



the **CALVIN** **orum**

Political Action
A Symposium

Natural Science
In Christian Education

Ecumenical Synod
Or International Conference?

Kierkegaardian Philosophy
A Review

World Voices

Of Books

Verse

VOL. XV, NO. 8

**TWO DOLLARS
A YEAR**

MARCH, 1950

THE CALVIN FORUM

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

<i>Editor-in-Chief</i>	CLARENCE BOUMA
<i>Associate Editors</i>	HENRY J. RYSKAMP HENRY SCHULTZE GEORGE STOB EARL STRIKWERDA
<i>Book Editor</i>	HENRY R. VAN TIL

CALVIN FORUM CORRESPONDENTS

ARTHUR ALLEN	<i>Australia</i>
HARRY R. BOER	<i>Nigeria</i>
ARNOLD BRINK	<i>Calvin College and Seminary</i>
CALVIN CHAO	<i>Shanghai</i>
J. CHR. COETZEE	<i>South Africa</i>
SAMUEL G. CRAIG	<i>Presb. Church, U.S.A.</i>
JAMES DAANE	<i>California</i>
PAUL DE KOEKKOEK	<i>Canada</i>
F. W. DEN DULK	<i>Ethiopia</i>
MARK FAKKEMA	<i>Nat. Assn. Chr. Schools</i>
A. G. FOENANDER	<i>Ceylon</i>
BURTON L. GODDARD	<i>Boston</i>
EDWARD HEEREMA	<i>Orthodox Presb. Church</i>
JACOB T. HOOGSTRA	<i>Ecumenical Calvinism</i>
FRED S. LEAHY	<i>North Ireland</i>
PIERRE C. MARCEL	<i>French Calvinism</i>
TAKESHI MATSUO	<i>Japan</i>
J. GRAHAM MILLER	<i>New Hebrides</i>
PIETER PRINS	<i>Netherlands</i>
ARTHUR V. RAMIAH	<i>South India</i>
W. STANFORD REID	<i>Montreal, Canada</i>
WM. C. ROBINSON	<i>Presb. Church in the U. S.</i>
WILLIAM A. SWETS	<i>Ref. Church in America</i>
JOHN VAN BRUGGEN	<i>Nat. Union Chr. Schools</i>
LEONARD VERDUIN	<i>Ann Arbor, Michigan</i>
CHARLES VINCZE	<i>Hungarian Reformed</i>
JOHN W. WEVERS	<i>Princeton</i>

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, 1879.

The CALVIN FORUM

Published by the Calvin Forum Board of Publication

VOLUME XV, NO. 8

MARCH, 1950

Contents

Articles

Calvinism and Political Action: A Symposium.....	
William Spoelhof	155
Amry VandenBosch	156
Edward J. Tanis	157
Donald H. Bouma	158
Earl Strikwerda	159
The Place of Science in Christian Education.....	
Henry Schultze	161
A Third "Reformed Ecumenical Synod"?.....	
J. K. Van Baalen	164

From Our Correspondents

Festivities in South Africa.....	167
A Letter from India.....	168
Hungarian Letter	169
Letter from Irish Calvinists.....	170

Book Reviews

Kierkegaardian Philosophy	171
Sermons by Dr. Bonnell.....	173
The Roman Octopus.....	173
Two Works on the Old Testament.....	173
Mid-Century Religious Art.....	175
A Christology of Experience.....	176
Puritan-Anglican Controversy	176

Verse

Woods in Winter.....	166
----------------------	-----

Calvinism and Political Action

A Symposium

THE articles of Professor Vander Kroef and Mr. Smedes which appeared in last month's issue may well be made the basis and starting point for a discussion on the question what sort of political action is most in harmony with the principles of Calvinism. This is a very practical question for everyone who is himself a Calvinist, but its discussion also presents the opportunity to arrive at greater clarity on the true social and political implications of the religious and ethical system of John Calvin.

Mr. Smedes calls Calvinists to political action and discusses the basic objectives that face the Calvinist as possible live options. Professor VanderKroef, while bringing tribute to the remarkable achievements of Abraham Kuyper and his Anti-Revolutionary Party in Dutch political life of the last half century, inclines to make serious strictures on the propriety of such distinct and separate political organization. At least, when the question as to the propriety and advisability of such a distinctly Christian or Calvinist party for this country is raised, he declares himself emphatically for the negative and tells Calvinists that they "would do well to respect the historically sanctioned dual party system of the United States."

It should not escape the observation of the reader that Professor Vander Kroef argues this not on practical and utilitarian grounds of feasibility, but on the ground of principle. It is on this point that he is chiefly attacked in the following symposium. One might agree that it is not practicable to have a separate political party of Calvinist conviction on a national scale. But this is a question of strategy, not of principle. That Professor VanderKroef is emphatic in condemning all organized political effort on the part of Calvinists, whatever particular form it might assume in practice, is clear from such utterances as these. "A Calvinist party could only operate in a society which is wholly Christian and on a plane of conduct which is consistently moral." "The place of the Christian is therefore not in the ranks of the social crusaders, but is there where it has always been: on his knees in Church." From this it is clear that the writer in the name of the very faith which the Calvinist (and Calvinism is only the most consistent form of Christianity!) professes, holds that he should stay out of the political sphere in any systematic or organized way. "His own religious code can shield him from corruption, if necessary he should dwell in the ivory tower of his faith."

There is the issue, clearly stated and sharply drawn. The ideas of Professor VanderKroef have great affinity to the position today advanced against the basis and objective of the historic party of Abraham Kuyper in the Netherlands by the group who draw their inspiration from Karl Barth. We thank both Mr. Smedes and Professor VanderKroef for their clear statement of two divergent positions, originally not intended to be juxtaposed on the pages of THE CALVIN FORUM, and we believe that the following symposium begun in this issue can be fruitful indeed in clearing the atmosphere on this phase of our Christian duty as followers of Christ and sons of John Calvin. The symposium will be continued in the next issue, and meanwhile we welcome the expressions of agreement or disagreement from our readers. THE CALVIN FORUM strives to be Calvinistic, but it strives no less to be a true Forum.—EDITOR.

William Spoelhof
Professor of History
Calvin College

PROFESSOR Vander Kroef's significant article, "Calvinism as a Political Principle," is indeed provocative. It indicates an acquaintance with the European as well as the American political scene. Many of his observations indicate political perspicacity, especially in those sections of his article which delineate the dilemma of an American Calvinist in exerting real political influence. In analyzing these difficulties Vander Kroef makes his contribution. As far as his fundamental thesis is concerned, however, there is little to recommend it to adherents of historic Calvinism.

Vander Kroef's thesis strikes a discordant note in its context of Calvinism. The title of his article is a misnomer. True, the text does deal with Calvinism in the sphere of politics, but in doubting the feasibility, practicability, or even justifiability of Calvinistic action in the realm of politics the author challenges the validity of the entire Calvinistic system. Actually, the article should be titled, "Calvinism: The Validity of its Fundamental Principle." His thesis calls in question Calvinistic action not only in politics but by implication in every field—social, economic, and cultural. Professor Vander

Kroef presents the nub of the issue in his concluding paragraph where he states, "To him who believes, death and disaster are scarcely worth as much attention as the problem of his own sins and of possible redemption." That is not historic Calvinism. The Calvinist is concerned with the honor, majesty, and sovereignty of God, and not solely with his own salvation. Vander Kroef's tenet would lead him back to the monastery. It would make of a Calvinist a stylite. Taking exception to Vander Kroef's thesis which he states succinctly in his excellently-phrased concluding sentence, a Calvinist would contend that his first and last concern is neither a place in the sun nor a possible place in the Kingdom of Heaven. His first and last concern is not for himself but to glorify God and enjoy Him forever within the broad sweep of God's whole creation.

Calvinism does not admit of a double focus as Vander Kroef suggests—a setting up of a dichotomy between the inner life of an individual and man's social life. The genius of Calvinism embraces both in a single focus and for that reason the Calvinist can be "on his knees in church" as well as "in the place of the social crusader." This sense of individual as well as corporate or social responsibility is the very heart of the Calvinistic system of thought. Should the Calvinist in practice divorce ethical and religious principles from his economic and political life or even view these categories as antithetical, that is a failing of the Calvinist, not of Calvinism. Undoubtedly Calvinists have been and are still guilty of overemphasizing or slighting either individual responsibility or social responsibility, but the result is nevertheless a distortion and not a representation of Christian life and thought. The problem facing the Calvinist in his political or any other relationship is not one of action versus inaction but, as Mr. Smedes suggests, the problem arises in the realm of action, i.e., coalescing or colliding with so-called semi-secular forces.

Vander Kroef's presentation of the difficulties which obstruct the formation of an American Calvinistic political party is excellent. His contrast of Dutch and American Calvinistic political potentials is, in the main, sound. A mere transplantation of Dutch political institutions to American soil is indeed unworkable. The dream of an American Anti-Revolutionary Party shall have to remain visionary. Calvinistic political action must find a medium other than a national political party for reasons arising from the very roots of American political tradition and practice. The validity of some of Vander Kroef's contentions in formulating his observations is, however, questionable.

One such contention is that "for the Calvinist there can not be in the end a separation of Church and State"; nor can he [the Calvinist] subscribe to a program of civil liberty "which by its professed tolerance implies that one religion is as good as the

next." Although it would not be too difficult to defend Vander Kroef's point from some of Calvin's own pronouncements, and from history, and from an article in the old Calvinistic Confession of Faith, yet it unreservedly contradicts a dictum of Kuyperian Calvinism. Risking a criticism of John Calvin ("the difficulty lies in the unanimous and uniform advice of Calvin and his epigones who demanded intervention of the government in the matter of religion"¹) and of Calvinists in history, Kuyper and his followers have stood solidly under the banner of a free Church in a free State. This separation is required "because the government lacks the data of judgment and because every magisterial judgment here infringes the sovereignty of the Church." Kuyper is emphatic in his conclusion: "And that therefore neither the Caesaropapy [Caesaropapism] of the Czar; nor the subjection of the State to the Church, taught by Rome; nor the *Cuius regio eius religio* of the Lutheran jurists; nor the irreligious neutral standpoint of the French revolution; but that the only system of a free Church, in a free State, may be honored from a Calvinistic standpoint."²

One further contention is open to question. In summing up the difference between the Dutch and the American political *milieu*, Vander Kroef maintains that "the cultural roots of the United States, as a nation, lie deeply buried in the soil of religious skepticism, popular sovereignty and often genuine amorality." True, this is a popular view of the origins of our governmental principles to which many noted historians and political scientists have subscribed. Nevertheless, no one has yet completely shattered the pronouncement of Horace White, "The structure of our government bears the imprint of . . . the religion of John Calvin."³

¹ A. Kuyper, "Calvinism and Politics," in *Calvinism—Six Stone Foundation Lectures*, p. 99.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 106.

³ Quoted by Richard Hofstadter, *The American Political Tradition* (New York 1948), p. 1



Amry VandenBosch
Professor of Political Science
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Ky.

I HAVE with much reluctance reached conclusions very similar to those of Professor Vander Kroef. The basic political principles on which Calvinists could agree would be so general as to be nearly meaningless from the point of view of practical politics. Large, established political parties can frequently win elections on vague, general slogans, but a small minority party, such as a Calvinist party would certainly be, cannot follow such tactics. It can win votes only by specific proposals with an appeal to the millions. Any attempt to reduce general principles to planks in a party platform would

be met with difficulty and cause dissension. Christians can honestly differ on the proper solution of the liquor problem, social security, farm policy, labor problems, and dozens of other live issues. The best that we can do is to discuss basic Christian principles and their application to our social, economic, and political problems, with the expectation of reaching some agreement. This is all we can hope to do. I am not convinced that collectively it is our duty to do more, though I am equally certain that we have an obligation to do that.

It is true that the Antirevolutionary Party of the Netherlands achieved many successes in spite of the fact that it is a relatively small party, but that is due chiefly to special conditions which prevail in the Netherlands and which do not obtain in this country. Professor Vander Kroef has indicated some of these; I would like to point out at least two others.

The Netherlands has a parliamentary system of government while we have an independent executive. If a party in this country does not after a few campaigns succeed in winning the governorship or the presidency it ceases to attract voters and begins to wane. Under the system of the independent executive the party must win the governorship or the presidency or it has little. Moreover, our system does not enable a party effectively to play the role of the opposition. Note the contrast with the Dutch system, which is a combination of many parties and parliamentary supremacy. For many decades no single party has been able to win a majority of the seats of the Second Chamber, and thus alone form a government. As a result ministries are formed by a coalition of parties. This has enabled the Antirevolutionary Party to play a leading role in the government though it has never commanded a large bloc of seats in the Chambers. This system made it possible for Antirevolutionary leaders to become ministry-makers and serve as Minister-President for a large part of the period from 1888 to the present. (Mackay, 1888-1891; Kuyper, 1901-1905; Heemskerk, 1908-1913; Colijn, 1925-1926; Colijn, 1933-1939; Gerbrandy, 1940-1945. In addition, de Geer of the closely related Christian Historical Party was Minister-President from 1926 to 1929 and from 1939 to 1940.)

Secondly, the Antirevolutionary Party is able to muster such strength as it has in the Chambers because of the system of proportional representation, which encourages the formation of small parties and hence the multi-party system. In theory proportional representation has many attractions but its practical workings have nearly everywhere been disappointing. In fact, by its encouragement of party or political fragmentation it has made governments highly unstable and ineffective, and thus helped to bring democracy into disrepute. In any case, the success of the Antirevolutionary Party is largely to be ascribed to these two features of the

Dutch governmental system. Many of us might be willing, even eager, to see the parliamentary system introduced into our country, but I hope few would be willing to work for the adoption of proportional representation. However that may be, it is highly unlikely that Americans can easily be induced to adopt the parliamentary system.



