

# THE CALVIN FORUM

A MONTHLY

Abraham Kuyper Centenary  
1837--Oct. 29--1937

Kuyper: Christian Statesman  
Genius--By God's Grace

The Ant and God  
Musings

The Anti-Revolutionary Party  
Kuyper in Action

Church and State  
An Insoluble Problem?

Integration in Antiquity  
Pagan and Christian

Calvinism vs. Collectivism  
A Discussion

Book Reviews

Poetry

# The CALVIN FORUM

## PUBLISHED BY THE CALVIN FORUM BOARD OF PUBLICATION:

PROF. LOUIS BERKHOF, B.D., PROF. CLARENCE BOUMA, A.M., Th.D., PROF. ALBERT E. BROENE, A.B., PROF. JOHANNES BROENE, A.M., PROF. HARRY G. DEKKER, M.S., LAMBERT J. FLOKSTRA, A.M., PROF. PETER HOEKSTRA, Ph.D., PROF. WILLIAM HARRY JELEMA, Ph.D., PROF. DIEDRICH H. KROMMINGA, A.B., Th.B., PROF. H. HENRY MEETER, Th.B., EDWIN Y. MONSMA, Ph.D., PROF. JAMES NIEUWDORP, B.S., WILLIAM T. RADIUS, A.M., PROF. ALBERTUS ROOKS, A.M., PROF. HENRY J. RYSKAMP, Ph.D., PROF. HENRY SCHULTZE, A.B., B.D., PROF. RALPH STOB, Ph.D., PROF. SEYMOUR SWETS, A.M., JOHANNA TIMMER, A.M., PROF. HENRY J. VAN ANDEL, A.M., PROF. J. G. VANDEN BOSCH, A.M., PROF. JOHN P. VAN HAITSMA, Ph.D., PROF. HENRY VAN ZYL, Ph.D., PROF. SAMUEL VOLBEDA, Th.D., HARRY J. WASSINK, A.B., B.S., PROF. MARTIN J. WYNGAARDEN, B.D., Ph.D.

## THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:

DR. CLARENCE BOUMA (Managing Editor), DR. HENRY J. RYSKAMP, PROF. HENRY SCHULTZE, PROF. HENRY J. VAN ANDEL, and PROF. J. G. VANDEN BOSCH.

---

## CONTENTS—Vol. III. No. 3, OCTOBER, 1937

### EDITORIALS

The Centenary of Abraham Kuyper's Birth.....	51
Honoring the Memory of Kuyper.....	51
America Knows Only One Flag.....	52
Can Nothing Be Done?.....	52

### ARTICLES

Abraham Kuyper, Christian Statesman. By Edward J. Tanis, A. M.....	53
Go to the Ant. By M. M. S.....	56
The Political Party of Abraham Kuyper. By Leroy Vogel, Ph. D.....	58
The Relation Between Church and State. By D. H. Kromminga, Th. B.....	61
Lack of Integration in the Past. By Henry Van Zyl, Ph. D.....	63
Calvinism and the Economic Order: A Discussion.....	66

### BOOK REVIEWS

Worship—Mystical or Reformed?.....	69
The Problem of Prayer.....	70
On God's Eternal Election.....	70
Foster on E. A. Park.....	71
Dutch Church History.....	72
Believing the Bible.....	72
Cow-ology and So Forth.....	72

### VERSE

Thy God Is Able.....	56
Abraham Kuyper.....	57
Jesus of America.....	60
Summer Shower.....	65
Summer Night.....	65

---

THE CALVIN FORUM is published monthly. Subscription Price: Two Dollars per year. Address all editorial as well as business correspondence to: THE CALVIN FORUM, Franklin Street and Benjamin Avenue, S. E., Grand Rapids, Michigan.

---

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

LIBRARY  
OF  
Calvin College  
& Seminary

VOLUME III

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., OCTOBER, 1937

NUMBER 3

## EDITORIALS

### The Centenary of Abraham Kuyper's Birth

OCTOBER 29, 1837, is the birth date of that greatest and most versatile of all modern Calvinists, Abraham Kuyper. There is a peculiar propriety in our devoting this and some of the succeeding issues of THE CALVIN FORUM at least in part to the memory of this Christian statesman and Calvinistic theologian. Every living group that believes in Calvinism, not merely as a theological system but as an all-inclusive world and life view with definite implications and applications in the realm of education and scholarship, statecraft and politics, business and industry, looks to Abraham Kuyper as the embodiment of great whole-souled and God-consecrated leadership. He was a giant. His versatility was phenomenal. He was a stylist and journalist of the highest order. He was a church reformer of massive proportions. He was a preacher and public speaker of unexcelled power. He was a theologian and scholar worthy to be mentioned in one breath with St. Augustine and John Calvin. He was a leader of men and an organizer of inexhaustible resourcefulness and indomitable perseverance. He was a statesman of greater stature than any of his Dutch contemporaries. He started a weekly and a daily and edited both for decades. He founded a university, the only consistently Calvinistic university in the world. He served as prime minister and as a member of both houses of the Dutch parliament. He virtually created the Anti-revolutionary party and remained its inspiring head until his cloak fell upon his spiritual son, Hendrikus Colijn, the present premier of Holland, known for his statesmanship throughout Europe. He edited Latin theological treatises of the old Reformed writers; he wrote massive works in the fields of Dogmatics, Apologetics, and Ethics; and he wrought the most tender, the most touching, the most brilliant Scripture meditations that have ever flowed from any pen. None of these superlatives are inspired by excessive admiration: they are statements of sober fact. As we pause to honor his memory on the centenary of his birth this month, there is neither need nor room for laudation. Laudation of such a man would be cheapening the occasion. We enumerate his achievements and wonderful endowments only to remind ourselves what this great-souled master did not for himself but for *his* Master, whose he was and whom he served. For that is the challenging thing

about this giant among men: he lived passionately with all the energy that was in him for his Lord and King. It was all *Pro Rege*, as the title of one of his three-volume works has it. He moved in realm after realm as a master—only to dedicate all of them to *his* Master, the Christ. He was a one-holy-passion Christian *par excellence!* Averse to all narrowness on the one hand, having an outlook that tolerated no exclusion of any sphere of human endeavor from the range of his interest, he was on the other a fearless proponent of the absolute antithesis between the people of God and those of the world. One does not know which to appreciate most in the man: his masterful exposition and application of the doctrine of common grace, or his consummate reaffirmation, in religious thought as well as in ethical practice, of the absolute antithesis between those who serve God and those who are of the world. Precisely in this twofold emphasis, both in theology and in the practical Christian life of the people whose lives he touched and molded, must be seen the greatness and the lasting significance of this man of God for the coming generations.

C. B.

### Honoring the Memory of Kuyper

HOW shall we honor the memory of this peerless Christian leader? Not by slavishly following him, nor by indulging in uncritical adulation. But we shall honor him most by unfurling the banner of truth and Christian duty which he unfurled. Kuyper was a man of such stature that his leadership among Calvinists of the modern day will not be antiquated for many years. Indeed, we must push on from his day and generation and face the problems and situations of a new day. But it is well to remember that no Calvinist will be pushing forward on the royal highway of genuine progress who begins by undermining what this giant among Calvinists has by the grace of God accomplished. No ridicule on the part of the world or of a modernistic church should keep us from affirming and reaffirming with solemn emphasis the awful but glorious truth of the absolute antithesis for theology and life which was carved so deeply into the thought and influence of Kuyper. And let no resurgence of the old separatistic exclusivism, from which Kuyper delivered us, however pietistic its appearance, rob us of the deeper insights

and perspectives for both thought and life which his exposition and application of the doctrine of common grace has given to the Reformed theology. Let us follow him in preaching the glorious truth of the *Soli-Deo-Gloria* gospel of sovereign grace for a sin-sick and lost world. Let us be as determined as he in the great struggle that is still facing the American Church of our day, the struggle against the perversion of the biblical, God-centered, and Christ-honoring gospel of redemption into a man-centered, Christ-dishonoring "gospel" of human uplift. And let us be as determined to make our Christianity vocal in every realm of life. Kuyper had no use for a Sunday Christianity. Inspired by the truth that a Christian is a man who belongs to Christ body and soul and must consider himself called to crown Christ King of his life in every contact that he makes and in every sphere of influence, Kuyper—the same man who preached so powerfully that the Christian is not of the world—taught the Calvinists of his day by a practical and concrete object lesson what it means that the Christian should claim the whole world for Christ. If at times we are in danger of forgetting this truth, let Kuyper's writings and living influence serve to remind us that our Christian testimony and influence must reach into every nook and corner of life and that no sphere of human endeavor is excluded from it. We need positively Christian homes, schools, and churches, and a positively Christian influence and organized activity in political, social, and industrial life. Christ is satisfied with nothing less than being King in the whole of our lives.

