this, for in many respects it brings out the age-old difference between the active and speculative West and the reticent and mystical East. The tussle also between rich and poor, capital and labor is illustrated by such factors in all countries, and again in our own days. But the underlying motive for all conflicts in politics, economics, and culture is, we believe, of a religious and ethical nature. The temperamental shadings may be based on heredity and environment, but wars and revolutions are caused by moral factors. Religion and culture cannot be divorced. The devil is still the dragon who wants to swallow up the virgin of the Kingdom of Christ. It is too bad that the author wants to contradict this. His idea is that of Occam, that there are two watertight compartments, the church and the state, each with their own interests. Culture and politics are of a neutral quality. And, therefore, the thesis of Groen and Fruin, that there was once upon a time a Calvinistic culture, is absolutely discarded and declared to be worthless and incorrect.

Wanted: Calvinistic Historians

We, Calvinists, however, get a fairer deal than in the other recent works on Dutch history which are mainly written by Liberals. But, we do not get a square deal. We shall not get this until some of our Calvinistic college graduates will tackle the field of general history and especially the problems in which Calvinism is involved. We are receiving a few compliments now and then, which is certainly gratifying, but, nevertheless, we are still the black sheep of the family. Liberals and Catholics are very busy writing hundreds of books and pamphlets to show the greatness of Humanism and Thomistic history, and in the abstract. But Calvinism is in vain looking for its paladins. We need graduate and research study in theology, history, philosophy and education. A commentary on liberalistic and Thomistic works is insufficient and futile. We must show to the world of the educated as well as of the masses that we have an excellent record and an acceptable system of thought. We must, therefore, form a Calvinistic Historical Society next to our Calvinistic Philosophical Society, and publish popular and scientific material that will equal the excellent books of our opponents, and promote the cause of the Kingdom as we have learned to see it by the grace of God, and by the light of John Calvin and his great followers.

H. J. VAN ANDEL.