Edward J. Tanis
Minister Second Chr. Ref. Church
Grand Haven, Michigan

MR. SMEDES has given us an excellent analysis of the difficulties involved in the setting up of a program for political action from our Calvinistic point of view. His discussion reminded me of a Calvinistic political organization in Grand Rapids some years ago, known by the Latin name "Fas et Jus" (divine and human right). The Greek scholar and philosopher, Prof. Klaas Schoolland of Calvin College, a Calvinist to the core, had suggested this name for the political organization in which he was very active. Americans, not knowing the origin and meaning of the name, pronounced it "faucet juice." It is quite evident that our noble Greek teacher was not a practical American politician. Latin?

"Fas" means divine law and right, while "jus" means human law and right. Professor Schoolland saw very clearly that the thing a Calvinist should strive for in the political sphere is the preservation of human rights by the maintenance of divine law. Only as we uphold the laws of God can we preserve our human rights. It is the old, old question of Authority and Freedom. Professor Schoolland wrote many articles on this subject and its application to political problems. If some one has this material, it would be well to bring it out and examine it again, and see how much of it is relevant to our present situation. No doubt the basic principles of Schoolland's political philosophy are still valid.

As Professor Schoolland always emphasized, the main function of the State is to maintain law and order—not to solve all the problems of society and thus intrude into other spheres of life (economics, industry, education, religion, etc), *and thus also to destroy both justice and freedom!* Calvinists like Schoolland, Dr. Abraham Kuyper in The Netherlands, and others, stood for the separation of Church and State. All his life Kuyper fought for what he called "a free church in a free state." He also contended for the freedom of education, freedom from state control and ecclesiastical domination (Rome). His *Vrije Universiteit* in Amsterdam, 1880, was established on that basis.

The members of "Fas et Jus" were intelligent and enthusiastic Calvinists and for a while they exerted some political influence in Grand Rapids, but I doubt whether they ever elected one member of the City

Council. (Correction will be welcome.) Eventually the organization died out for lack of interest, and also lack of popular support among Reformed people of both denominations (Reformed and Christian Reformed).

Political indifference is the great curse of American politics, and Christian people of all churches are infected with it as well as the mass of non-churchgoing people. It is *not* the fault of the church, nor of the ministry, but is due to our modern love of ease and shameful indolence. Sports mean much more to the average American and even the average churchgoer than the political problems and political affairs of our cities and our nation. When a totalitarian regime is set up in Washington, or some foreign enemy proves its superiority in war, and does to us what we have done to Germany and Japan, we will wake up, but then it will be too late! Most of the so-called Calvinists in Grand Rapids are no better than the rest of the people, as the history of "Fas et Jus" proves. [This was written before the recent sweeping victory for good government forces in Grand Rapids, a reform in which citizens of the Calvin group and of Christian Reformed Church affiliation took an active and prominent part.—EDITOR]

I lived in Chicago for 15 years and attended the meetings of a very active Good Government Organization (this was the name) but this and other reform organizations did not make so much as a dent upon the political life of that great metropolis. Prof. Paul Douglas of the University of Chicago, and others, worked hard for political reform, but the old politicians remained in the saddle.

The majority of American people still want decent government, but they are too lazy to work for it, and, of course, there is no money in it. The corrupt forces in politics are willing and able to spend a lot of money, because they have no conscience, no moral scruples, and they know how to get their money back with dividends. The people who stand for clean politics have no such strategic advantage. *This is a practical factor we must never lose sight of. We must be realistic and face the facts.*

At the same time we must accept the challenge of this desperate hour. We must be awake to the gravity of the political situation at home and abroad. We must think, study, write, pray, pray much for our political leaders (I Tim. 2).

Rather than organize a political party right now, we must study the political situation and problems in the light of Christian ethics, and also with our eyes wide open to the needs of our times. We are in great danger of losing our American freedom, both political and religious. The peril is greater than most people realize. The Romanists and the Communists are tremendously active. They want political power and they are going after it. One man like Cardinal Spellman of New York is a greater force in American politics than all our Cal-

vinists put together. I know what happened in Chicago, and I think I know what is going on in New York. May the Lord deliver us from ignorance, indifference and indolence. It is later than we think!



Donald H. Bouma
Associate Professor of Sociology
Calvin College

THE "Calvinistic world and life view" is one of those aphorisms we press fondly to our bosoms and yet which, regrettably, apparently has come to mean almost all things to all people. Worse, it has for some become a shibboleth, muttered in the subconscious, which gets them by the stern tests of reality situations without having to come to grips with them.

Although a plethora of miserable social situations about us cry out for the God-directed attention of the Calvinist, many of us mumbo-jumbo the shibboleth and "pass by on the other side". Of course, this is the most comfortable thing to do, and when the conscience is sufficiently dulled by uttering pious platitudes, our comfort is undisturbed.

When one grapples with the problem of the delineation of a Calvinistic program of social action, or when one tries to spell out the specifics of the mandate for the Christian in the social *milieu*, it appears that there are at least two challenges which might command our attention. One of these is emphasized in the contribution of Mr. Smedes in the February issue of THE CALVIN FORUM. He calls for a thorough analysis of certain ideas fundamental to the formulation of a Calvinistic action program. This analysis entails, among other things, a thorough study of the historical situation, the long range aims or goals of the action program, as well as the techniques to be used.

A second challenge, not inconsistent with the first, but a complement and conceivably an aid to it, is for Calvinists to enter the social arena and to courageously face some of the vital problems of the day, armed with the knowledge we now have, motivated by the scriptural mandate. The crisis is too serious to wait for a thorough analysis of the historical situation. The need is too pressing to risk getting bogged down in interminable arguments concerning what Mr. Smedes calls "ultimate aims being striven for, whether or not there is hope that the ultimate aim will ever be realized in history."

While we tread water, awaiting a more perfect blue print for a Calvinistic action program, other blue prints, developed through the years and peddled to conventions and in the various journals, gather dust in the archives. Further, we believe that facing up, to a larger extent and more courageously, to the on-going social situations will be a learning process in itself, thus contributing to the development of a better Calvinistic social action program eventually. Meanwhile we would be answering some

of the criticism that comes both from non-Christians as well as from more socially conscious Christians that we deal only with generalities and fail to grapple with specifics. These often charge that we piously talk to the "image of God in man" but in practice deny it when we categorically discriminate against Negroes, as we do in so many predominantly Calvinistic communities.

Some of these critics suggest that we give lip service to the second table of the law and subscribe to Christ's broad definition of the brother as unfolded in the parable of the Good Samaritan, but are myopic when it comes to seeing the brother's need and coming to his aid in Grand Rapids, Chicago and Paterson. Some of these charge that we put the dollar sign between the first and second tables of the law. We do not tolerate the man who puts financial interests ahead of "loving the Lord thy God with all thy heart . . .", but we have no qualms, they say, about reshaping the command that we love our neighbors as ourselves in terms of dollar considerations.

Other critics contend that while we deny that Calvinism is a fatalistic system we actually behave as if it is when it comes to social matters. They charge that there is a tendency among us to attribute these problems to total depravity and then to dismiss interest in them with a futility gesture. This writer has found an unpleasant element of truth in these charges. When working on ameliorative programs he has been told several times, "After all, these things are due to sin, you know," or "But, God has determined these things so to be". It is regrettable that these significant truths are used as an excuse for inactivity and resignation, and as a sedative for the conscience.

Prof. VanderKroef in the February CALVIN FORUM provides additional basis for these criticisms when he suggests that the Calvinist retreat to the ivory tower of his faith is necessary to insure his place in the Kingdom of Heaven, apparently in complete disregard of the clear teaching of Christ in Matt. 25:34ff. (Then shall the King say . . . Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you . . . For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat; thirsty . . . drink; stranger . . . took me in; naked . . . clothed me; sick . . . visited me; in prison . . . came unto me.) Apparently he also advocates a talent-in-the-napkin technique, although similarly condemned by Scripture.

We have one further comment on the VanderKroef article. He quotes with approval from Niebuhr's *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, "A realistic analysis of the problems of human society reveals a constant and seemingly irreconcilable conflict between the needs of society and the imperatives of a sensitive conscience." Rather than this, we would suggest such an analysis of contemporary problems would reveal a conflict between, on the one hand,

the needs of society and the imperatives of a sensitive conscience, and, on the other hand, the selfishly dictated needs of the individual and the insensitive conscience. In fact, it is just this conflict which challenges the Christian to social action, since the uprooting of selfishness and the development of conscience sensitivity is a distinctly religious matter.

In addition to the crystal-clear scriptural mandate, the Calvinist is uniquely responsible for a social action program because only he understands the essential etiology of social problems. He views these problems in a two-level framework. Basically, he believes social problems are due to a disturbance in the vertical axis; there is something wrong between God and man. *Because* of this there is a disturbance in the horizontal axis, and hence things are wrong between man and man, group and group. The non-Christian sociologist sees only the horizontal axis disturbances and explains causation in terms of conflict of values, social disorganization, culture lag, and the like. The Christian sociologist does not deny the importance of these factors, but insists they themselves must have been caused by something; viz. to him, the disturbance in the God-man relationship.

Similarly the attack on social difficulties must be viewed in terms of the two-level framework. Basically the relationship between God and man must be restored and the Christian sociologist is a strong advocate of missions and takes heart especially in the increased interest in city mission work. Then, secondly, he believes in ameliorative work on the horizontal level, in the area of man-man, group-group relationships, as especially directed in the second table of the law. He does not believe in the social gospel, in fact repudiates it because of the same superficiality which characterizes the non-Christian sociologist. But he is a firm believer in the social implications of the gospel.

We are aware of the pressing social needs around us. We are cognizant of the criticisms from several quarters. We are impressed with the contribution we could make. We are challenged by the scriptural mandate. While, on the one hand, we work toward the development of a more carefully delineated social action program, we must at this time move more courageously into the social arena and grapple with the problems with the knowledge and blue prints we now have.



Earl Strikewerda

Calvin College
Associate Professor of History

I LIKE Smedes' delineation. He formulates something, and he does so concisely. We are living in a religio-cultural crisis, and Calvinism must have its answers. Smedes presents three possibilities. I shall make four out of them. Number one: We can seek new individual converts and

leave things go pretty much at that. As their numbers increase, immediately and over the years, the hope is that somehow we will make a stronger impression on our world and age. That could be if each person and each generation understood his duties and Christian obligation to society. But if all these converts are strictly soteriological in their Christianity, as they may be, by emulation, there will be only a feeble Christian thrust. Solution Number One alone is inadequate, immature, and unworthy of us Calvinists.

Then there is Number Two: We Calvinists can move in on and assert ourselves in many of the neutral institutions which constitute the warp and woof of our world. Number Three suggests that we should boycott the neutral social groups, establish our own, and thus express ourselves collectively, effectively, and competitively. And Number Four would call on us to turn our backs on the world and develop our own religio-social communities which are isolated—even spatially.

To me the crisis of our times in Western Christian civilization lies in the relative weakening of the impacts of institutionalized Christianity on the paganism of the day. Maybe the impact is actually weakening, or maybe our work is being merely out-distanced. Either way, the effect is about the same. What Smedes asks is: What now shall we do?

I have eliminated Number One. I would also eliminate Number Four. It is unsatisfactory to any historic Calvinist. It is the approach of the Anabaptist. It is selfish. It writes off this universe. It is cowardly and sterile. It does not proceed. And historically it is suicidal in the sense that that sort of Christianity dies out.

Then there are Number Two and Number Three. I favor both. Three is probably the ideal, and maybe in a sense, the stronger way. But it is not always possible, simply because of the paucity of numbers of believers in many areas and because of feeble financial strength. After all, we are creatures of space and creatures who must express ourselves and exert ourselves through *means* rather than through miracles. Here are examples: We believe in institutional Christian education. This calls for elementary schools, high schools, and a college. In terms of our numbers we may have the first three, but to add a medical school or a school for the study of Biblical archeology *just now* might be unwise if

not impossible. There is such a thing as over-extension. Or, to take another case, you and I might favor the establishing of a Christian hospital in Northwestern Iowa, if we lived there, but we might not favor such a project in Detroit, Michigan. The one might be conceivably wise, the other foolish. Or you and I may favor a Christian political party to control the local governments in western Michigan. But we might not advise the good Christian people of Denver, Colorado to organize such a party. In the one case the attempt would be splendid; in the other it might be dissipative of Christian effort.

Hence, where we cannot have institutions that can possibly succeed, we elect to work as individual Christians in secular frameworks. This is not a second choice; it is a legitimate and desirable alternative. We know that scores of our neutral institutions are imperfect, but in the long run over the years their impact and contribution is wholesome. In many cases secular institutions enable even strictly Kingdom institutions to function more effectively. From the Red Cross to the American public school such secular institutions are necessary, and we believers simply cannot and may not withdraw our support from them. To boycott what is decent may result in depriving many neutral institutions of what good character they have. Many of our institutions are what they are because their personnel is heavily or partially Christian. We cannot cease supporting such institutions unless we want to see them deteriorate. And so we stay with them. And in some cases we establish our own alongside. We can support and maintain both.