C. B.

## America Knows Only One Flag

IT may be questioned whether there is a second country in the world that has been so easy and indulgent toward foreign influxes as has our own. We have thrown our doors wide open in earlier decades to the immigrant from every conceivable European country. It has been our boast that ours is the country of opportunity for anyone that desires to cast in his lot with us. All this is well. But this easy-going attitude toward the foreigner is also largely responsible for certain conditions that should not have been tolerated. It should not have been possible for men to sojourn for years and decades in our land, economically living off its prosperity and enjoying its plenty, without showing the least concern about their moral responsibility toward this country of their virtual adoption. Masses of foreigners have congregated in our large cities only to remain utterly unassimilated and uninfluenced by American ideals and institutions. This easy-going hospitality of the American people is also largely responsible for the emergence of societies whose chief aim is the cultivation of loyalty to a foreign nation. Organizations inspired by propagandists from the country whose leader adopts the motto, "Once a German always a German," cannot be tolerated in this country. It was a perfectly harmless

procedure when, as in many cases heretofore, groups of American citizens of foreign antecedents displayed in their meetings and parades alongside of the Stars and Stripes the flag of the country from which they came. It meant nothing but respect for the country from which they hailed. Such respect did not conflict with the loyalty which the overwhelming majority of these foreign-born Americans had sworn to the American flag. But the matter is quite different in the case of some of the "patriotic" societies that have of late sprung up among certain foreign American groups. Outstanding among these are the German-American Nazi groups. It is no fault of our people and its flag that the Swastika and the Stars and Stripes cannot stand side by side. In the case of these societies, it is time that the American government speak out clearly and unequivocally. There is no room for any flag except the Stars and Stripes in this country. If people seek the advantages and protection of our Constitution and our government, they cannot at the same time swear virtual fealty to a foreign government. This is the more serious when the head of that foreign government does not hesitate to tell the world that once a German is always a German. If American citizens of German extraction subscribe to that doctrine, they should be honorable men and return to Germany. There is no room for the Hitlerite goose-step in this country. There is no room for people of divided national loyalties in these days of intense propaganda for an exclusive totalitarian state. And what is here stated of those who are of German extraction holds with equal force of everyone who dwells with divided national loyalty within our borders. It is time America look to its fences. America knows only one flag.

C. B.

## Can Nothing Be Done?

INDIGNATION and despair must be jostling together in the breast of every American Christian who reads the accounts of the Sino-Japanese war. Who can help being indignant? Has it come to such a pass that after all our discussions as among so-called civilized nations on the ethics of internationalism, of war and peace, we have now fallen to the level where strong nations just begin the murder and butchery that is war without so much as declaring it? Can international hypocrisy go farther than this way of avoiding the technical responsibility for having started the war? And have we shaken out even the last vestiges of civilization and international decency when a country like Japan can with impunity direct its ruthless aerial bombardment against groups that can by no stretch of the imagination be called anything except innocent non-combatants? What fiendish delight must these Japanese warlords derive from the knowledge that they have "intimidated" their enemy by leaving bloody torsos of innocent women and children in the streets of Chinese cities far removed from the scene of military operations! One asks in despair, Can nothing be done to stop this?

C. B.

# ABRAHAM KUYPER, CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Edward J. Tanis, A. M.

Minister Second Englewood Christian Reformed Church, Chicago.  
Author of "Calvinism and Social Problems."

DR. ABRAHAM KUYPER, the great Dutch Calvinist, born one hundred years ago this month, was one of the few men that can really be called a genius. And he was a marvelously well-balanced genius. There was nothing abnormal or erratic about this colossus. He combined a most brilliant intellect with an iron will, and an intense interest in practical affairs. He could produce profound theological tomes, deliver a speech in parliament that would confound the opposition, write a comforting spiritual meditation which the humblest soul would enjoy, and enter his class room in the Free University to delight his students with a lecture which was worthy of the best scholar in the land. Kuyper was a great pulpit orator, astute political leader, successful journalist, and university builder, all in one, and all that he did was illumined by the brilliance of his genius.

He was born in 1837, received his doctor's degree in theology at a very early age in the University of Leyden, was in full accord with its modernism and began his career as a modernist preacher. But in his first congregation he made the acquaintance of some real Calvinists and found a life and world view that satisfied his mind and heart, and from that hour until the end of his long career he was a powerful witness for the living Christ, the eternal Son of God, whom he proclaimed as the King of kings. One of his favorite mottoes was *Pro Rege*, "For the King," and he wrote a three volume work under that title, presenting the just claims of Christ to leadership in every sphere of life. Unceasingly and most eloquently he pleaded for the recognition of the Kingship of Jesus in education and politics as well as in the Church. Hence his whole-hearted acceptance and tireless propagation of the Calvinistic philosophy of life.

## Calvinism—Philosophy of Life

Dr. Albert Schweitzer laments the fact that our modern world has no philosophy which can adequately meet its needs, and to this lack he attributes the collapse of our civilization. In his *The Decay and the Restoration of Civilization*, this keen interpreter of modern life speaks of "the collapse of civilization," and one of the factors contributing to this collapse, he says, is the failure of philosophy to provide us with basic and universally accepted principles. Now the great Kuyper found just such a philosophy in the Calvinism of his fathers. And whereas Schweitzer would have us take our starting-point once more in the Rationalism of the 18th century, Kuyper claimed that precisely Rationalism was responsible for the moral and religious breakdown in Europe in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Kuyper knew all the philosophy of the age. He knew Kant, Hegel, and Schleiermacher, with their respective emphasis on the will or the intellect

or the feelings, but he also knew that whatever truth there might be in these respective philosophies, they did not deal adequately with man's deepest need. Kuyper knew from his own experience that man's real trouble is sin, and his greatest need is grace. Objectively he needs a divine revelation, and subjectively he needs regeneration, and both are gifts of God.

Hence he began his theological labors in *De Heraut* ("The Herald," founded by Kuyper as a religious and theological weekly) with a series of articles on the *Saving Grace of God*. In the Introduction to his three volume work on *De Gemeene Gratie* (Common Grace) he reminds us of this fact, and wants us to remember that by *Common Grace* he does not mean that *saving grace is common*. The fact is that it is *uncommon*, particular, the gift of God to the elect soul. Man is saved by grace, the unmerited grace of God, and unless he is saved by God he cannot solve his own personal problems nor the problems of the world, which at bottom are always ethical problems. We shall never get rid of poverty and crime and war as long as we continue to despise the grace of God. Hence from now on Kuyper devoted himself to the preaching of the grace of God, engaging in the titanic struggle to displace the rationalistic theology with the Calvinistic theology of the fathers, which inevitably involved him in a conflict with the modernists in the State Church of Amsterdam, where he was now a minister. Kuyper and his colleagues in the State Church, and thousands of loyal followers, now organized what were known as "*Doleerende Kerken*," which churches united with most of the Christian Reformed Churches in 1892 under the name *Gereformeerde Kerken van Nederland* (Reformed Churches of the Netherlands).

## Kuyper, the Journalist

Kuyper's work in *De Heraut* belongs in the field of his theological labor. Equally significant was his establishment of *De Standaard* in 1872, a Christian daily, which is still read by Christian people all over the Netherlands, and in which Kuyper gave the Christian people of Holland an education in Christian politics. It is true that the scholarly Christian gentleman Groen Van Prinsterer, the talented historian, had been active for many years before Kuyper as a Christian statesman, but he was a "general without an army." It was not until Kuyper started *De Standaard* and reached the common people every day with his brilliant and popular discussions of the current problems of the Netherlands, that the Christians were given a training which prepared them for participation in the practical political life of the Netherlands. This does not mean that the majority were Christians. But there was still a large group in 1870 that was faithful to the faith of the fathers, and Kuyper knew how to reach and move that group.