That leaves us with the problem of when to concentrate *on* the one and when to concentrate *in* the other. It seems to me that this choice must be left to the individual Christian. We are sons of the Protestant Revolt which terminated ecclesiastical monopoly of thought and action. Our laity is enlightened, in the good sense, and it is becoming more astute and wise. There are those among us, both in the pulpit and out of it, who think sharply, who are very wise, who display common sense of an admirable type. What with all this and what with the fact that Calvinism is the most mature and complete of the theologies, we can move on. We have a heritage which we can study. We shall continue to water and God shall grant the increase in His own good measure.



The Place of Science in Christian Education

Henry Schultze
President Calvin College

WHEN Christianity made its unwelcome entrance into this world, it came as a tremendous educational force. All the early Christian leaders were essentially teachers. However, they did not start, as it were, from scratch. Centuries of development along scientific, philosophical, and religious lines had preceded them. It is true that human culture had already passed its zenith and was on the down grade, but nevertheless it was there, resisting every educational effort put forth by those who represented the truth as Jesus proposed it. The world into which these Christians came treated them with contempt and resented their claim to possession of the truth. Because of the persecutions to which they were subjected they began to associate less and less with the world of culture, eventually adopting a policy of complete isolation. They thus escaped many of the difficulties with which they were confronted and could comfort each other in the midst of their afflictions. This policy was not entirely in keeping with the spirit of Jesus. He went out into the midst of the world and also commissioned His disciples to bring the truth to a sin-stricken people. He even stated that they should be subject to persecution, maltreated, arrested, summoned before magistrates, and cast into prison. Christ Himself regarded the world of general revelation as the source of many lessons concerning the Kingdom of Heaven. It could also serve as a field of pedagogical help to the disciples. Paul, a man bolder than many of his contemporaries, certainly operated along lines in keeping with the spirit of Jesus. He went out into the world in spite of all the persecution and, judging from his epistles, learned much from the pagan literature, customs, and practices, which he utilized in the interest of promoting the Kingdom.

Two Early Schools of Thought

However, this policy of separation, based perhaps also in part upon a mis-interpreted conception of the principle of separation expressed among the early Christians, could not long be maintained without some sort of rationalization. As the early church leaders faced this problem, they developed two schools of thought. Tertullian, who headed the North African school, insisted that all the developments in

the non-Christian world were foolishness before God. Its philosophy and science were vanity, and fit only for the scrap heap. These representatives insisted that they had their all in Christ. They needed nothing more than the teaching of Jesus. (That, of course, is correct if one fully realizes what is implied in Christ's teachings.) They, therefore, struggled along without any vital contact with this world. We have such people today, particularly those who do not believe in an educated ministry. They would certainly look askance upon the development of a science department in the area of Christian education.

There was another group in the early church known as the Alexandrian school. Clement and Origen were the outstanding representatives. They were inclined toward the rationalistic position and regarded science as well as culture definitely associated with faith as a source of knowledge. Indeed, their appreciation of the development of science was such that they believed that science was determinative. Consequently, being believers in the Word, they found it necessary to twist the meaning of the Scriptures by allegorical methods of interpretation so that the Bible was compelled to support general culture. It is a method of Bible interpretation not unknown today. There are hosts of Christians who come to the Scriptures with the demand, "Say thou this," and not with the question, "What dost thou say unto us?" That is, perhaps, basic to the fact that there are dozens of warring positions, some of them diametrically opposite, but all of them having advocates who are convinced that they represent the true Scriptural position.

You will find the position of the Alexandrian school represented by the Modernistic school of thought in the field of so-called Christian thinking. It insists that the findings of science are to be accepted and the Scriptures interpreted accordingly. One cannot expect these two schools of thought to live alongside of one another indefinitely. It was St. Augustine who, by the grace and providence of God, brought an end to this apparent *impasse*. He agreed with neither extreme. He postulated the proposition that these two could be joined, as it were, in wedlock. He assumed a twofold source of knowledge, variously called authority and experience, faith and reason, special and general revelation, and so on. The relationship between these two

is at bottom the relationship between science and Christian education. The union between them was for centuries not a happy one. Representative scholars quarreled bitterly among themselves, trying to determine which one of these two was to be dominant, excluded, or otherwise related. At the present time the union seems to be more promising, and there is a growing conviction that Christianity and science do have something in common and can be mutually beneficial, and that is probably the chief reason why science is receiving an ever-increasing appreciation in the world of Christian thinking.¹

Science as Revelatory

It is my purpose to indicate briefly the position of science in Christian education. Science deserves a prominent place in Christian education, first of all because it is revelatory in character. God has written, as it were, two books. The one is called special revelation; the other, general. It is the second one that science is primarily interested in. General revelation reveals God and certain important aspects of His Kingdom. The Psalmist was fully aware of the revelatory value of nature. He declared that the heavens declared the glory of God and the firmament showed His handiwork. Christ Himself went into the field of nature and culture in general to find lessons to convey the truth about God and His Kingdom. He said, in effect, look at the grain, the vine, the sun, the stars, men, and so on, and in them, if you have eyes to see, discover the marvelous revelation of spiritual things. Paul went so far as to declare that from general revelation one can find certain attributes so clearly revealed that even the unbeliever is without excuse. (Romans 1:20) Today many believing scientists, who have been concentrating upon a study of the minute world with the aid of instruments, discover a world heretofore unknown to students, and they are filled with the same enthusiasm which characterized the star-gazing Psalmist. When they look into their microscopic world, they are ready to declare, "O Jehovah, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all: the earth is full of thy riches." And I am sure that I shall not be gainsaid when I declare that any book of God, any revelation that can promote divine glorification should certainly not be overlooked by what is known as Christian education. Herein lies an important reason for assigning a prominent place to science in our educational program.

The men of science have shown an increasing appreciation of their findings, but they have, in general, persisted in glorifying the discoverers of the

marvels of nature by failing to take due cognizance of Him who has made the things that men have discovered. Christian education has also a tremendous responsibility in correcting this serious misdirected praise.²

Science as Redemptive

The second reason why I think science should occupy a very important place in Christian education is that it is not only revelatory but also redemptive in character. I am, of course, not thinking of redemption in the narrow sense, of a soul being released from the bondage of sin, but redemption in a more general sense, of deliverance from the misery and results of sin. To me it is simply amazing how much of Christ's time and effort was spent in bringing about deliverance in this secondary sense of the term. He went about doing good. He made the deaf to hear, the blind to see, the crippled to walk, and the hungry to be fed, all of which was part of the redemptive plan. In this area science has a task to perform—a task which will enable Christians to work all the more effectively in alleviating in this world the enslaving effects of sin. Any education that purports to be Christian in character must take due cognizance of the means which God has placed at the disposal of man to stay the destructive hand of sin. This close relationship between science and a Christian's obligation in the face of the tragic destruction wrought by man's sinful folly was clearly seen by the Christians of the medieval period. Dr. Abraham Kuyper calls attention in his own unique way to the obligation that Christians have as scientists anent deliverance from evil.³ He declares, for instance, that sin does its disastrous work on the body, and the science of medicine has its work cut out for it against disease.

Sin has a tendency to make barren the fields, threatening to bring starvation to humanity. The science of agriculture must join the battle against sin's soil-impoverishing activity so as to alleviate the impending starvation. Sin has made social living a militant experience. The science of sociology must join forces to make human associations at least tolerable. Sin has darkened our minds. Science is not without responsibility in holding a candle to lighten the way. This is possible only when science has been permeated with the teaching of Him who is the Light of the World. It is a sad commentary upon humanity that it uses its science—which should be used in the interest of human betterment—for destructive purposes. One of the important elements in Christian education is to make students conscious of their bounden duty as the representatives of the Most High. The powers that come to us from

¹ H. Bavinck has given a brief historical survey of the relation between science and Christianity up to the beginning of the twentieth century. Cf. *Christelijke Wetenschap*, pp. 10-17.

² Voskuyl, *Science and Christian Faith*, Ch. I, "A Christian Interpretation of Science."

³ Abraham Kuyper, *De Gemeene Gratie*, Vol. II, p. 508.

the scientific field belong to the area of stewardship. They should be used in the interest of fulfilling the requirements of the law: "Love thy neighbor". Certainly they should not be the exclusive property of the ungodly.

Science as Corrective

Besides being revelatory and redemptive in character and thus having the right to a prominent place in Christian education, science is also corrective. There can be no question at all but that Christian thinking is sadly in need of correctives. Science needs the corrective of Christian thinking. After all, it is only in the light of God that the men of science can see light. But I am interested now not in the thinking of scientists but in the thinking of Christians and surely if anywhere thinking should be correct, it is in the field where men think God's thought after Him. One of the most condemning phenomena among Christians is that they are violently opposed to one another both in what they think and what they do. This appears to be all the more serious in the light of the fact that the vast majority of those who insist that they are Christians claim to have based their position on the selfsame Word. They acknowledge the Bible as their source of information but are nevertheless divided into numerous groups, all fighting what they choose to call "the good fight."

Now, there is something wrong here. Are the basic facts from which deductions are made, correct? Are all the pertinent facts in? Are Christians satisfied with only a partial enumeration of the facts pertinent to the matter under investigation? Are Christians unduly biased and thus prejudiced and unfit to pass fair judgment? Are their deductions correct? Many such questions should be asked. Certainly one of the weaknesses of Christian thinking is that it has been so unscientific. Lest there be a misunderstanding, let me state that scientists have also manifested many dubious developments in their thinking processes. The scientists have been fighting a battle royal. They do not agree by any means. However, there can be little doubt but that they are committed to rules of procedure that are calculated to reduce possible errors to a minimum. If courses in the sciences can teach a student to be more careful in his search for pertinent facts, more careful in his classifications, analyses, and conclusions, they will have merited a worthy place in the program of Christian education. There are theo-

logians—orthodox theologians included—who regard a good science course as well-nigh indispensable to an adequate pre-seminary course. They are not at this point primarily interested in having these students learn all the facts of science, nor the fundamental philosophy of science, but particularly the methods of science. Hence they often recommend at least one laboratory course. It is in this field that the scientific methods come most to their own.

Dr. Woodhull of Columbia University recommends that a course in science be taught in the secondary schools.⁴ He states that the chief value of the study of science is to cultivate certain habits that may be characterized as scientific. He suggests, further, that science study will develop the habit of thorough investigation. If this be true, it will do much to eliminate the all too common practice of "snap judgments" in the area of Christian thinking. This recommendation is in line with the Scriptural injunction, that we must "search the Scriptures." More careful Christian thinking is certainly not superfluous. Woodhull also states that the scientific method stresses the process of seeing things in their true relationships. If the Bible is regarded as a unit, which is the position of most Christians, then the relationship of parts to the whole should be emphasized. It will come to us as a warning against the all too frequent practice of bolstering an important doctrine with the citation of a text or two. Christians must see relationships if they are to do justice to the basic conception of Scriptural unity. Among the many things that Woodhull calls to our attention there is one more that I regard as very important. Science teaches us to be conservative; that is, not too quick to accept a conclusion or, to put it in Scriptural terminology, not to be "tossed about by every kind of doctrine." If science in a Christian educational program can give us such values, we should be grateful to God for the important place accorded to it in Christian education. To recapitulate: Science should occupy an honored place among us because of its subject matter, which is divine revelation. Again, it merits a prominent place because of its real purpose, namely, to join the battle against the devastating effects of sin. Then too, we should accord it the place of honor in Christian education because of its method of promoting correct thinking. Science, therefore, should be welcomed and utilized by a Christian educational program.

⁴ J. W. Woodhull in *Teaching of Science*, Ch. I, "The Educational Value of Teaching Science."



A Third "Reformed Ecumenical Synod"?

Jan Karel Van Baalen

Minister First Chr. Ref. Church
Mount Vernon, Washington

THE writer of the following lines has laid on the table of the "Reformed Ecumenical Synod, Amsterdam 1949" an overture concerning the name of its successor which, owing to the excessive interest in another problem, was taken off the floor and given into the hands of a committee that has also other things to consider.

Here we might leave the matter but for the fact that if the present name is perpetuated without a single voice being uttered against it in public, it will have so dinned itself into the minds of all, that "Edinburgh 1953" will find it useless to consider a proposed change.

Yet, here is an important issue; for, when all the speeches and recommendations of Amsterdam 1949 shall have been largely forgotten, the movement that called them into being will continue to be known by its name; and the name will be either correct or incorrect, and it may even give needless offense or arouse mild ridicule.

The name, as now bequeathed to us by the decision of seventeen men in Grand Rapids, 1946, is "Reformed Ecumenical Synod." I object to each one of the three words in that appellation, because to me every one seems to be dubious, hence apt to be misunderstood.

I. Reformed.

1. This word originally denoted that branch of Protestantism which separated from Luther under Zwingli and Calvin. Its primary meaning had a doctrinal and ecclesiastical connotation (Reformed doctrine, Reformed form of church polity); but of late years it no longer designates the doctrinal position of a group, and that for two reasons:

a. There are churches that still bear the name "Reformed", yet are not invited to our international councils because we are convinced the name has in their case become a dead letter, doctrinally speaking. Evidently, the word "Reformed" has, in some cases, become a denominational rather than a doctrinal designation.

b. So accurate and final an authority as Webster's *Unabridged Dictionary* (Second Edition) states that the name "Reformed" often means merely "a Protestant or Protestants." Moreover, there are in America a "Reformed Catholic Church", and a "Reformed Episcopal Church." Clearly, the word is confusing.

2. There exists in the United States a church which is a union of the former "Evangelische Lutherische Kirche" and the erstwhile "Reformierte Kirche." When these two bodies amalgamated they adopted the name "Evangelical and Reformed Church". Is it any wonder, that the present writer, who lives in a Lutheran environment, has frequently been asked, "Is not your church the same as Lutheran?" Let alone the fact that the Reformed Churches, all told, are numerically so small, that many Americans (none of them too well posted in these things) write to "the Christian Reform Church." They do not know the word; but tell them you are a Calvinist, and most of them know at least "that stands for predestination, does it not?"

3. The word "Reformed" has a linguistic meaning with a history. It means re-formed after de-formation. One delegate of the very young Christian churches in Indonesia said at Amsterdam, "We cannot be RE-formed, because we never had anything to re-form from." But they can be Calvinistic.

4. The word "Reformed" is confusing when translated into Dutch. Does it denote *Gereformeerde* or *Hervormde*? Linguistically it means both. But apart from the debate, hoary with age, whether the *Hervormde Kerk* is still officially a *Gereformeerde Kerk*, this is what one comes to. The minister of a Reformed Church in the Netherlands (*Hervormde Kerk*) agrees with my stand in this matter because he, as a member of the *Oecumenische Raad van Kerken in Nederland*, considers our use of the term "ecumenical" arrogant. The minister of another Reformed Church in the Netherlands (*Gereformeerde Kerk*) agrees because he feels that the movement is not sufficiently inclusive to use so great a name. It is queer: you have to designate both these ministers with the same English word: the word "Reformed" simply represents two mutually exclusive bodies and names in the Netherlands. Why not say what everybody understands, and, from now on, call such meetings "Calvinistic"?

II. Ecumenical.

Of course, linguistically speaking, this word merely means universal, world-wide. Thus there might be, conceivably, ecumenical "Catholic", ecumenical Lutheran, ecumenical Episcopal, Baptist, etc., gatherings. To my knowledge, however, no such names are in use, save among the small group that met in

the Waalkerk in Amsterdam in 1949. Why not? For the simple reason that *verba valent usu*.

Again we turn to Webster. Webster distinguishes between the ecclesiastical and the general use of this word. As to the first, it means, "pertaining to, representing, or governing the whole church; such as an ecumenical council." In its second sense the word is said to mean "world-wide, tolerant, liberal."

Ecclesiastically, then, the word means a gathering of all churches of the world that are entitled to the name Christian churches. And this is corroborated by two facts:

1. When we speak of ecumenical creeds we mean neither roman catholic, lutheran, nor presbyterian creeds, but such as the *apostolic creed* because these are accepted universally wherever there is a christian church.

2. Of late there is but one mass movement which has brought the use of the word "ecumenical" again to the fore. It is the group representing fifty countries, and several church groups within each of these countries, which in 1948 have formed "The World Council of Churches." They mean by the use of this word that they consider themselves above, or beyond, the differences of various shades of Christianity. This is an historic fact. And when Dr. John A. Mackay became the first occupant of the first seminary chair in "Ecumenical Christianity" it did not mean that he would teach Calvinism as expressed universally (that had been done before at Princeton), but that he would teach what all Christians of different creeds have in common, and how they could approach one another more closely. By "ecumenical" this world-wide movement designates its ideal of fulfilling Christ's words "that they may all be one."

3. In view of these facts, it is no wonder the minister of a Reformed Church in the Netherlands (*Hervormde Kerk*) denounced our use of the word ecumenical as "bold theft" (*brutale diefstal*), and resented it. We would prefer a more mild expression; but we regret that so small a group should needlessly give offense by using, and that in a totally divergent sense, a word that is more and more universally understood as meaning that one world-wide effort to lift Christianity above the division of creeds and sects. This is not discussing the relative merit or demerit of said movement, but *verba valent usu*. Moreover, the movement begun in Grand Rapids, 1946, has the very opposite intent and purpose of the Ecumenical Movement with its *Ecumenical Review*. The latter means to break down the distinctive points of doctrine; the former deems it necessary to emphasize together the specifically calvinistic principles in view of increasing looseness. Why then use a confusing terminology, and one that may even create the feeling that we are imitating, or trying to substitute for, a different and larger movement?

And this last point, in the present writer's opinion, is all the more lamentable because the gathering at Amsterdam, 1949, has appointed a committee whose task it will be to warn the World Council of the dangers involved in their almost creedless stand. Such a warning, when coming from a small body calling itself "ecumenical" (a clear imitation or substitution) will have two scores against it in the eyes of those men who can only resent the use of that term by a body that is strictly creedal and of one type of Christians.

Must we then forever remain bound by the name adopted by a very few men and passed on to a group with only twenty-six voting members, and adopted by it without debate? Can we never retrace our steps, or improve as we begin to see things in a larger perspective? Is not "universal council" good enough?

III. Synod.

The 1946 gathering adopted the following overture: "The present assembly bears the character of a Synod because it is a gathering of Churches which, through duly appointed delegates, convene to consider certain ecclesiastical matters in an ecclesiastical manner" (*Acts of the First Reformed Ecumenical Synod*, p. 36.)

This is rather weak. A classis might be called a classis for the very same reason and with the identical words. Webster defines the word "synod" as indicating "a formal meeting to consider and decide on church matters; a governing or advising body in various churches."

That is exactly it: a general definition because the word is used in various ways by different church organizations. Sometimes a Synod has only advisory capacity, especially in bodies with a congregational form of church government; in other cases its decisions have binding authority. This latter the meetings at Grand Rapids and Amsterdam had not, and could not have. And shall we now search musty and hoary documents to discover if, even among the Reformed Churches of the past, there have not been some assemblies with only advisory capacity which were nevertheless called synods? Shall we detract from the none-too-great respect which our Synods enjoy today by telling the people that hereafter we have two types of "synods", some with the good old binding authority by majority vote, and some that have only advisory power and must pass on all their decisions to national Synods for adoption or rejection? Why should we do this, when there are other terms available that are at least as good, and less confusing?

IV. Conclusion.

May I ask, in all soberness, and with due modesty, that these words shall be given the attention they

seem to me to deserve, and not merely be read with the desire to defend that which we have once helped to decide?

And may I, for better understanding within and outside of the churches to meet at Edinburgh, tenta-

tively suggest the name of "The Universal Council of Calvinistic Churches"? Or, in case that name seems to be too reminiscent of the great "World Council", why not speak of "The International Conference of Calvinistic Churches at Edinburgh"?

The Voice of our Readers

May I remark that (excepting the Bible) The Forum does more than any other single agency to energize my convictions of Calvinism.

J. J. WEERSING, Escalon, Cal.

Let me congratulate you again on another successful year of publication. Though I am busier than ever before, I still take time out and enjoy reading the Forum. May God in His wisdom and providence make it possible for you to continue your fine work.

ARTHUR C. JOHNSON
Prairie View Reformed Church

I am enthusiastic about your publication. It is a real joy for me to find in The Calvin Forum articles about live subjects, correspondence of Calvinistic friends, and also such varied, complete, and thorough book reviews. The Calvin Forum serves to strength-

en my faith and contributes to my spiritual communion with Calvinists of the whole world.

PIERRE C. MARCEL, Vice-Pres.
French Calvinistic Society
Saint Germain-en-Laye, France

I find real encouragement in discovering the existence and activity of people such as you and those who write for your magazine, people who have the power that comes from an authentically Christian faith, the definiteness and clarity of mind that go with orthodoxy in belief, and (what is the rarest of all) a firmness of attitude that is devoid of any ill-will and the wrong kind of censoriousness.

RENE DE VISME WILLIAMSON
Editor, The Journal of Politics
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tenn.

Woods in Winter

Oh, winter is a dead thing,
so worn with wind and drear.
The woods lie hushed of music
with only the branches to hear,
And sounds of stalks worn brittle
and dark as a sparrow's wing,
The clack of leaves left turning
to free themselves and fling
Their brown, unlovely fragments
far down to ravaged brush.
Oh, gone is the early matin
of linnet, lark and thrush,
And green tree shadow and sunshine
like butter, thick and sweet.
Now only the thin leaves splinter
and break beneath my feet.

Grand Rapids

MARIE J. POST

From Our Correspondents

FESTIVITIES IN SOUTH AFRICA

University College,
Potchefstroom, S. Africa.
Dec. 17, 1949.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

WE HAVE just returned from attending the nation-wide celebrations in connection with the inauguration of the majestic Voortrekker monument at Pretoria. The celebration lasted a full week ending on the evening of Dec. 16, the so-called Dingaans Day.

On Dec. 16, 1838, the Voortrekkers finally broke the military power of the Zulu warrior, Dingaan, and by this act saved both white and black in South Africa. The Zulus were then overrunning all black tribes and were trying to put a stop to the immigration of the whites. Were it not for the Voortrekkers European civilization would have been wiped off the map of South Africa and all non-Zulu blacks would have been exterminated. One important fact should be remembered in connection with our black problem in South Africa: by destroying Dingaan, the Voortrekkers saved all other black races, even the Zulu race itself. The Voortrekkers and their descendants never waged any exterminating war on the blacks; proof of this is the fact that since 1838 the blacks have increased in numbers and outnumber the whites today by 4 to 1. If you people take this fact into consideration, you will be much fairer in judging our present policy of *apartheid*. By *apartheid* we do not intend to suppress the non-whites, but only to give them an opportunity of developing on their own and become an independent, or rather separate, entity. During the nineteenth century the blacks kept themselves apart; it was only during this century that they left their own territories to migrate into those of the whites. We want to stop this intermingling and to put the native in a position to develop along his own lines.

You may still remember the historic Ossewage-trek during 1938, the centenary of the Great Trek. The Trek was to commemorate the Great Trek and to celebrate the laying of the foundation on Dec. 16, 1938, of the Voortrekker monument.

Now full eleven years later another nation-wide trek to Pretoria took place to inaugurate the monument itself. It took, especially due to the second world war, fully eleven years to finish the monument itself.

In 1949 no new Ossewage-trek to Pretoria took place. To arouse the enthusiasm of our people, another form of symbolism was attempted, with great success. On Oct. 10 the first public movement towards Pretoria started in the form of dispatch riders. The idea was to hold public meetings in all the more important centers and to take written messages from there to the central place of meeting, viz., Pretoria. Dispatch riders started from 15 different places and directions and converged gradually towards Pretoria. They were equipped on horseback and each rider carried a knapsack in which the messages were conveyed from all over South Africa to Pretoria. The messages were all—as we call them—“volksboodskappe” in connection with our development as a nation in the past and in the future; no sectional or party-political messages were accepted—all messages were to be national. At each place of reception of the dispatch riders open-air celebrations took place: they were met outside the city or town by a commando of horsemen and formally accompanied to the central place of meeting. There a full day's program was conducted. In such a program was included: formal welcome, religious ceremonies,

popular singing, “volkspele” (folksplays), torch light processions, speeches by one or more acknowledged leaders, “braai-vleis” (roast meat) festivities. The dispatch riders, coming from 15 directions all over Southern Africa, were gradually working their way to Pretoria. They assembled outside the city by Dec. 13, and were formally welcomed at the Monument on Dec. 14. On this day the real celebrations started at Pretoria and culminated on Dec. 16 at 12 noon with the inauguration of the Monument by Dr. S. F. Malan, the prime minister. The festivities at Pretoria were along the same lines as at the different meeting places of the dispatch riders on their journey to Pretoria—with this important difference: they took place on a scale never before imagined or attempted in South Africa.

Amid crowd scenes and solemnities on a scale so rare and impressive that they will be remembered with pride and joy for life by the multitude who witnessed them, South Africa consecrated a time-defying memorial to its Voortrekker pioneers and founders on Monument hill on Dec. 16. It is estimated that more than 250,000 people, one-tenth of the total white population of South Africa, took part in the overwhelming climax of the four-day festival. Of this number, nearly 100,000 lived during the festival in specially erected military tents. This tent town made a lasting impression on those attending the festival. My family and I, coming from Potchefstroom more than a 100 miles away from Pretoria, also stayed in a tent. Living in a tent in the open air was quite a new experience to us. Although it was very inconvenient, and at this time of the year extremely hot, we still enjoyed the new experience as a part of the grand festival. Living under strange circumstances was part and parcel of this memorable festival.

This Dec. 16 was and will be a red-letter day for all South Africans, more particularly for the Afrikaans-speaking group. It was our festival and all speeches, even by English-born speakers, were delivered in Afrikaans. Nobody took this amiss, and many English-speaking South Africans attended the festival.

To give you a general idea of what we were doing, I shall give you the full program for Dec. 16.

The day started at sunrise with 21 cannon shots by the South African permanent force followed by sacred music executed by the military orchestra. At 5:20 a.m. an impressive procession of families was formed marching slowly accompanied by the playing of sacred music to the top of Monument hill where the monument itself is built. At 6 a. m. the flag was raised in the amphitheatre at the foot of the Monument. At 6:15 a. m. early divine service was conducted at the Monument. From 7 to 9 there was an interval for breakfast. Precisely at 9 the so-called “geloftediens” took place. (The solemn promise was made by the Voortrekkers during Dec., 1838, that if God should give them victory over Dingaan, they would hold that day as a Sabbath for all generations to come.) The inauguration ceremony itself started at 10:30 and lasted till 1 p.m. In this ceremony were included: speeches by Mr. N. C. Havenga, leader of the Afrikaner party, by Judge C. Newton-Thompson representing the English speaking nation, by Dr. D. F. Malan, prime minister and leader of the National party, and by Gen'l. J. C. Smuts, leader of the opposition and the United party. In between the speeches songs were sung by special choirs and by the audience itself. The morning program was concluded with a speech by the chairman of the Voortrekker Monument Inauguration Committee, Dr. E. G.