He had a brilliant journalistic style and the common people read him gladly. He was master of the Dutch language and knew how to use it most effectively. He could make his readers see what he wanted them to see, and to feel what he himself felt so profoundly. One can turn to the articles Kuyper wrote sixty years ago and still be delighted with the crisp and scintillating style and enjoy his keen insight. His knowledge of history, of the modern world and of present day problems was simply amazing. If Kuyper had never done anything else than edit *De Standaard* he would have had a great career.

And the thing that was so marvelous is that Kuyper could discuss every problem *from a Christian point of view*. That does not mean that he wrote like a preacher and that his editorials were homilies. Of course not. They were real editorials, newspaper articles, and could stand comparison with the best that might appear in the *London Times* or the *New York Times*. But everything that he wrote was written from the standpoint of his own definite and crystalline conception of life and of the world. In spite of his being born and educated in the Victorian era with its shallow and optimistic outlook upon life, he predicted the coming of a European war, and also the colossal conflict in the Far East. Carnegie's Peace Palace in the Hague never left him with any illusions. He saw that human society was rotten at the core, that European diplomacy was thoroughly corrupt, that the imperialism of England and France and Germany was undermining European civilization. And from day to day and year to year Dr. Kuyper gave his readers the vast benefit of his wide knowledge and keen insight. Such a newspaper, standing in the flux of time with a *timeless* approach to all that is timely, was a new thing in journalism.

### Political Achievements

If the enemies of Groen Van Prinsterer referred to him as a "general without an army," they never had occasion to repeat the taunt when the eloquent and indomitable Kuyper became the leader of one of the Christian political groups in the Netherlands, the *Antirevolutionary Party*. The other parties were the *Christelijke Historische*, with most of its adherents in the State Church, and the Roman Catholic party.

The name *Antirevolutionary* was adopted to indicate that this party was opposed to the spirit and principles of the French Revolution and the whole revolutionary movement which had played such a big role in European history ever since 1789. Kuyper himself said that the French revolution was a justly deserved judgment upon the House of Bourbon and other corrupt and despotic institutions in France, but the *revolutionary philosophy* which made man the source of all authority and which had very definitely broken with the concept of a *divine revelation* was poisoning the life of Europe. It was against this philosophy and its application to the family, the school, the state, that Groen Van Prinsterer and kindred spirits protested.

Groen Van Prinsterer was as much of a democrat in his political philosophy as Abraham Lincoln, his American contemporary, but like Abraham Lincoln he did not believe in a *lawless rebellion*. Rebellion against God and his truth, and against all divinely

established institutions, was bound to end in demoralization. The revolutionary philosophy which made marriage a mere contract to be broken at will; which denied the divine source of all authority and made the government the instrument of a democratic majority so that the majority had the right to rule *merely because it was the majority*; which claimed that the state had the right to educate the child according to the views of the majority and outlawed Christian schools; which had made the colleges and universities of the country breeding places of infidelity—this revolutionary philosophy was contributing to the decadence of the Netherlands and of all Europe. Groen Van Prinsterer contended that resistance to this godless movement, not only in the Church but also in the schools of the land and in the affairs of the state, was the solemn duty of all Christians, and therefore he called his movement anti-revolutionary, and laid the political foundation for the achievements of his successor. Years before his death Groen predicted that the talented and forceful Kuyper would be the next leader of the Anti-revolutionary Party. His brilliantly edited *Standaard*, to which we have already referred, and the publication of *Ons Program*, a massive volume in which he applied the Christian philosophy of life to all modern problems, and his incomparable gifts as an orator, all indicated that Kuyper was the one man to carry the standards of his party into the Dutch parliament.

A significant extension of the franchise in 1887 and in 1897 put the ballot into the hands of thousands of Christian working people, so largely represented in Kuyper's party and among his *Standaard* readers. In 1897 the Antirevolutionary Party gained several seats in parliament, and in 1901 the three Christian parties came out of the election with a combined vote which gave them a majority. After this victory for the parties on the right the Queen invited Dr. Abraham Kuyper to organize a cabinet. It was exactly one hundred years after Groen's birth that his brilliant successor became the prime minister of the Netherlands and that the Christian groups were in power.

Of course this did not mean that the majority of the Dutch people had accepted Christianity and really wanted a Christian government, no more than Roosevelt's victory in 1936 proves that all the people that voted for him are Jeffersonian Democrats. What it did prove is that the old Liberal party had lost much of its influence and prestige and that a large element in the nation was insisting upon a recognition of its rights. And it also proved, and that is far more important, that a big element in the nation, even if not in the majority in the full sense of the word, had profited by the immense labors of Kuyper, and that the century-old struggle to make Christianity once more a living force in the life of the nation had not been in vain. The foundations of the Dutch Republic had been laid by Christians and cemented by their blood, and once more there was a Christian group in the nation with so much vitality and vigor that it could make its influence felt in the government and in the highest lawmaking body of the land. That in itself was a great achievement and a sovereign God had used Abraham Kuyper to bring it about.

### The Statesman in Action

The Kuyper cabinet was at the head of the Dutch nation from 1901 to 1905. No doubt some enthusiastic Calvinists expected too much of their great leader and his Christian groups in parliament. If Kuyper had been a dictator of the Mussolini type—a thing impossible in 1901 and in conflict with Kuyper's political philosophy—he would have been able to accomplish much more, but from the day he took hold of the government until the end of his term in 1905 he had to fight for every bit of reform in the face of a bitter, intense and unreasonable opposition. The Liberals were anything but liberal. They had always denounced the Socialists as enemies of the nation, but they did not hesitate to work hand in hand with them to oppose the Kuyper program.

In spite of the opposition, however, much lasting good was achieved. After a bitter parliamentary contest Kuyper secured the passage of a law which gave the graduates of private universities of recognized standing the right to enter the professions without taking another examination at a state institution. Until this right was incorporated in the law no graduate of any institution, no matter how good the institution and irrespective of the qualifications of the graduate, could enter the professions without passing the examinations of a state institution. In other words, Protestants and Roman Catholics had to take *two* final examinations. This was an unfair discrimination against the private institutions of learning and their graduates. The new Kuyper law placed all recognized institutions upon an equal basis.

We must bear in mind that this was not only a victory for the institutions and their graduates, but it was of immense significance for the Christian educational movement. It implied that *Christian education was recognized before the law*. The new Kuyper law dealt a death blow to the hegemony of the state universities and to rationalistic scholarship. If they met the technical requirements of the state for *all* universities, then the new Kuyper law recognized all the universities and their graduates as being on a par. The time had come when Christians could be scholars as well as non-Christians! From now on the law said so!

Another notable achievement of the Kuyper cabinet was the subsidizing of the free Christian Schools, schools maintained by Christian associations in the case of the Calvinists, and by the Church in the case of the Roman Catholics. Kuyper maintained—and in this he was absolutely right—that primarily the parents, and not the state, must provide the children with an education, in order that this education, which is not purely a matter of the impartation of factual knowledge, but which is bound to exercise a formative influence upon the soul of the child, may be in harmony with the deepest convictions of the parents. That means that a neutral state, such as our modern democratic states are supposed to be, cannot provide *Christian* education. Only *Christian* parents, banded together in Christian associations, can provide such education. Kuyper always maintained that only the parents, and neither the State nor the Church, can provide such education. But it is also a fact that a large number of Christian parents belong to that

part of the nation which has a very small income and is unable to maintain their schools without the aid of the state. In other words, why should the State provide free education for the children of unbelievers or of indifferent church members, and at the same time tax the Christian people for these schools? Kuyper secured the passage of a law which also ended this injustice, and the result has proven the wisdom of his action. Today the entire educational system of the Netherlands is on as high a level—or even higher—as anywhere else, and the injustice to the Christian element of the land has been ended.

### Kuyper and Industrial Legislation

It must also be said to the credit of Kuyper that his program included some much needed legislation in behalf of the working classes. Kuyper believed in Christian labor unions and his party gave them whole-hearted support. He condemned the *laissez-faire* liberals who never tried to replace the abandoned labor guilds of the past with good labor organizations. The strikes and other labor troubles, said Kuyper, were largely due to the fact that labor and its rights were ignored by the lawmakers. "Sedert jaren vraagt nu ook ten onzent de Arbeid om regel en recht." Kuyper said in his parliamentary address: "We would rather see that labor would organize itself and regulate its own affairs, but we are not so far as yet" (1901). Hence he tried to secure the passage of labor laws. And a member of Kuyper's own party said, in commenting on Kuyper's labor law: "This is the merit of this new labor legislation that it is an attempt to remove those malpractices of which labor has been the victim."

To say that Dr. Kuyper was not interested in the welfare of the laboring man reveals gross ignorance. His monumental work on the political principles of his party, *Ons Program*, which has been re-edited and made up-to-date by the present Christian prime minister, Dr. Hendrik Colijn, furnishes abundant evidence of Kuyper's interest in social reforms. But we must also remember that 1901 is not 1937, and it is only in very recent years that America has adopted some of the social legislation for which Kuyper pleaded twenty-five years ago.

Kuyper's government passed laws which did away with night work for bakers on the ground that all night work which is not an absolute necessity is inhumane ("wreedheid"). Kuyper said it was healthier for people to eat bread that was baked the day before. And people who insisted on fresh bread should wait till 9 or 10 A. M. They did not need it at 6 A. M. This was good horse sense and it also indicates Kuyper's interest in the laboring man.

Laws were also passed to protect women and children laboring in factories, and in this connection Brummelkamp quotes the English statesman and historian, Macauley, as saying: "I hardly know which is the greater pest to a society, a paternal government, that is to say, a prying, meddling government, which intrudes itself into every part of human life, and which thinks it can do everything for everybody better than everybody can do anything for himself; or a careless, lounging government, which suffers grievances, such as it could at

once remove, to grow and multiply, and which to all complaint and remonstrance has only one answer: 'We must let things alone; we must let things take their course; we must let things find their level.'"

### Kuyper and Colijn

Much more could be mentioned to indicate that the Kuyper government had many achievements to its credit, and that its promise to apply the spirit and principles of Holy Scripture to the administration of national and colonial affairs was carried out with laudable zeal and holy energy. If the opposition parties had been as deeply interested in the welfare of the nation as the Christian groups in the Dutch parliament, much more might have been accomplished.

It is also a matter for profound gratitude that in this centennial year of Kuyper's birth the Anti-revolutionary Party achieved one of its greatest victories, so that her Majesty, the Queen of the Netherlands, requested Dr. Hendrik Colijn, who has been premier for a number of years and led Holland safely through the great depression under the blessing of God, to take the responsible position again. Colijn refused at first, but finally yielded to the Queen's insistence. Colijn is not only a Calvinist, but is recognized in Europe as one of the greatest statesmen and economists of our day. And thus the life and labors of the great Kuyper bear splendid fruit in our own time.

In his last letter to the dying Kuyper, who was then too weak to receive another visit from his good friend, Dr. Colijn, the latter wrote:

"I know that doubt may arise in your soul whether, after your departure, we shall continue to walk in the old and tried paths. Therefore I wish to assure you in the presence of God that I, in co-operation with Idenburg, shall devote all my energies to holding our people to the paths in which you have led us. Next to the help which I shall seek from God, the constant memory of your labor will always guide me. I had to tell you this once again. May the Lord be very near to you and give you an abundant entrance. We are so eager to keep you a while longer, but we bow before the will of God, and we shall always remember in gratitude the wonderful gift He gave us in giving us you.

Your cordial brother in Christ,

H. Colijn."

A few days later Kuyper said to Idenburg: "The Lord is with me in every way."

And on November 8, 1920, the great warrior fell asleep in Jesus.

## THY GOD IS ABLE

Thy God is able to deliver thee  
From foes without, and from thyself unstable  
And from the clever ruthless Enemy—  
Thy God is able.  
But when thy heart's accusers make a babel  
So that thy spirit is o'erwhelmed in thee,  
And Satan strives with "lost" thy soul to label,  
Then seek thy room, confess, and make thy plea,  
So shall the Intercessor thee enable  
With courage from on high that will set free—  
Thy God is able.

—JOAN GEISEL GARDNER.

## GO TO THE ANT

**B**UT the ant came to me.

He came to explore my cupboard—one of those big little fellows that venture out bravely alone. I watched him hurry here and there, investigate various corners with pulsating antennae, and taste of bread-crumbs. Interesting, that little member of a clan known for its wisdom!

I put a finger in his path. He stopped. He saw the finger. He didn't see me. He avoided the finger, running around it. Again I interfered with his plans. Again he went around it, and hastened on his way.

But he quickly found a drop of honey I let fall for him! How clever of him to find such a treasure! He would tell his kin about that! Whence it came? Why, it was there! He simply found it!

Hastily he takes all his stomach can carry. And then away, with speed.

But there is that annoying obstacle again. Strange, how that appears in his path wherever he goes. And bothersome, too. There it is again. For a moment he considers running up the finger to investigate. But something—perhaps a sinister foreboding—makes him turn away.

And then the finger pushed him, tipped him over. He scrambled frantically to his six feet, and fled.

He would have dropped from the shelf, but once again that horrid thing came. He was pushed aside. This time he squatted low, lay very still for several seconds. What strange influence could this be, this constant interference? But nothing more happened. Cautiously he raised up. He ran.

And I let him go.

I wondered. He didn't see *me* at all. He only saw my finger as an obstacle in his path. Was I too big to be seen? Is it because God is so much greater than man that men fail to see Him? Ant wisdom doesn't reach unto man. And human wisdom . . . ?

Arriving home, he probably told his fellow ants of the strange adventure. With waving antennae, and gesticulating fore-legs, he told of the uncanny obstruction, quite beyond ant wisdom to explain. But they, no doubt, assured him that he had been imagining or dreaming. "You just didn't see through the thing. There must be a rational explanation!" And after a day or two he probably believed them.

Poor blind creature!

He couldn't see much farther than his antennae can reach, and he hadn't the least suspicion of things greater than himself influencing his important life. With all his wisdom and skill, for all his cleverness and speed, in spite of his delicate antennae and marvelous eyes, he failed to see that a being far greater than he stooped over him, watched him amusedly, dropped honey for his pleasure, put trouble in his pathway. A being (had he but known it) who could have crushed out his busy throbbing little life with the pressure of one finger!

M. M. S.

# Abraham Kuyper

Who can lay the spirit of man in a mold,  
Freeze life into a statue gazing eyeless  
Over a lonely sea?  
Is there not granite enough in the world to dishonor a soul?

When I would sing of the glory that is in a man,  
I touch on the form that is formless where being is freed  
From the dry dust of bones or the humid clay that is heavy with death  
Till the Breather of life with compassion broods on the nest of a world.

This is my creed when the lyre is stirred by the winds:  
The veins of music are swollen from the heart of God;  
And song is the poet's answer to flames in a rock.

Are there not waves that reach high over rolling seas?  
Are there not flowers and trees that weave shadows from light?  
So among men there are giants who stride in the van.  
He whom I sing loomed as a master of men.

Like Orion, the hunter, he held his course through our skies  
Where mysteries multiplied as new stars rose from the deep,  
And men lost God because their earth seemed dust.  
He held that God is more than all the stars.  
From His hand he took the crystal lens of truth,  
The enlarging Word, and saw our island planet  
Aglow with life whose light played on the boundless seas  
Where ghost-ships moved at night with white sails blown,  
Dead planets and pale suns, lost bits of universe,  
Discovered only when the eye of faith is wide  
With wonder on the cosmic shore.

Work was his strength for he drew  
Aeons of life from a globule of time  
That to dullards was but a vague hour,  
Sixty seconds of boredom times sixty of waste.  
Scorning the aimless putterings of men  
Who piece hours together like ill-fitting blocks  
In the hands of a listless child,  
He grasped both the granite and clay and built us a temple of faith  
With beams from Parnassus and girders of wood from a tree  
That stood on the Skull-hill where Christ had died for a world.