Jansen, and by a special dispatch from the Netherlands read by Prof. G. vander Leeuw, who with two others formed a group of dispatch riders from the old mother country. In the afternoon there were a children's service, a "spreekkoor" and the lowering of the flag. From 5:30 to 7. followed a break for the evening meal. The concluding items followed after 7. At 7 there followed some more choral songs; at 8 the "dankdiens" (thanksgiving-service) and at 9:15 the final ending of the festival.

On the morning of the 17th we all returned by motor car, by bus, by train or otherwise to our homes.

I hope this is another "gleeful account" of Afrikaner enthusiasm as John van Lonkhuyzen quite rightly called my letter on *apartheid* (see his letter in the Aug.-Sept. 1949, issue.)

With kind regards,

J. CHR. COETZEE.

A LETTER FROM INDIA

Telugu Village Mission,
Adoni, South India.

January 3, 1950.

My dear Dr. Bouma:

THE new constitution of "Free India" is to be inaugurated in a few days and the country swings into action as a sovereign republic. But we continue to remain within the framework of the British Commonwealth and, *ipso facto*, we are to regard King George of England as the titular head of the group of free nations of which India is a member in full standing. The exact position of an avowed republic in such a setup is rather anomalous, but it may be presumed that the basic reasons for such a partnership are two-fold: for India's defence needs and in order that Britain may enjoy the vast market for her products which a population of over 300 millions affords.

Externally, all seems to be well with India since she 'enjoys' diplomatic relations with nearly the whole world, including Soviet Russia and the newborn Communistic regime centered at Peiping. Our polished Harrow-&Cambridge-trained Prime Minister Nehru is accorded royal honors in your great country, and our late rulers, the British, hold out to him and India, the hand of true fellowship. Internally, however, the situation is far from rosy. Politically inexperienced administrators, "Clad in brief authority," have for the past two years launched one socio-political experiment after another, with the inevitable results: economic pressure on the public, general dissatisfaction, and a great deal of confusion which here and there borders on the chaotic. However, it must be said, in fairness, that there is enough of stability and law and order in the day-to-day life of the nation, and sufficient religious liberty in the land for the more or less normal functioning of Christian enterprises. And for these blessings we of the Household of Faith praise our sovereign God in humble gratitude. Indeed, "The Lord God omnipotent reigneth" even in this largely pagan land, and He continues to call out His own, chiefly from amongst the under-privileged communities now no longer permitted to be known as "Untouchables." These now enjoy, at any rate in theory, full civil rights.

Missions and Foreign Policy

There is a fresh facet of our new government's foreign relations policy which I feel I must bring to the notice of FORUM readers, particularly those of our denomination charged with the task of organizing Christian work in the Orient. It is the steadily narrowing basis of admission of mission workers from overseas. Hitherto it was a matter of simple routine in the Passport Department at, say, Washington, London or Berne, for an American, British, or Swiss Mission Board to obtain an India visa for its outward bound missionaries; and the Home Department in India accepted as a matter of course the entry of a foreign worker to India. Now, however, the

situation has undergone a radical change. The authorities at our capital, New Delhi, in consultation with the corresponding authorities in the Provinces, maintain a rigid scrutiny of all applications for visa to enter India. And while medical doctors and nurses, educational missionaries, and certain categories of technical workers are admitted without much trouble, the case of a prospective evangelistic worker is quite different. In any case, the onus of making out a good case for the admission of all workers to India now rests almost entirely with the local head of the religious organization recruiting a foreign missionary for its work in India. And when a candidate is needed for purely the propagation of the Gospel, the official barriers are up in force.

Let me cite a specific case of very recent date. When advised of Miss Ann C. Bosch, of Spring Lake, Mich., being ready to join us here in India, I sent up two applications for the issue of an India visa for our prospective missionary assistant—one to the Central Government at New Delhi through the National Christian Council, and another through the local District Commissioner to the Provincial authorities at Madras. Both applications went forward strongly recommended, but it was *ten weeks* before the papers were finally released and the necessary authority cabled back to New York. In the course of scrutinizing Miss Bosch's 'fitness to work in India as an evangelistic missionary' and my own *bona fides* as a solvent head of a genuine missionary organization, the following were some of the questions put to me for answer before a magistrate: "Why do you wish to have the candidate in your Mission?" "Is it necessary to have her help you?" "What will be her duties?" "Will she be an asset to India and her peoples?" "Can you prove your ability to maintain her while she is in India and to finance any possible repatriation?" "Could no suitable Indian candidate be found for the post?"

It may be said that the Telugu Village Mission which your correspondent has the privilege of leading with the help of his American wife, is still an independent organization and as yet without a program of education beyond the equivalent of the American sixth grade. Further, we have no regular medical work, although we make full use of the existing state medical facilities. Thus our need for help fell outside of the medical, educational and technical categories which the India government apparently deems essential for its nation-building program. But, *Soli Deo gloria!* And we also express our debt of gratitude to Dr. R. B. Manikam of the National Christian Council for his help and kind co-operation, and would like to record the belief that the fact of my being a citizen and an ex-Army and Civil Service officer *probably* helped to storm the citadel of official prejudice against the entry to the New India of at least one non-technical Kingdom worker from abroad.

Visit of the Schurings from Ceylon

A visit we had from the Rev. John and Mrs. Schuring may interest your readers in the telling. This brother came to us from his post in Ceylon on instructions from the denominational Board of Missions and we were able to take him to nineteen of our sub-stations. Here he met each one of our six Indian pastors, about 40 other workers, and a great many of the Mission's elders and adherents. Points of Reformed doctrine were discussed and numerous questions answered, by interpretation mostly, as to details of Christian Reformed Church practices. It must be mentioned here that Reformed indoctrination has been conducted for the past 21 months in many parts of the T.V.M. field, and copies of the Heidelberg Catechism, especially translated into the Telugu language, widely distributed among our helpers. Also each of our Indian pastors has been studying our Psalter-hymnal with gratifying results: they have all accepted the Reformed position freely and without any coercion having been used on my part. And so the Mission's doctrinal position and its working policy move steadily on towards a definitely Reformed goal and we are determined, the Lord helping us, to keep out of mergers with

this or that union movement. We desire above all else to maintain our evangelical witness and to follow well-tested lines of orthodox Reformed teaching.

We welcomed our two weeks' fellowship with the Schurings all the more owing to the fact of there being so few Christian Reformed families in this teeming sub-continent. For instance, our nearest neighbors, the Steenstrals (of Cleveland, O.) are 200 miles to the north at Bhongir where they labor for the India Mission among groups of Telugus. We have not as yet had the pleasure of personal contact with these folks, save through correspondence. And another 1,000 miles must be traversed before we come to the Bergsmas at Ludhiana. But, scattered though we are, and impelled by circumstances to work under boards outside of the denominational framework, I personally feel that we are each of us pioneering for the Christian Reformed Church many thousands of miles from the "Home Base" at Grand Rapids. And I also believe that the FORUM is the finest kind of equipment a pioneer could have in his task of propagating the historic Reformed faith and the Calvinistic world and life view.

May God bless you in your varied literary activities!

ARTHUR V. RAMIAH.

HUNGARIAN LETTER

Dear Dr. Bouma:

WHenever I see a new edition of THE CALVIN FORUM, I always feel like a debtor at the sight of his creditor. I could stand it no longer. Here goes one of my long overdue Hungarian letters.

Bishop Revesz Resigns

In Hungary the bishopric of the largest diocese, the Trans-Tibiscan, of the Reformed Church changed hands. The former bearer of the office, Dr. Imre Revesz, resigned and a young "outsider," the Rev. John Peter of the Danubian diocese was elected in his place. The resignation of Dr. Revesz amounted to a complete retirement from public life, because with his resignation from the office of the bishop went his resignation from his pastorate and university professorship in Debrecen. Apart from considerations of health, given as one of the main reasons for his retirement, the fact that Dr. Revesz felt himself compelled to resign may be considered as a healthy sign of the doctrinal, theological integrity of the Reformed Church in Hungary. In his rapturous joy over the reconstruction of the old Great Church in Debrecen, preponderantly with government subsidies, last April he made some unsolicited statements which appeared to have committed the Reformed Faith and the Reformed Church to the communistic ideology. Since then he had no peace, ceased to enjoy his former prestige and trust, received severe criticism on both sides of the Atlantic. It was the logical thing for him to resign. It is a different thing to steer under adverse conditions and to give moral, theological sanction to ideologies and systems of government.

His successor, although an acceptable person in the eyes of the regime, seemed to have benefited by the mistake made by his predecessor. In his long inaugural address there was not one word which could have been construed as in any way compromising the spiritual integrity of the Reformed Church in Hungary. The quietly working consensus of the Church still seems to be strong enough to fell mighty oaks, as Bishop Revesz was, and to elevate young "novices," as Bishop Peter is in the eyes of many. We in America wish him well, although personally he is unknown to most of us. After all, the Lord's cause is not a matter of personal relationships.

Another Loyalty Oath

Taking out oaths of loyalty seems to be a favorite continental pastime. While I was a young soldier during the second half of World War I, I was made to take the oath of allegiance to old Emperor-King Franz Joseph I, and to his

young successor Emperor-King Charles IV, at least a half a dozen times, until I knew the oath almost by heart. Again, when the communists came into power in the spring of 1919, we, theological students, were herded to the city hall and before we knew what it was about, we were made the sworn subjects of the new regime. Of course that made none of us a communist at heart. In view of these past experiences my most serious objection to these repeated demands for oaths of allegiance lies in the frequency of the demand for and the hypocritical significance attached to them.

These thoughts surged through my mind when reading about the oath of allegiance to the "new" constitution of the "new" Hungarian People's Republic demanded from everyone, who either partly or in full draws a salary from the public treasury. On a five-yearly decreasing scale all clerics of all denominations in Hungary are receiving a state subsidy. The Protestants, I understand, took this recent oath without making much ado about it, whereas the Roman Catholic hierarchy allowed it to the lesser clergy and declared its own taking of an oath dependent upon instructions from the Papal See. As the oath was not demanded from anyone in his ecclesiastical capacity, but in his capacity of a recipient of financial support from the public treasury, I am inclined to say that real religious principles were not involved on the part of those whose misfortune it was to take one oath more to the ones already exacted from them. With a heavy heart, to be sure, it may be regarded but one more sacrifice for the sake of a living and also for the sake of an unmolested possibility to carry on the Lord's work.

The State and Church Support

An entirely different news item gave a much more enlightening glimpse into the power which the government holds over the churches and their institutions. Out of the hundreds and hundreds of schools of lower and higher education which, for example, the Reformed Church in Hungary had, four colleges and seminaries attached to them have been left, but all of them shorn of their bequests and land holdings to support themselves. They revived an ancient custom derived from the mendicant friars of the middle ages. Occasionally they send out their students to the congregations within their respective territories in order to solicit free will offerings in kind or in sums of money for the support of the institution, especially for the maintenance of the student dining rooms (convictus). This was done sometime during the spring of the year 1949, too. The authorities stopped these students and had them recalled by their schools. The central executive board of the Church turned to the government for an explanation. The answer, made through the ministry of the interior, was that for such collections a permit from the government is required. True, assurance was given that such permits will be issued upon application, yet the implications of this state of things are potentially far-reaching and sinister. It seems to indicate that those institutions and the whole church behind them are existing not by right, but by the mercy of the government, not even the people being permitted to help them without a permit and consent of the government. People who profess to be tired of hearing their ministers appeal in behalf of the causes of the church and of its public institutions should ponder over this thing. They might well appreciate the freedom of their church to ask, and their own freedom to give out of what a bounteous Lord gave them. The ultimate inference seems to be that a communistic government regards even the last penny in the pockets of the citizens as its own and arrogates to itself the right of its ultimate disposition.

Progress in Church Life

Yet, under such conditions the Church seems to thrive. A timely awakening prevented the masses, hungry for heavenly comfort, from throwing themselves into the arms of atheism or of the sects. Thus far the Church was able to hold its own and the outlines of a theology of evangelization are emerging

from the first heat and zeal of the new awakening. Bishop Peter, too, in his inaugural address stressed that the results of the awakening must be incorporated into the established church congregation by congregation and that the unity of the whole body must be maintained and re-inforced. Indicating the direction of this trend, an internationally well-known exponent of Calvinistic thinking in Hungary confided to me that he is working on a new translation of the less popularized, yet the theologically more important, official standard of the Church, the Second Helvetic Confession. To the new translation he intends to add expositions that would afford a fresh application of its underlying principles to the problems of the times, as they present themselves in the life of the Church in Hungary.

In the meantime the catholic, or to use the now more fashionable phrase, the ecumenic consciousness of the Church is also alive. They do care what the brethren in the rest of the world know or think about them. It was plainly indicated in the above mentioned inaugural address of their youngest bishop. True, in their zeal for brotherly understanding once in a while they fall into a trap set by their own government. This happened, for example, when they unreservedly committed themselves to a representative of the American left wing magazine, *The Protestant*, but that may be brushed aside as a clear case of misinformation or even better, absence of information.

Your own representation of the Free Magyar Reformed Church in America at last summer's Ecumenical Synod at Amsterdam, and in a wider sense the representation which that fact afforded to the whole Magyar branch of the Calvinistic family, engendered a quiet joy in the hearts of those who could be made to hear about it, together with the resettlement program of your Church for the displaced Hungarian Calvinistic families.