They who have frosted the spring-time of Christ,  
Chilled the white blossoms of faith that no fruit  
Beckons the reach of pale hands in the silent drama of mounds,  
Found him their foe.

Like a trusting child he walked with the Shepherd of life,  
And though as a prince he governed the land of his birth,  
To him the pastures were lush, and the streams that nourish were good.  
And when on the final uplands he leaned on his staff,  
The spires in the valley were silvered before the night,  
And psalms drew out of the hush like forms in a dream  
Over the marshes where not for him the long years  
Lay dead like birds shot by wayward hunters of time.  
He gathered his life about him, and when in the crimson west  
The hours lay like dew on the web of eternity,  
He smiled and was glad, for the stars would ride again;  
And he would take him a star and sail to the white cliffs of day.

BASTIAN KRUIHOF.

# THE POLITICAL PARTY OF ABRAHAM KUYPER

Leroy Vogel, Ph. D.

German Exchange Student of Princeton Seminary at Heidelberg University, Heidelberg, Germany. Author of "Die Politischen Ideale Abraham Kuypers und sein Entwicklung als Staatsmann."

ON the evening of May 16, 1869, there was held in the church auditorium at Utrecht a school-reform meeting. What took place at the meeting itself has not been recorded. But what is of genuine importance for the political life of the Netherlands is that during the course of that evening the pastor of the church, Dr. Abraham Kuyper, and G. Groen Van Prinsterer, the guest speaker, met and discovered each other. The latter was about ready to retire from a tireless forty years of public political life; he discovered in this militant young preacher, who already had established himself as leading controversialist in the half-century old church-strife, a useful colleague and a likely successor; he forthwith appointed him political editor of the weekly *De Heraut*. The thirty-one year old Dr. Kuyper discovered in the poorly organized and wholly unimportant Antirevolutionary Party of Groen, a likely vehicle for those principles which already had stamped him as "the man of the antithesis" and for that controversial spirit which had caused his father to refer to the lad as an "animal disputax" and which in public life was to popularize him as "Abraham the violent." The result of the acquaintance made in the church parlors at Utrecht was that Kuyper went into politics and that the Antirevolutionary Party became the party of Abraham Kuyper.

## Beginnings

Within a year, through the efforts of Kuyper, the party had assumed a completely different character. Heretofore, the party had been no more than a society of the spiritual descendents of Willem Bilderdijk's *Reveil*, who were bound together by a mutual respect for Groen and by the common quest after full rights for the "school with the Bible." There was no political program and there were no party candidates. Before elections Groen was wont to declare certain candidates for office as worthy of Antirevolutionary support, with the result that many were elected under the Antirevolutionary banner; but in the Lower House, for a period of twenty years, Groen had been rather accurately designated as "the general without an army." Kuyper wrote a letter to Groen, in which he proposed that this futility be ended and in which he suggested that henceforth the party nominate its own candidates who were to be bound by a program. Groen drew up a brief school-reform program and declared Kuyper one of the three party candidates for the Lower House in the election of 1871. All three candidates were defeated and the press declared the Antirevolutionary party dead; Kuyper declared the *old* party to have died and editorially he rejoiced that the days of make-believe and compromise were past: "Now for the first time we know just where we stand. The legions on paper have disappeared! To be rid of that illusion is priceless!"

Kuyper immediately set about rebuilding. His first step was to found his daily paper, *De Standaard*. The first edition appeared on April 1, 1872, when Holland was celebrating the 300th anniversary of the turning-point in the Eighty-years War. To recapture and re-establish that sixteenth century Calvinism and Nationalism was the party's purpose. The following year party organization had been achieved, a central committee had taken office and an election campaign fund had been raised. In 1874 forty delegates met at the first party convention. Local party units had been established and small party newspapers were appearing. That same year Kuyper was elected, as delegate from Gouda, to the Lower House, and the pastor of the largest church in Holland, so popular that crowds would sit the afternoon in church, lunching from baskets to be assured of a pew at vesper services, retired from the active ministry, never to return to it.

## Laying Foundations

Kuyper spent only one year in the Lower House. Then a complete breakdown of health, from overwork, compelled him to retire for a period of two years to the sunny mountains of Italy and Southern France. Returning to Holland, he did not again seek election; his year in office had shown him that such an office was not a victory for the principles which his party represented. Nor did he consider accepting one of those numerous calls which came to him from various churches. Instead, he decided to devote his entire time to his party and to journalism.

Journalism was Kuyper's greatest gift; although his *Standaard* was a comparatively small paper and at constant editorial war with the large presses of the country, the newspapers of Holland were accustomed to declare editorial peace on the anniversaries of the *Standaard* and of its editor. On these occasions they would declare that Kuyper was first of all a journalist, even though he did ply at politics, theology, and education too; his colleagues designated him as Holland's ablest journalist and elected him head of their national society. Journalism was Kuyper's favorite field, and his daughter tells that retiring from his daily after he had edited it for forty-seven years was the unhappiest moment in his old age. It was Kuyper's strongest weapon, for with it he broke down the ascetic tendency of Calvinistic Holland, which held politics to be a field unworthy of and contaminating to the christian, and with the press he persuaded the orthodox of the duty they had and coached them in doing it. Through the press, Kuyper did more than any other single individual to popularize thinking about political questions along constitutional and historical lines.

In 1878 the party adopted the "program of principles" which Kuyper had drafted and which he elucidated in his daily so extensively that, when it

appeared in book form as *Ons Program*, it constituted a work of some thirteen hundred pages. Until today, both the program of principles and the election program have not been altered materially from this declaration of sixty years ago. The fundamental principle of the Antirevolutionary political philosophy is Calvinism, which is so definitely a part of Holland history and character that there was nothing novel about this approach. It is, according to Kuyper, only the product of fidelity to history. The days of Holland's greatest glory, and those in which she was most true to her real self, were those days of consistent Calvinism before she began making concessions to the ideas of the French Revolution. The name Antirevolutionary indicates this desire to escape any revolt against that which is historically basic; only godlessness can be revolutionary in this individualistic sense. In practice the Antirevolutionary party has stood for school-reform legislation, which has made the confessional school state supported; for tariff; for social reforms; for state pensions and insurance for workers and aged; and for a nationalism engendered by a popularization of national history and expressed in improved foreign service, compulsory military service, and an enlarged national defence.

### Political Success

About 1880 the effect of Kuyper's work began to show itself in the political life of his country. His party was by that time strong enough to make itself felt, for it occupied twelve of the one hundred seats in the Lower House. Kuyper's ideas were taking root. In modern Holland history this date marks the end of the period of Thorbecke and the beginning of that of Kuyper. For while Kuyper's party was coming to the fore, the opposition was undergoing internal deterioration. The Liberal Party had been unchallenged in public life during the twenty-five years in which J. R. Thorbecke had led it. With his death in 1872 it immediately lost its old power and prestige. In 1878, legislation which aimed at killing the confessional schools, lost for this party the strong Catholic support on which it had heretofore always counted. At the same time Kuyper was bidding for the co-operation of the Catholics with the Calvinists.

The first great victory of the party came in 1888, when A. Baron Mackay, Antirevolutionary leader in the Lower House, was called to form the cabinet and to head it as Prime Minister. The victory came as a result of coalition with the Catholic Party. Kuyper's party never has been strong enough for an effectual stand alone; its influence on Holland national life is all out of proportion to its strength, for it commands only about ten per cent of the vote and generally about fifteen per cent of the Lower House. The Catholic Party, the largest in Holland, controls thirty per cent of the vote. Early in his career, Kuyper began agitation for a coalition of the two parties, in which he immediately came face to face with the old confessional hatreds of the Eighty Year's War. It took years of patience and writing on the part of Kuyper to overcome this and to persuade the people that the spirit of the French Revolution now is the foe which threatens Holland national life, just as during the sixteenth century Catholicism was this

threat, and that to preserve Holland, spent grievances must be forgotten in a co-operation against the present foe. In 1888, a one-point fusion program was arranged between the two parties, namely a school-reform program. The election gave the coalition parties a majority in the Lower House, and a cabinet under Antirevolutionary direction came into power.

The first coalition attempt was a success in so far as it secured a small subsidy for the private schools. Thus was broken the previous governmental policy of hostility. It also succeeded in making a beginning with social legislation. Then it could hold out no longer, for the Catholics were not prepared to support the Antirevolutionary program of strengthening the army and navy. The coalition broke, and it was ten years before Kuyper could restore it again.

### A New Coalition

When Kuyper had retired from public office in 1874, he had sincerely meant to stay retired. His time was too valuable and too much taken up to hold office, and he was much too violent a character effectively to lead by means of public office. He was much more adapted to leadership which involved writing, inspiring, and heading movements. For twenty years he was able to refrain from candidacy. Then he was driven back into public office. In 1894, a split in the party formed a crisis for Kuyper's movement. Complaining that in his policies Kuyper was much too democratic and in his practices much too dictatorial, A. F. De Savornin Lohman, commonly known as a spiritual twin to Kuyper, formed a party of his own, taking half of the old party with him. Already the party was weak from the coalition failure of two years before; this threatened to be a death-blow. The party also lacked a suitable leader in the Lower House now that Lohman was gone. To save his twenty-five years of political work, Kuyper took a seat in the Lower House, in spite of the fact that in addition to directing the party and editing his daily he also edited a weekly, held two professorships, one in theology and one in literature, was responsible for his own newly-formed denomination which he was negotiating to unite with another, and was in the midst of writing his classic *Theological Encyclopaedia* and eager to prepare his Systematic Theology for publication. Busier than he had ever been before, and unmindful of the fact that already twice he had broken down from overwork, he accepted this additional work.

The following six years in parliament were spent in laying the ground-work for a new coalition. By 1901 the Antirevolutionary Party had regained its old strength in numbers and an increased prestige; friendship had been made with the Christian-Historical Party of Lohman, which, although it maintained its own organization, has ever since supported the Antirevolutionary program; and a new and broad basis of co-operation with the Catholic Party had been agreed upon. The election of 1901 gave the coalition an overwhelming majority, and Kuyper, as leader of the Antirevolutionary Party in the Lower House, was charged with the Minister Presidency.

### Thrilling Incidents

Dr. Kuyper's life was full of thrilling incidents and contrasts. In 1878 he was denied an audience with

his king; twenty-three years later his sovereign called upon him to form the government. In 1901 psalm-singing parades celebrated the victory of "the great 'Bram'"; four years later even his party colleagues joined a coalition which had the one aim of putting down Kuyper, and the press which carried his defeat caricatured him as "the tiny 'Bram'." His term as Minister President had been a colorful one: a few of the ablest statesmen refused seats in the cabinet, and Kuyper was left to build a cabinet which did not dispute with him; the queen was deathly ill, and Kuyper practically reigned; in a strike, he called out the army; he betook himself to London to negotiate for cessation of the Boer War. Small advances were made in Antirevolutionary legislation. A liberal cabinet was called in to succeed him; his coalition was defeated forty-eight to fifty; his religious sincerity, his tariff program, and his dominating violence had to bow to the outcome of an election which was determined, mean, and negative.

Once again Kuyper retired from office. He did not seek to regain the post he had lost, although all evidence points to the possibility of success had he tried it. After a two-years retirement from Holland, he again became member of the Lower House, from 1907-12, and 1912-20 he served in the Upper House. Much more significant is the role he played in the party, which he continued to administer and whose controlling spirit he never ceased to be.

The Liberal cabinet which succeeded Kuyper fell in mid-term. The Liberal Party, which had dominated Holland politics until Kuyper appeared on the scene, was broken; it has never again formed the cabinet. Since then, all cabinets have been either coalition or extra-parliamentary. Two years after Kuyper's cabinet had failed to regain a second term, Th. Heemskerk, the liberal Antirevolutionary floor leader, was called to form a coalition cabinet. During its six years of office, it was able to make tremendous advances on all the favorite points of Antirevolutionary legislation: social laws relating to labor and insurance were passed; the army and navy were ordered reorganized; the equality of the confessional high-school was achieved, just as that for confessional lower schools and universities had been gained by the coalition cabinets of 1888 and 1901.

### **Catholic Co-operation**

The war-time cabinet, headed by a Liberal, showed full sympathy for Antirevolutionary principles. The spirit and tendencies which the old Liberal Party's dominion had represented, and which Kuyper had come to break down, were gone. The coalition parties have maintained a loose coalition ever since, and they are united enough to work effectively. The significance of Kuyper's coalition program becomes plain when we remember that before 1880 the Catholics opposed the Antirevolutionary Party; and in 1920, just before Kuyper's death, the cabinet headed by the Catholic C. J. M. Ruys de Beerenbrouck carried out the last steps in the school-reform program, a century-old Antirevolutionary quest. Since 1901, men representing the coalition parties have headed the government a total of thirty years, fifteen years Antirevolutionary, eleven years Catholic, and four years Christian-Historical. Holland has about

twenty political parties; the coalition parties command over half of the vote: Catholics about thirty per cent, and the other two each a little over ten per cent. That the party of Kuyper is able to maintain such influence against such numbers is surely due to the fact that it has a program and a political philosophy which is based on religious principles of which they are themselves firmly persuaded, and which is worked out into a system so consistent and historically adapted that it appeals to others as well.

### **The Party Since Kuyper**

It goes without saying that the religious fervor is not as evident and pronounced as it was in the early days. That fervor has not died; it is less conspicuous because the party need not be as militant as it did once, since it has been conceded the right to a lion's share of respect. Were a big issue involving a question of faith, as was the school-reform question, to come up, certainly the spirit of Kuyper would not be lacking. The Antirevolutionary Party is still the party of Abraham Kuyper.

The mantle of Kuyper fell upon Dr. H. Colijn; it definitely continues to be the mantle of Kuyper, in keeping with the solemn promise written to Kuyper by his successor, a week before the former's death. In the election of May 26 of this year, Dr. Colijn, the Antirevolutionary leader, was returned to office; he now heads the government for the third time. This election was the greatest election-victory that the Antirevolutionary forces have ever enjoyed. Campaigning under the slogan, "Unity through Democracy," Dr. Colijn issued an effectual appeal to the Netherlands to give a united support to a campaign against the political extremisms of Fascism and Communism. It was a campaign as Kuyper would have wished it. He himself virtually inaugurated it, when in 1919, in one of his last political writings, he undertook to point out that the spirit of the French Revolution shows itself in two types of tyranny, the one of which pretends to establish the rights of the individual, the other of which asserts the finality of the state.

## **JESUS OF AMERICA**

Judea had a Jesus  
Who, from the Adam-sons,  
Damned the self-righteous multitudes;  
Saved only "given" ones.

America repudiates  
Such partiality;  
Builds up a liberal Jesus  
Stripped of reality;

Till Jesus of Judea  
Shall cease from heaven to frown;  
But, coming to America,  
Shall knock the image down.

—ALBERT PIERSMA.

# THE RELATION BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE A PERENNIAL PROBLEM

Diedrich H. Kromminga, Th. B.

*Professor of Church History, Calvin Seminary*

(Note: This article is part of a paper read before the General Ministers' Conference of the Christian Reformed Church. See also last month's article dealing with Church and State in history.—EDITOR.)

THE changing relations between Church and State have in the course of history given rise to various theories as to what those relations should be. Every one of these theories has arisen after the emergence of a definite type of relationship between Church and State in explanation and justification of that type. The characteristically Roman Catholic theory, the theory that characterizes historical Lutheranism, and the one that goes in its roots back to Calvin—these can be designated as the major theories. They correspond to the three fundamental possibilities with regard to the relationship in which two magnitudes can stand: in our case, the State may be conceived of as subordinate to the Church, or as superior to the Church, or as co-ordinate. These are the Christian theories, which recognize the existential right of both magnitudes, the Church and the State. Besides these, there are two other major theories conceivable, both of which destroy the problem, either by denying the Church or by denying the State. Both have actually appeared in history: the denial of the State was involved in the early Anabaptist position and was there associated with communistic tendencies; the denial of the Church is involved in the modern Bolshevist position and is again associated with communistic tendencies. Both have logically issued in a life-and-death struggle between the adherents of the theory and the magnitude which the theory cancels out.