For the time being I have chattered enough, I think. Next time, when the Lord shall face me again with the alternative of taking a little well-earned rest or writing for THE CALVIN FORUM, I may again choose the latter and tell you about ourselves here in America. God bless you and the readers of THE FORUM!

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES VINCZE.

LETTER FROM IRISH CALVINISTS

15 College Sq., East,
Belfast, North Ireland.
February 1st, 1950.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

ONCE again it is time for me to write to you concerning the British Isles in general, and the Emerald Isle in particular. As I sit down to do so, I realize that there is little news from this side of the Atlantic, although I expect my next letter will contain more detailed information.

Our General Election

Excitement is rising here because of the General Election now approaching, which will be history by the time this letter appears in print. In Britain, the Conservatives are exerting themselves much more than they did at the last election. They are really fighting now. They have issued a manifesto, and it is definitely a manifesto for the worker to read. All parties are appealing to the worker. It is hard to say how the election will go; it is hard to see Labour retaining its tremendous majority; and it is hard to imagine the Conservatives gaining a working majority. General opinion, even amongst Churchill supporters, is that the Socialists will be returned with a reduced majority. Even that will be a great pity, yet under such

circumstances the Socialists could not do as they liked regardless of the wishes of a great section of the people. In Northern Ireland, the Unionist Conservative government will have no difficulty in seeing the majority of our representatives in London, "King's men." In every election in North Ireland, the "border" is the deciding issue, we still remember the words and actions of the Romanist leaders of Eire, and we are all the more determined to retain our connection with Britain. To break that connection would mean not only subjugation to Eire, but also to the Vatican. From time to time we hear sad stories from Spain, and so we are more jealous of our Reformation heritage than ever.

"Welcome Home"

The Irish Evangelical Church has recently welcomed home one of her esteemed missionaries, Miss A. J. Dunlop, S.R.N., after 5 years' service in India. Nurse Dunlop was given an official welcome in Botanic Avenue Evangelical Church. The chairman of our Council, Rev. W. J. Grier, was ill during the preceding weeks, and so could not attend the meeting. Nurse Dunlop had been a member of his congregation before going to India. In his absence, Rev. C. E. Hunter presided. It was an impressive meeting. A letter from Mr. Grier, an official welcome by Rev. W. J. McDowell on behalf of the Council of our Church, a welcome by Nurse Dunlop's Sunday School teacher, good wishes from the secretary of Botanic Avenue Church, a solo by a friend, and finally a moving address by the missionary herself, all contributed to a sense of fellowship in the presence of God. It was a meeting that will linger in the minds of many. It came as a reminder to our people that although we are a small Church, yet God has opened a door for us through which we have sent forth our dear missionaries to India, Africa and South America.

A Challenge

Our Church is small, our task is great, our God is Sovereign. We are faced by great opposing forces. Perhaps they might be summed up as follows:

- a) Romanism,—an ever-active force in our province.
- b) Dispensationalism,—a force which is weakening resistance to Rome, and spreading an isolationism which is detrimental to the well-being of the people.
- c) Modernism,—which has blighted the large denominations, producing a pernicious, pseudo-Christianity.
- d) Arminianism, a system linked up with all the above, and cementing them all to constitute a *challenge* to a Calvinistic Church like ours.

The fruits of this challenge are plentiful and dangerous, one of them being a sad lack of interest in the doctrines of grace. Young Christians in this city run in their hundreds to the meeting which is run on concert-hall lines; they look for emotionalism, excitement and crowds. But the serious, systematic study of the revealed truth of Jehovah,—no, they cannot have that. And so the challenge is not met by all who profess Christ's Name. Indeed, many of them suffer from the infection. As a Church we are almost acutely aware of our position. In our smallness we look to God's greatness, conscious as we do so that, by His providence, we are linked with all who in generation after generation have been "set for the defence of the Gospel."

We are a fighting church, a despised church, a happy church. We do not wish it otherwise. Frequently we pray for our Calvinistic brethren in different countries. Will you pray for us?

With Greetings from Irish Calvinists,

Yours in His service,
FRED S. LEAHY.

Book Reviews

KIERKEGAARDIAN PHILOSOPHY

KIERKEGAARDIAN PHILOSOPHY IN THE FAITH OF A SCHOLAR. By David F. Swenson. Edited by Lillian M. Swenson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1949. 160 pages. \$2.50.

ON February 11, 1940, the community of American philosophers lost a colleague of Scandinavian descent whose significance in the story of American culture will depend on the effect that another Scandinavian, Søren Kierkegaard (1813-1850), will have upon us. For Professor David F. Swenson, who was associated with the Department of Philosophy of the University of Minnesota throughout his academic career, devoted himself almost entirely to the mastery, propagation, and translation of Kierkegaard's thought and writings. In 1898, while still a graduate student and assistant, and still, as he tells us himself, "earnestly wrestling with many problems far beyond my strength" (*Something about Kierkegaard*, p. 1), and having no basic faith to support him except what his mother had taught him as a child, Swenson discovered by chance in a public library a work of Kierkegaard in the original Danish; he read it through with passion in the course of the ensuing 24 hours, finding in it an amazing penetrating analysis and an impassioned defense of Christian belief.

From that moment until his death Swenson labored to make Kierkegaard known and appreciated in a culture which today is just beginning to recognize in him a leader of thought not to be placed below such 19th century figures as Dostoevski, Nietzsche, Darwin, and Marx. In 1914 Swenson delivered the first public address in English about Søren Kierkegaard to be heard by an American audience. In 1921 he published, in the periodical *Scandinavian Studies*, the first discussion in English of Kierkegaard's writings. For many years he busied himself as a solitary agent for his cause by addressing many groups, contributing articles to American philosophical journals, and translating many of Kierkegaard's works, including *Philosophical Fragments* and several devotional discourses. Death came to him before he had quite completed Kierkegaard's *magnum opus*, the staggering production known in full as *Concluding Unscientific Postscript to the Philosophical Fragments*, the publication of which in this country occurred in 1941 under the supervision of Dr. Walter Lowrie.

While I do not know as much about Kierkegaard as I intend to know, I can see Swenson's debt to him on each of his pages. A few specific debts may be listed as follows. First, Kierkegaard reveals, as few recent writers can do, the depth of the passion of the human soul: its unspeakable concern about the truly terrific issues we all must face; the possibilities of sinful pride and lust which it may actualize, as well as its need for an eternal happiness such as God offers through His own invasion into time in Christ. Swenson absorbed the Danish writer's marvelous dialectical analysis of the human soul; and freeing himself from the pseudo-scientific and utilitarian views of recent decades, he could rejoice in the spiritual fellowship of such minds as Dante, Augustine, and Socrates.

Further, through Kierkegaard Swenson learned how to appreciate the unique dignity and responsibility of the single individual. A good deal of recent thinking, while professing to honor individual rights, is given to regard the person as a member of a mass the ends of which are material enjoyments and the code of which is conformity to general practice. No one in modern times is Kierkegaard's equal in putting the essential questions to each man in person. Do you yourself hold a given belief and accept responsibility for your choice? Will you in person take a stand on which depends your own

eternal destiny? The group cannot think or choose for you; if you follow the crowd, you cannot expect to be credited with making a decision except the decision to go with the crowd. Swenson, in short, was enabled to see that all basic decision is typified by the choice before Peter when he was shaken by the Master's words, "Lovest thou me?" And finally, with the help of Kierkegaard, Swenson maintained a significant intellectual liberty in the face of the prevailing anti-Christian drift of modern culture.

As Kierkegaard himself had done, Swenson resisted the pressures of two widespread modern tendencies, one making for a transmutation of Christianity into something speculative and "higher" *a la* Hegel or Royce, the other making for an abandonment of Christianity in favor of some variety of naturalism which claims the backing of scientific method. Swenson's judgment on the restricted efficacy of scientific categories, when converted into philosophical principles, is shrewd and sound. His shrewdness as a critic of both scientific and idealistic notions is vividly displayed in a passage in which he discusses Kierkegaard's analysis of Original Sin. Kierkegaard's interpretation, he says, "excludes the pseudo-scientific, pseudo-evolutionary, pseudo-ethical and pseudo-optimistic notion of a human race on its upward path of a gradual liberation from the burden of a 'brute inheritance of sin,' than which no conception could be more confused." On the other hand it also escapes the identification of the concept with the abstract metaphysical and pre-moral condition in human nature for the existence of the moral task, namely the fact that the individual is a synthesis of particularity and sociality, is both himself and in a sense also the human race, as is done by Josiah Royce in the *Problem of Christianity*. "To call the existence in human nature of conditions making possible a moral task, by the name of a moral burden from which the individual needs to be saved, as does Royce, is also to indulge one's self in the luxury of a confusion of the categories." (Swenson's Introduction to *Philosophical Fragments*, p. xxiii) That Kierkegaard could help Swenson to such insights in an age when to be educated was nearly synonymous with religious skepticism is a tribute to his power; and that Swenson could express himself so firmly is a tribute to his courage.

The little book before us is a collection of Swenson's addresses and papers from the years 1927 to 1937. The first two contain useful discussions of the basic sense in which the life of man can be said to have dignity and of the only important meaning of the term progress when applied to religious thought. Mere increase in knowledge about the externals of religion is of little help to those that concern themselves with the religious life itself. The third address presents a careful analysis of the concept of evolution—what it does mean, and what it has been mistakenly taken to mean—plus a biting critique of various misleading applications of this concept to important aspects of human life: it does not shed any light on the origin or nature of evil; it does not in any way connote or guarantee moral progress; it does not explain religion or dispose of theology. Omitting the fourth address from consideration, I pause over the fifth, which is the longest and most difficult in the book. It aims to show that in the actual living of life man must make choices in the absence of compelling objective evidence. Because the empirical order is temporal and flowing, and we are not outside the flux, our knowledge of fact is never quite certain. Events are contingent, not necessary; and the existent object intended by our propositions is never completely given. Besides, existents are particular, while knowledge is phrased in universals.

It is evident then, says Swenson, that all human knowledge involves taking risks. The notions of probability and induction, instead of being tokens of our rational control of events, are tokens that we choose between alternatives for reason which reason does not decisively measure against each other. Man must believe, and belief is an act of choice without the support of decisive evidence. Were the evidence conclusive, we could not speak of an act of belief. Belief is the more conspicuous and the more crucial where the intended object is vital to human life: moral obligation as a reality, God as the cause of contingent existence and as fixing man's final goal. In such cases we cannot reach the object without passionate choice; here truth is subjectivity, not a mirror response to objective evidence. If I do not myself choose to believe that I ought to do a particular act which I judge to be right, no argument can possibly convince me that I ought.

Someone might say to Swenson: "As to God, however, am I not entitled to objective certainty on the basis of the infallible Word?" Would not the answer be: "This is a truth of faith, is it not, or is it a proposition in science? Certainly you do not place your faith at the mercy of the shifting currents of scholarly opinion about 'critical' questions pertaining to authorship, date, and preservation in un mutilated form of the documents. Would you not be in a comical position if you did rest your hope for eternal happiness on such considerations?" Another might say to Swenson: "Are not the classic arguments for God's existence really cogent, those that come down to us from Plato and Augustine and St. Thomas? Do we not have decisive proofs for at least the rudiments of theology, i.e. preambles to the specific Christian doctrines?" To this Kierkegaard and Swenson seem to reply: "No; those arguments are not convincing. To see the empirical world as of such a nature as to lean on God (Being Itself) as its Creator and Preserver is to assume precisely what you try to prove; this is a circle. Besides, to know the conclusion of the argument objectively, as a fact merely, is religiously useless; the devils know the objective truth, and what is their religious state?"

The last two chapters (VI and VII) provide an excellent discussion of a topic which in recent years has fallen into disrepute, the topic of supernaturalism and other worldliness as the dynamic for the finest human lives. Kierkegaard based his life on belief in what these terms connote. St. Paul was able, after enduring the severest hardships, to speak of his "light affliction." Here Swenson's pages are a perfect answer to John Dewey's sermons on the text that belief in divine perfection, immortality and judgment impede us in getting on with the practical work of the day. This quaint opinion of Mr. Dewey can be matched by others he has expressed. In *Freedom and Culture* he finds the source of Stalin's suppression of dissenters in the Communist attachment to principles. Intolerance and oppression, he says, are the inevitable result of adopting principles as true; liberal democracy depends on the experimental attitude. Granting with Mr. Dewey that Communist oppression is criminal, I should like to ask him what reasons we could find for resisting it—perhaps even to the point of death. Will he ask us to give our lives without a reason? I should think that an observer of the contemporary scene could be sufficiently aware that those for whom the majority is the standard are not the least likely to be oppressive and that without the classic doctrines about man, and particularly his relation to God, our traditions of personal liberty will be engulfed by the tides of collectivism and totalitarianism. In this matter I see in Kierkegaard more of an ally than in Mr. Dewey. It would profit anyone to consider seriously what quality of human life would be produced by a disappearance of otherworldly belief.

American readers ought to appreciate the publication of this book, but it would be unfair to Swenson to measure his significance by it chiefly. His other scholarly achievements have

a higher value; especially his translations of Kierkegaard with excellent introductions, and his volume entitled *Something about Kierkegaard*. Nevertheless, *The Faith of a Scholar* has an importance of its own in showing how Kierkegaard could inspire a reflective mind to swim upstream in an age characterized by a declining intensity of spiritual conviction. I for one have wished that I had been reading Kierkegaard several years earlier, especially during the war. I have wished also that the leaders of Western thought since 1850 had been as familiar with Kierkegaard as with Marx, Nietzsche, and Darwin. The Danish writer might have spared us much confusion of categories and have clarified the basic issues.

But I do not intend to leave the impression that in my judgment Kierkegaard is a perfect expositor of Christian doctrine or an unsurpassed Christian philosopher. I am ready to believe, when the evidence is presented, that he departed from classic Christian theology on several points; and, to mention one matter with which I am somewhat concerned, he seems to have overdone the "absurdity" of Christian faith. Swenson also at this point adopts an extreme position. In the brief space of two pages of the present book (pp. 127-128), I find a disparagement of arguments for God's existence alongside a plainly stated implication that finite existence is intrinsically incomplete, requiring the constant support of a sustaining cause. I am not convinced as yet that apologetics can only point at the paradox and appeal to man's need for positing an Absolute Cause; I am not sure that rational theology is quite futile.

On the other hand, I have not found sufficient ground to accept the allegation sometimes made that Kierkegaard considered subjectivity itself to be the source and criterion of truth. In his *Philosophical Fragments* Kierkegaard charged the Greeks (I do not stop to inquire whether the charge is justified) with the erroneous view that the truth is within us; he then contended that in Christianity man is represented as requiring to receive from God the possibility of learning and accepting the truth—man, he says, is in Sin and needs God as Teacher and Savior. Unless this is mere rhetoric (I see no reason why it should be so construed), for Kierkegaard the measure of truth is God. When he goes on to argue that truth is subjectivity, he means, so far as I have managed to understand him, something like what the golf instructor means when he tells us what stance and bodily motions are needed for hitting the ball. One cannot strike the ball without holding and moving oneself with tension in a certain form. The objective truth must be internalized, appropriated, allowed to rule emotion and practice; else we do not really have it. The devils have truth; but do they have it? This is the distinction Kierkegaard worked on; we should not convert the point he makes into a theory about the standard of objective truth which he would not profess.

I conclude by urging that Kierkegaard be read. This, I am sure, is what Swenson wanted. I can promise that the experience will produce a healthy disturbance. Swenson testifies that he was profoundly moved when he first discovered the *Unscientific Postscript*. Eduard Geismar was so deeply excited by his study of Kierkegaard that his physician ordered him to desist for an entire year. Karl Barth became what he is in good part because of Kierkegaard. Two persons of my own acquaintance were stirred by Kierkegaard as by no other writer; after being placed briefly under psychiatric observation, one of them decided to prepare for the ministry. If there is any modern writer who can challenge the non-Christian to agonize over his basic choice, and can compel the Christian to think about what it means to be what he professes to be, it is Kierkegaard.

University of Kentucky

JESSE DE BOER.

SERMONS BY DR. BONNELL

WHAT ARE YOU LIVING FOR. By John Sutherland Bonnell. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. 188 pages. \$2.00.

THE thesis of this book of sermons is: "For me to live is Christ," and living for Christ makes life worth-while and makes us see life whole. The subtitle to the first division of the book (there are four in all) is: *Invitation to Adventure*. It deals with the religious experience of conversion. As is to be expected, pastor Bonnell psycho-analyses his cases. Both Levi and Paul had an incubation stage to which the actual experience recorded in the Bible is simply the climax. But even so the response of the sinner to Christ's invitation is only the beginning of Christian life. There must be years of training in the school of Christ, for discipleship is not a temporary, emotional experience.

Dr. Bonnell further describes conversion as a character transformation that may be compared to the breaking up of fallow ground. "There are tremendous spiritual potentialities in all of us as there were in Matthew, but the soil must be broken up and cultivated" (p. 18). Jesus was able by his searching, yet tender eyes, to explore the soul of Matthew. Those eyes were filled with condemnation and hate, but to his amazement, Matthew, the Quisling, saw in the face of Jesus only understanding, sympathy and love. To this he responded. The secret of Jesus' success was that he did not judge Matthew, the publican, by externals, but he had looked into the heart. "Love is the secret. The world is hungry for love. People are perishing for lack of love. Christ came to kindle love in our hearts for all men, and where love is there God is also." (p. 17).

This is a sample of the type of sermon that pastor Bonnell preaches. It makes interesting reading. It is filled with apt illustrations and convincing stories and cases in which the "power of an expulsive affection" is demonstrated. As a matter of fact these short sermons are very engrossing and they breathe a certain conviction and power which makes them very effective.

However, though my appreciation and enjoyment make any strictures impossible, there are just a few critical comments that I venture to suggest. In the very first sermon, e.g., the whole setting, and all the imagery employed, conveys the idea of the basic good quality in man which simply has to be discovered and elicited by love. Man is compared to a field that was unproductive. Through the simple expedient of draining and plowing, it brought forth a fine crop of clover. "Human lives are just like that. Break up the fallow ground—the hard unproductive ground. Give your soul a chance for self-expression. It will surprise you what a harvest you will produce to the glory of God and the blessing of yourself and others" (p. 18). Salvation seems to be a matter of setting loose the dormant powers for good in the human soul. The question of original sin and guilt in the sight of God is not broached at all. And further Christianity is said not to confront us "with a program, but with a Person; not with a body of dogma to be received, but with a life to be lived; not with a creed, but with the inescapable Christ" (p. 19). But this is a false antithesis, as Dr. Bonnell very well knows. Christ did actually confront his disciples with the question of creed concerning himself: "Who do ye say that I am?" In my humble opinion, the great pastor of New York's Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church is actually doing the same thing that the modernists have been doing for years—viz., setting up Jesus as an example for victorious living without being willing first of all to demand what the Gospel makes the *conditio sine qua non* of discipleship—to believe on Him as the Saviour from sin.

To mention but one more point in which I am forced to disagree with the author in his interpretation of Scriptural data. Concerning the conversion of Paul it is said: "Deep within him a voice was sounding: 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?'" Whereas according to Luke's narrative the light is said to be coming from heaven and Jesus spoke from heaven, what reason is there to subjectivize this objective revelation?

In spite of such serious defects from the point of view of exegetical procedure and doctrinal precision this book of sermons ought to be read by the Reformed minister in order to show him how to relate the Word of God to the needs of man in the atomic age.

HENRY R. VAN TIL.

THE ROMAN OCTOPUS

THE VATICAN IN WORLD POLITICS. By Avro Manhattan. New York: Gaer Associates, 1949. 444 pages. \$3.75.

"IT is impossible to deny that the polity of the Church of Rome is the very masterpiece of human wisdom. In truth, nothing but such a polity could, against such assaults, have borne up such doctrines. The experience of twelve hundred eventful years, the ingenuity and patient care of forty generations of statesmen have improved that polity to such perfection that among the contrivances which have been devised for controlling mankind, it occupies the highest place." With this quotation from Macaulay, Mr. Manhattan introduces us to the devious ways by which the Vatican contrives today, as in the past, to control mankind not merely by the spiritual power of the Word and the Sacraments but especially by its machinations and political intrigues.

The author's real service does not consist in apprising us of a fact which was heretofore unknown to most of us, but he simply furnished the data from contemporary history to prove that the Vatican has not changed its ways one iota from the days of Hildebrand and Innocent III. After indicating something of the inner workings of the Roman Catholic church as a world power, Mr. Manhattan sketches the intrigues of the Vatican before, during, and after the second world war. The presentation is factual and scientific. The author is not opinionated but presents the evidence in a calm, dispassionate tone. There is a truly representative collection of documentary evidence and the author has had access to the records of the Nuremberg trial.

It is my settled conviction that every citizen of a democracy ought to read this book. It is doubly imperative for men of Reformed persuasion, who see the evil of an ecclesiastical totalitarianism as at least as disastrous as the political counterpart. However, this book is marred by the easy assumption that Communism must be associated with liberalism and that the latter is the truth that will set men free. As Calvinists we can agree with Monsignor Sheen that the world needs a return to authority to escape anarchy. Protestantism is not a denial of authority but a return to the authority of the Infallible Word.

HENRY R. VAN TIL.

TWO WORKS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT

THE PROPHECY OF DANIEL, A COMMENTARY, by Edward J. Young, Ph.D., Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949. Pp. 330. \$4.50.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT, by Edward J. Young, Ph.D. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949. Pp. 414. \$5.00.

THE appearance of two important and scholarly volumes in the Old Testament field in the same year and by the same author is a noteworthy achievement. It is to be noted, however, that their almost simultaneous appearance is more or less accidental. Dr. Young tells us regarding the *Introduction* that it represents the "outgrowth of a series of forty articles on Old Testament Introduction which appeared during 1947-1948 in *The Southern Presbyterian Journal*"; and the reviewer understands that the *Daniel* was completed before the *Introduction* was prepared. We mention this merely to guard against the possible inference that Dr. Young has rushed into print and given us two volumes which were hastily thrown together. The reader will not have to read far in either volume

to arrive at the conclusion that they are the product of years of careful and painstaking study and research. They show that Dr. Young has great capacity for scholarly work; and the fact that he is still a comparatively young man leads us to look forward confidently to other and even more notable products from his facile pen.

Since the *Introduction* is broader in its scope than the *Daniel*, it may be well to discuss it first. In view of the vast field covered by the word "introduction" as it is now used by Biblical scholars, it is to be noted that Dr. Young has felt obliged to restrict himself in this volume "to the consideration of those aspects of Special Introduction which are most fundamental to the subject. It is, therefore, the literary characteristics of the books that are emphasized in these pages." This means that Canon and Text are only dealt with incidentally in this volume.

The discussion follows the order of the O. T. books as they appear in the Hebrew Bible. But Hebrew words and phrases are transliterated, for the benefit of the general reader. After an introductory chapter of 20 pages the available space is about equally divided between the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa. In each of these three Parts, the discussion proceeds book by book; the various theories as to date and authorship are first considered and then an analysis (usually relatively brief) of the contents of the book are given. In the case of the Pentateuch, a special chapter is devoted to the "Literary Criticism of the Pentateuch." At the end of the chapters or sections Special Bibliographies are added, which include books and articles, a sizeable proportion of which are in foreign languages, chiefly German, Dutch, and French. It is quite obvious both that Dr. Young has a very wide acquaintance with the literature produced by the various schools of opinion and that it is his aim to make them, as far as possible, available to his readers. To what extent the majority of his readers will make use of this feature which is so valuable to the scholar is another question.

In his Preface, Dr. Young remarks, "... I am impressed with the monotonous sameness of the case against the Bible. The arguments which Eichhorn, De Wette, Bertholdt, von Lengerke and others raised long ago are just about the same as those which appear in the most recent Introductions. This fact, for fact it is, has strengthened me in the conviction that the so-called modern school of criticism is based upon certain philosophical presuppositions which from the Christian point of view are negative in character and reveal an utterly inadequate conception of God and revelation." With this statement we heartily agree. It raises the question whether in the next edition of his book, it might not be well if Dr. Young were to devote somewhat less space to the negative side, the discussion of critical theories, and more to the positive, the evidence for the unity, harmony, and trustworthiness of the O. T. itself. Thus, according to the Index, there are more references to the recent Critical Introduction by R. H. Pfeiffer, than to Hengstenberg, Keil, W. H. Green, R. D. Wilson and W. Moeller, taken together. In some cases it would be helpful to the reader, if instead of merely listing certain books or articles as conservative in the Bibliographies, he had stated briefly the position taken by the writers. For example, instead of simply referring to Wilson's articles on "The Headings of the Psalms", he might have quoted the concluding sentence of Wilson's long discussion: "As far as the objective evidence goes the headings of the Psalms are presumptively correct."

In general the reviewer finds himself in hearty agreement with the positions taken by the author. It is refreshing to read a vigorous and scholarly defense of, for example, the early date of Deuteronomy, the unity of Isaiah, the historicity of Jonah. Only very rarely would he enter a word of caution or of dissent. For example, since Dr. Young does not hesitate to declare that Jonah was the author of the book that bears his name and since he feels that there is "no sufficient reason" for denying to Solomon the authorship of the Song of Songs, it is rather surprising to find that he is so definitely opposed to

accepting Solomon as the author of Ecclesiastes. The linguistic problems of Jonah and Ecclesiastes are in some respects quite similar. If "was" may mean "was and is" in the description of Nineveh as "a great city", as it undoubtedly can, why may it not mean "was and am" in describing the royal author of Ecclesiastes? Dr. Wilson after careful study of the linguistic problems reached the conclusion "that Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs and most of the book of Proverbs may, for all we know, have been written by Solomon." Such a statement as the following seems inconsistent with Dr. Young's consistently conservative position: "The word Qoheleth also indicates the author of the book. But who is the author? In 1:1 he speaks of himself as the son of David, words which without doubt refer to Solomon." From this we would naturally infer that Dr. Young is prepared to accept the Solomonic authorship. But he goes on at once to say, "However, one need not conclude from this that the author intends to identify himself with Solomon." These statements seem contradictory. Qoheleth is Solomon; Qoheleth in the author of Ecclesiastes; but Solomon did not write Ecclesiastes. This is equivalent to saying that the Solomonic authorship is "a literary disguise" (Driver); and it is the same line of argument which the critics use to avoid admitting the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. We are, of course, aware that quite conservative scholars take the same position regarding Ecclesiastes as does Dr. Young. Nevertheless, it seems to us a dangerous as well as an unnecessary position for so staunch a Conservative as Dr. Young. This, as we have said, is one of the few points we have noted at which we would take exception to Dr. Young's excellent treatment of the difficult and highly important subject of Old Testament Introduction.