## **The Problem**

The three Christian theories all recognize both, the Church and the State. In these two institutions we have the constant factors of the problem. The actual relationships which spring up between these two will naturally be influenced or controlled by the views which prevail in these institutions concerning both, themselves and each other. The point to observe is, however, rather the necessity and unavoidableness of relationships between the two. This unavoidableness of relationships between Church and State results from the fact that they are both organizations of the same human society. They overlap and claim the loyalty of the same individuals. The situation is accentuated by the fact that each institution claims within its own realm and within the human sphere supreme authority. It is true, that the realms of authority differ: the State demands formal obedience to its laws and stand ready to enforce the demand by external means of compulsion, while the Church demands inner agreement with its precepts and has at its command only spiritual means for securing such agreement. The situation is once more accentuated by the fact that both institutions are more or less consciously universalistic in their aims.

Again it is true, that the universalism of the State is ordinarily circumscribed geographically, while the universalism of the Church, which recognizes no geographical boundaries in principle, is ethically circumscribed. But it is not to be thought, that these differences between the absolutism and the universalism of the State and the Church mean the elimination of conflicts between their claims.

The friction that thus is almost bound to ensue in one form or another may moreover develop on various levels. Most obvious is the possibility of a clash in the lives of the men and women who are members of both, the Church and the State, when these two institutions undertake to direct them to courses of action that are mutually exclusive. Such a situation arose, for instance, when James I of England issued his Declaration of Sports and the Puritans insisted on a Sabbath-observance of Jewish rigor. But the friction may also develop directly between the Church and the State. The Church is, among other things, also a property-holder, is as such subject to the laws of the State, and there have been times when the State failed to respect the property rights of the Church as well as times, when the wealth of the Church seriously menaced the revenues of the State. On the other hand, the State can not in its legislation avoid moral issues, and in so far is at all times exposed to conscientious adverse criticism from the Church. Both have an immensely wide and complex range of common interests, and their interests are by no means always harmonious.

## **A Would-Be Solution**

An effective solution of the problem of the relation between Church and State would be the existence in human society of a power or authority superior to and acknowledged by both, the Church and the State. Time has been when the Bible functioned as such an authority in theory and more or less also in practice, being proclaimed by the Christian Church as the infallible Word of God, and being acknowledged by the Christian State as such. Due to the ever present possibility of differences of interpretation this control over both institutions did in fact never quite eliminate the possibility of real and persistent conflict. But when the modern States one after the other canceled their admission of the authority of the Bible and when the modern Church not merely split into a multitude of fragments on the question of the meaning of God's Word, but also weakened in its conviction of the divine origin of the Book and, in many of its spokesmen even advanced to bold denial of its infallibility and sometimes to merciless criticism of its integrity, the situation changed definitely for the worse. The State is God's gift to human so-

ciety for the maintenance of law and order over against the disruptive forces of sin; and the Church is His gift to human society for the knowledge and recognition of His Law and His order; but the best that can be said at the present is, that the existence of both institutions side by side is a factual reminder to an altogether too forgetful society of the existence of the Lord of all beyond and above its realm, and of its inability to get along without His control.

### **Insurmountable Obstacles**

It is evident, that there are inherent and insurmountable obstacles to a wholesale and final solution of the problem of the relation of Church and State. These obstacles have been connected with an averred dualism in the Biblical teaching concerning the State. It has been averred, that Paul for example, in Romans 13, recognizes the authority of the State as binding upon the Christian conscience, while John in the Apocalypse depicts the State as the great anti-Christian organization and agency, and that thus the Christian sources make a unified Christian theory of the State impossible. The scriptural phenomena are indeed unmistakable; but the claim that they can not properly be harmonized has received its refutation with the earliest appearance of the rudiments of a Christian philosophy of history in the writings of Irenaeus and with the extensive enlargement upon those rudiments in Augustine's *City of God*. We may feel the need of a further refinement of this Christian philosophy of history either in the Catholic or in the Calvinistic sense, but of its basic consistency here can be no doubt. The fundamental insuperable obstacle in the way of a permanent and wholesale solution of the relation of Church and State lies, to the extent of at least fifty percent, in the fact that the institution of the State is a historical variable. The question will endlessly recur: what is the particular character of the State, with which the Church happens to be in need of sustaining relationships?

### **The Church Also A Variable**

And this statement of the insolubleness of the problem needs to be immediately balanced up by the parallel statement, that also the Church is a historical variable. Not only has it changed in the course of history, but it has also assumed a number of concurrent forms, and these forms have in modern times increased so marvelously, that our United States government faces the question which one or which ones of over two hundred organizations it can and should recognize as the Church. They all claim religious authority, and the vast majority pose as Christian and are Christian. It is plain, that in such a situation the difficulties of the State in the way of a proper determination of its relation to the Church are as great as those on the Church's side. And it is really not surprising, that in our government's recognition of the Churches their Christian character, that is to say, their Churchly character, their subjection to the Lord, is actually dropped out and the recognition becomes for Protestant and Catholic and Jew and Unitarian alike a recognition of religious societies merely and simply.

If we should look into the question of the deeper reason and meaning of the inherent permanency of

the problem of the relation of Church and State, we would doubtless find, that this lies in the origin of both institutions. They have both come into being as distinct social institutions for what we might call emergency purposes, but for such emergency purposes as transcend the merely human and social realm. The rise of the State is casually connected with man's break away from his Maker in the Fall; and so is the rise of the Church. While the State checks the disastrous consequences of the Fall for sinful human society, the Church represents God's saving activity within sinful human society. And the only wholesale and permanent solution which the problem of the relation of both these institutions can and will find will come with the final consummation, when time shall be no more and when the temporal forms of both divine institutions will be swallowed up in the perfect Kingdom of God.

### **Revision of Art. 36**

In a discussion such as this of the relation of Church and State you have the right to expect some mention of the actual concrete problems which we as a Church and as a group of church leaders face now. There is no doubt about the existence of such problems, nor of the comparative urgency of their nature, nor of the serious and far-reaching character of their implications. I shall mention a number of such concrete problems.

I shall begin with the two which are probably most immediately present in our awareness. Our Belgic Confession contains a creedal statement of the relationship of Church and State which our Church has begun to modify in harmony with the existing American situation, just as has been done by a number of other American denominations. What is the propriety of having in the creed statements that are in need of adaptation to changing political situations? The recent world war brought into prominence the conscientious objector to military service in the field, and the post-war wave of pacifism has greatly multiplied his numerical strength: what should be the Christian and ecclesiastical attitude to war, and will it justify the conscientious objector, so that the Church should not merely abstain from adding ecclesiastical censure to governmental penalties but should also positively defend him and plead with the government for his exemption from active service on the battlefield?

### **The Federal Council of Churches**

But there are other problems besides. Red agitation has some time past called forth legislative concern for the preservation of our federal Constitution, and your servants in this seminary have been asked to swear as teachers an oath of loyalty to the Constitution in order to keep the Church's financial possessions embodied in the seminary tax free; our loyalty to the Constitution made compliance easy and the interests of a financially not overly strong denomination made it advisable; but what are the implications? Again, before the war, the prevalent divorce evil prompted our Church to seek affiliation with the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America for the purpose of working in the direction of more uniformity in marriage and divorce

legislation, only to discover, that as belonging to the sphere of the States and not of the Union, such legislation is beyond the influence of the Council. Nevertheless, the desire to send chaplains to training camp and across with our boys led to temporary affiliation, which fear of liberalism later caused to cease. But the Council continues to speak officially for the Churches of Christ in America, and it is the only agency for Protestant Christianity with which the central federal government will deal. In a sense, we as a Protestant Church are also willy nilly represented by it, and in a sense we have no recognized channel apart from it to approach the central federal government. And the Council sometimes voices as the conviction of American Protestantism a lot of opinions on economic and legislative matters, that certainly can not pass as the convictions of the Christian Reformed Church. Must anything be done about

this situation, or does it involve no dangers? The Council does at times considerable lobbying in Washington; it might perhaps be advantageously used in such matters as the official governmental encouragement of paganism on our Navaho mission field. At any rate, that policy of the Indian Commissioner was very much a matter of concern for our Church. I might go on. What about prohibition and the return of public drinking? What about Sunday laws and their enforcement? What about social and economic legislation and the Church's duty with respect to these? Must we be satisfied with merely giving the Christian guidance of which we are capable to those citizens who come under our spiritual influence, or should we also officially and corporately approach the government, both state and federal, on such subjects?