The *Commentary on Daniel* differs in an important respect from the *Introduction*. In the *Introduction* Dr. Young is engaged in presenting and defending the traditional view of the Old Testament against the assaults made upon it by the Critics. He has not, as he tells us, "devoted much attention to the question of interpretation" except in the case of such books as Job and the Song of Solomon. In the *Daniel* Dr. Young is concerned with both introduction and interpretation, more especially the latter. Consequently in this volume, he is waging a battle on two fronts, against the Higher Critics on the one side and the Dispensationalists on the other. Against the Critics, he holds that the Jewish and Christian tradition is correct that "Daniel, living at the royal court in Babylon, composed his book during the sixth century B. C." Since Dispensationalists are in hearty agreement with this position, Dispensationalism is not mentioned in the chapter on Daniel in the *Introduction*. And were it not for the listing of several books in the special bibliography at the end of the chapter on Daniel, readers of the *Introduction* might form the erroneous impression that Dr. Young was blissfully or lamentably ignorant that such an interpretation of Scripture existed. But if so, the first page of the preface to the *Commentary* will correct this impression. For there Dr. Young speaks of Dispensationalism as follows: "Another interpretation (he has just mentioned the so-called 'critical') which is widely held today, although maintaining the genuineness of the book, nevertheless interprets the prophecies in an extremely unwarranted manner by referring the fulfillment of many of them to an alleged period of seven years which is supposed to follow the second advent of the Lord." This makes it abundantly clear that in the *Commentary* which is largely concerned with interpretation Dr. Young feels himself regretfully obliged to take issue with a system of interpretation which is held by men whose attitude toward the authority and integrity of Holy Scripture is the same as his own.

In the *Commentary*, as in the *Introduction*, Dr. Young has shown his very wide acquaintance with the history of opinion. He has sought to state fairly and to meet squarely the objections to the conservative or traditional position. He holds firmly that redemptive Supernaturalism is the very heart and core of the Bible. In view of the date he assigns to the Book of Daniel, it goes without saying that he is a thorough believer in predic-

tive prophecy. He makes no apology for miracle and prophecy, but accepts and rejoices in them as evidencing the divine origin and authority of the Bible. With regard to the prophecies, his position may be described in general as the "traditional" one. Thus he believes that the "king of fierce countenance" (8:23) is Antiochus Epiphanes and that the 2300 evening-mornings are 2300 "days" (AV). But he rejects as unwarranted the attempt of the Dispensationalists to discover in this chapter "the Assyrian" or "king of the North", an eschatological figure who is yet to arise. In the case of the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks he accepts the Messianic interpretation which finds in vss. 26f. a prophecy of the Crucifixion and the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. But he rejects as unwarranted the claim that the Church age is an invisible parenthesis to be discovered between vss. 26 and 27, and that the one who "makes firm" the covenant (vs. 27) is not the Messiah but the Antichrist. As to the date of the commencement of the 70 weeks, he holds that they began with the edict of Cyrus, and that the first "seven sevens" cover the period from Cyrus to Nehemiah. Since this represents a period of nearly a century, he is forced to take the position that they are not 49 literal years but that the figure is symbolic.

Other examples might well be given. But these must suffice. Dr. Young has made careful use of the available archaeological evidence, and has discussed such questions as the fourth year of Jehoiakim, the Chaldeans, the use of Aramaic in 2:4b-7:28, and many other important critical questions.

These books by Professor Young are particularly timely, because they serve admirably to refute the claim of the Critics that all reputable scholarship accepts their conclusions. The adoption of the results of an at times quite radical Criticism in the "New Curriculum" which was recently put into operation by the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., was justified and defended by the editor-in-chief on the ground that a "directive" had been given it by the General Assembly, to "bring the study of Biblical materials abreast of the best scholarship in the field of the Old Testament and the New Testament," the tacit assumption being of course that the *best scholarship* must be *critical scholarship*. Dr. Young makes it abundantly plain that the issue is not between good and bad, intelligent and obscurantist, scientific and unscientific scholarship. It is between a believing scholarship and a sceptical and rationalistic scholarship. And those who have been wishing for a careful, scholarly presentation and defense of the Biblical view regarding the Old Testament and that storm-center in it, the Book of Daniel, will derive much satisfaction, edification, and encouragement from the appearance of these two admirable volumes.

OSWALD T. ALLIS.

MID-CENTURY RELIGIOUS ART

IN OUR IMAGE. *Character Studies from the Old Testament, selected from the King James Version by Houston Harte; Thirty-two Color Paintings by Guy Rowe; Foreword by Kent Cooper.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1949. 197 pages. \$10.00.

BIBLE-READING and Bible-believing Christians will welcome any serious attempts to lure our spiritually sluggish, nominally Christian nation into the reading of the Word. The editor of *In Our Image*, Houston Harte, with the aid of an extremely talented artist, and with the advice of several outstanding Protestant clergymen, has succeeded in making a beautiful volume to entice our generation into Bible reading. The one hundred ninety-seven large pages (12" x 9") of text dealing mainly with twenty-five characters are taken entirely from the King James Version of the Bible. Reproductions in color of thirty-two full page portraits of Old Testament heroes are the creations of former *Time* cover artist, Guy Rowe.

It is comforting, in this age in which the cynic and the skeptic dominate the world of art and books, to see an out-

standing publishing house prepare a costly book to propagandize the Biblical teaching that man's distinguishing characteristic is not the bestial but the divine. "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion . . .".

This reviewer feels that the selected Scripture passages plus the gifted hand of the artist have combined admirably to emphasize that nobility of character springs from one's relationship to God. In this book the hero is the "man of God," and human greatness is thought of in terms of faithfulness and devotion to man's Creator and Redeemer.

The work of an editor of an anthology is necessarily that of making a large number of omissions. It is hardly fair, therefore, to criticize Messrs. Harte and Rowe and their advisers for not giving full length portraits of, let us say, Rahab or Hezekiah. It is proper, however, to call attention to an omission which alters seriously the quality of a principal character. The scriptural material on Balaam, and, quite obviously, the painting too, ignore those references to Balaam that make this son of Beor such an enigma. He is presented only as a great hero of faith who refuses to prophesy otherwise than according to Jehovah's dictates. Not an inkling is given, however, of Balaam's evil counsel to the Midianitish women (Numbers 31:16) whereby the Israelites were lured into sin.

Another element in the book that does not always satisfy the reader is Mr. Harte's commentary on each of Mr. Rowe's paintings. Although it consists of only a sentence or two, it is often unnecessary and sometimes misleading. Below the picture of the temptation of Adam, Mr. Harte writes: "Eve is more confused than evil-intentioned." Mr. Harte's comment is pure apocrypha. Neither the Bible nor Mr. Rowe's painting substantiates his speculation on Eve's feelings as she shows Adam the forbidden fruit. Then there is the comment on the Abraham painting. It would seem obvious that Mr. Rowe were picturing Abraham interceding for Lot and his family; yet Mr. Harte comments only on Abraham's faith as the outstanding quality of his character. Elsewhere, however, Mr. Harte's commentary is useful especially in explaining the artist's symbolical background figures.

As for the work of artist, Guy Rowe, the least that can be said is that his portraits represent a sincere, modern attempt to visualize Old Testament heroes as being relevant to men of the mid-twentieth century. In the main his portraits are convincing and highly interesting. They are done in the bold manner of *Time* cover pictures, with highly accentuated realism of facial features and with background symbols suggesting chief elements in the personal history of the subject. Sometimes there is a tendency to exaggerate the dramatic. The picture of the handsome boy Joseph with his coat of many colors is set against the background of the heads of his snarling, completely vicious brothers. The brothers, being background material in this painting, should, it would seem, have the case against them suggested by understatement rather than by such direct accusation. The unity of the picture, moreover, is hereby endangered. In the representation of old Isaac giving his blessing to Jacob the observer might wish to find some trace of suspicion on father Isaac's face.

In the Christmas number of *Life* magazine, we were regaled with luxurious color photos of Michael Angelo's frescoes in the Sistine Chapel. Certainly, Mr. Harte's preface notwithstanding, the truly great among the renaissance artists still overwhelm us today. We appreciate Guy Rowe's masterful presentation of character in his Old Testament portraits, but let nobody deprecate the apocalyptic magnitude of Michael Angelo's conception and the vastness of his technical powers! For Michael Angelo the Old Testament narrative had cosmic significance which we must not expect our contemporaries to express. Let us be happy, nevertheless, that one of the artists of our day has at least found moral and religious significance in these Old Testament characters.

Those who love beautiful books will welcome this volume heartily. A book as this, if readily accessible in the living room of a Christian home, should provide many pleasurable and edifying periods of relaxation for young and old.

CLARENCE BOERSMA.

Calvin College.

A CHRISTOLOGY OF EXPERIENCE

THE MEANING OF CHRIST FOR PAUL. By Elias Andrews. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949. 266 pages. \$3.00.

AMONG the most significant questions of perennial interest in the field of theology is that of the relation of Paul to Christ. What did he think about the Lord Jesus Christ whom he preached so vigorously? From where did he receive his gospel? Did he remain true to the simple story artlessly told by the first disciples after the experience of Pentecost? These are some of the matters discussed by Prof. Andrews in this book.

The subject material of this book has been the focal point of much vigorous and heated debate throughout the past century. Today we find a radical change from previous years when Paul was too easily accused of being an innovator and a perverter of pure Christianity.

Dr. Andrews has presented us with a thoroughly scholarly and very detailed book on the subject, highly worth reading because of the careful and reverent way in which the material is treated. The author contends that Paul's theology of the Christ rooted in his Christ-experience. "Paul is in essential continuity with the christological thought which preceded him. He did not originate the conception of Christ set forth in his epistles. And yet he brought to his thought his own distinctive personality which had been transformed, enriched, and greatly inspired under the impact of his Christian experience." (p. 242.) As a result Paul "becomes the prototype of all who would in any adequate fashion attempt an interpretation of the person of Christ." Further, his experience "enabled him to meet the challenge of every situation" that arose in the churches which questioned the supremacy of Christ. And finally the apostle "secured once and for all time the essence and universality of Christianity."

Much in this book is worthy of careful attention by all students of the New Testament. Dr. Andrews has given prominence to an aspect of the life and work of Paul which is apt to be too much forgotten at times. Many of the contentions of the book are carefully and logically presented. It is markedly free from the one-sidedness which has often characterized similar studies.

And yet it should be stated that the view of the author is out of harmony with the best in the tradition of historic Christianity. The author, although stating his positions carefully and mildly, nevertheless rejects the Pauline authorship of Ephesians and several other Pauline epistles. Basically the book suffers because of the author's inadequate view of special revelation. Though we would be unwilling to deny that Paul's experience mediated the knowledge which he had of the Christ, we are convinced that here no real justice has been done to the uniqueness of the revelation which Paul received from God and delivered with apostolic authority to the churches. Herein alone lies the vindication of Paul's gospel. He received it not from men but from God and therefore "se-

cured once and for all time the essence and universality of Christianity."

PETER Y. DE JONG.

Grand Rapids.

PURITAN-ANGLICAN CONTROVERSY

THE ADMONITION CONTROVERSY, by Donald Joseph McGinn. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1949. pp. X + 589.

THIS volume, number five of the Rutgers Studies in English, sets forth, with incessant quotation of the sources, the story of the controversy that raged in Elizabethan England between Episcopalianism and nascent Puritanism. Theological controversy is seldom carried on with the calmness the subject deserves; and the Admonition Controversy was not an exception. Whether one's sympathies lie with the spokesman for the Puritans, Cartwright, or with the man who opposed them, Whitgift, there is enough in the record that we could wish had been written in less strident idiom.

Nor has the author of the present volume kept himself wholly free from the acrimony that ought by now to be out of vogue especially among "liberal" writers. McGinn is annoyed by almost everything Cartwright wrote; he is equally irked by a passage from Cartwright reproduced on page 131. He sees in it an opportunity to make the Puritans guilty, among all their other faults heaped upon them in our day, of thirst for blood. The passage takes up the question asked by Whitgift: "What then shall become of the papists and atheists, if you will not have them be members of the church?" Cartwright avers that the magistrate should take such people in hand "until such time as they declare manifest tokens of unrepentantness; and then as rotten members that do not only no good nor service in the body, but also corrupt and infect others, cut them off." And these last three words (McGinn has italicized them) are taken to mean that Cartwright clamored for "the death penalty for all who do not believe in Presbyterianism." McGinn calls this passage "an outline for an Elizabethan concentration camp" and there is glee in his words as he pens them.

But it seems to the present reviewer that he is not necessarily entitled to his mirth. The expression "to cut them off" stands in Presbyterian parlance for excommunication, as every one knows. And exactly what Cartwright meant is not easy to say. His style is quite vehement at times. Moreover it is quite possible that by this "cut him off" he meant an act of excommunication done by the magistrate subsequent to the expulsion by the Church; it must be remembered that some Presbyterian writers spoke of a double rule-right in the Church, and it would not be surprising if Cartwright was thinking of a double excommunicatory procedure. This interpretation would make the passage wholly innocent of the thing McGinn thinks to read there. And it becomes the more plausible when we see that the alternative of to "cut them off" in case they do profit in hearing is "to adjoin them unto the church which is next the place of their dwelling"—likewise by civil action we take it.

At any rate, we shall have to have more than a single passage and it is by no means open to but one interpretation, before we are ready to go along as our author adds to the ever lengthening list of Puritan vices that of "bloodthirst!"

L. VERDUIN.

Ann Arbor.