## LACK OF INTEGRATION IN THE PAST

Henry Van Zyl, Ph. D.

*Professor of Educational Methods, Calvin College*

WHEN Christianity with its message of integrated outlook of things temporal and eternal, of the natural and supernatural, of nature and grace, of faith, hope, and charity came upon the scene it had to conquer the high type of Greek civilization—probably the highest among the pagans of all ages. So extensive and intensive was this Greek learning in philosophy and art, in sculpture and architecture, and in music and oratory that the Christian church, the institutional embodiment of the Christian ideals, receiving this whole deposit of human achievement in her lap could not possibly assimilate properly this contribution from the Greek world. Throughout the succeeding centuries Church fathers and leaders in church and state borrowed from Greek thought and culture, but the task of fusing the latter with Christianity without the church losing her identity proved a colossal one. No one will claim that it is a finished task even today. All along the line the problem of integrating the Greek mind and the Christian soul constituted a dilemma for the best thinkers and most devout followers of the Cross.

### **Greek Culture and the Christian Faith**

In the field of education—a salient realm for the Church in establishing her domain, power, and influence—the task of integrating Classicism and Christianity was freighted with difficulties. And, no wonder, for two dissimilar systems were existing alongside of each other. The Church as a newcomer had the two-fold task of establishing herself and doing this also by means of utilizing the good in the other civilizations. That the two were in a sense wholly dissimilar is clear if we but consider how the Greek mind on the one hand stressed harmony, beauty and service to the State, and the seven liberal arts; and how with different articulation the Christian heart on the other centered on God, grace, eternal life, a special revelation in Scripture, a

supreme authority never to be interfered with, the historical founders Moses and Jesus, and the institutional embodiment of Christianity, the Church.

Even though Plato at times approached philosophical theism, the Greek mind moved largely along the horizontal line of the natural while the Christian's virtues of love, meekness, and mercy were unthinkable without the vertical line. Among the Greeks reason made out of man the highest personality imaginable, i.e., the philosopher. He of all creatures of the dust had to be king. Among the Christians the cross according to Chrysostom made philosophers out of farmers, so that in the words of one author, "Fishermen publicans, and tent-makers stopped the mouth of philosophers and stilled the voice of orators." This sort of dissimilarity gives us a glimpse of the difficulty involved when leaders of Christianity faced the Greek world and proves how well-nigh impossible a task the early teachers of Christianity had when they undertook to present an integrated whole of the Logos of Scriptures and the logos of the Greeks.

### **The Greek Lacked True Integration**

Even if the Greek civilization had been still more supreme in its principles, outlooks, attitudes, and remedies concerning a just man in a just state than it actually was in its highest stage, it lacked an integrated view of life. It presented very much a detached picture of human life as such and of the individual in his need for security, recognition, and expression in particular. In and throughout the best of Greek life and thought and culture there runs a basic separation inimical to integration and positively foreign to the genius of Christianity, which by its very concept of love between brethren and sisters in the Lord levels down these Greek walls of separation extending in especially three directions.

The Greek philosopher actually loved to make this separation in the realm of thought, in society, and in human activities—a threefold division resulting from his basic separation of knowledge and action. Hence he spoke of higher knowledge for the education of personality and character and of lower knowledge for handcraft; of an aristocracy of the spirit and of the doings of *demons*; of philosophers and workers; of good citizens and good speakers; of love of music as such and music for use; of liberal arts for the few and of non-liberal arts for those of lower rank and therefore degraded; of artists moving on a higher plane and artisans who *ipso facto* had to be slaves in spirit and whose occupation stained and warped their minds; of contemplation of the realm of essence and of activities in the realm of organic existence and providing the necessities for it. With this division very pronounced in the Greek social structure even a man like Plato for whom "every question of pedagogy was anchored in religion and religious convictions"—a message of integration our present generation ought not only to grasp but to grip—yet opined that people would be better off without their bodies. The material aspect of life was not honored by men whose chief and highest ambition was to live a life of contemplation of the essence of Being, an idea probably acquired from those Asiatics who hoped by self-effacement to unite with the infinite.

Though Socrates had a more wholesome attitude and refused to accept this separation in his view towards labor in which he saw the glory of the commonplace, yet Aristotle, the father for many leaders in Western civilization during the succeeding centuries even until the days of Reformation, isolated economics from ideal ends and placed it lower than either morals or politics. The many-sided ramification of this separation made integration impossible, gave birth to detached teaching, and resulted in an inglorious end.

### Paul's Lofly Ideal

Lack of integration among the Greeks was due to their unique point of reference; viz., the separation of knowledge and action, of theory and practice, of mental and material, of "forms" and "matter." How much more inclusive is the vision of integration Paul had, who as the greatest of all missionaries and fully cognizant of the Greek world of division and separation issued to the Greeks of Corinth the penetrating command without any exception or reservation, "Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." What a lofty and lordly ideal for all levels in the hierarchy of values! What a point of reference for integration! "Never man spoke like this." The ultimate of all ultimates is once for all proclaimed to be the vertical line where it reaches to High God in heaven. And what an extensive, comprehensive, and inclusive sweep for integration! "Whatsoever" is whatsoever. The exclusiveness generated by the Greek idea of separation and so faithfully revived and propagated by the classical scholars of the Middle Ages who considered the classical man as the only ideal of man—a notion which for some four hundred years proved a "fruitful source of evil in the history of education"—this

exclusiveness is once for all discarded by Paul. He wants the whole man, every man, all arts—liberal and non-liberal, fine arts and industrial arts, contemplations and social arts—yea, even eating and drinking in his program of integrated living.

And, yet, for many centuries the Church, while engaged in fighting many evils, in many ways copied the detached and divisive social, philosophical, and dualistic hierarchy of Plato and Aristotle rooted as they argued in the natural, rather than follow the injunction of Paul with its organizing, unifying, and co-ordinating Biblical principle born from the supernatural. Plato might despise the flesh, Aristotle might look upon slaves as animals without souls, but God still gloried in the sons of men. The Greek mind might be many-sided, but it lacked the unity of the Hebrew morality of justice and the Christian teaching of love. Its very many-sidedness was the source of danger. It lacked proper integration. It was detached. This detached spirit the church too often accepted as her own.

### Christian Education and Pagan Influence

Did the Church establish her own schools in the first centuries of the Christian era, and did she provide a curriculum with a unity of Christian pedagogy in harmony with the spirit of Christianity? She was simply too busy establishing herself and rounding out a system of doctrine. The result was that long after the establishment of a nominal Christianity in the institutions of the Empire—even during St. Augustine's time—schools were semi-pagan. Not till after Constantine's conversion shortly before his death in 337 A.D. were Christians permitted to aspire to a professor's chair in the academies of the Empire, where moral training was neither given nor expected; and Christian institutions where children were admitted did not arise, except very sporadically in private schools kept by Christian teachers before the appearance of monastic schools, which must be considered the nurseries for Christian schools.

In the academies of the State often the worst writings of Pagan authors were placed in the hands of scholars, and according to one writer it was a greater mistake to mispronounce "home" than to hate a man. The rhetorical schools during the first centuries held sway, and oratory was one's highest aim—an ambition considered of more value than a unified outlook upon life based on Holy Writ and ruling supreme in many a school even to the days of John Sturm (1507-1589), who according to Dr. Waterink made Latin eloquence his highest pedagogical ideal. The Academies copied the curriculum of the seven liberal arts of the Greeks—grammar, rhetoric, dialectic, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music—the seven pillars of the temple of wisdom. Though the expression, "The Seven Liberal Arts," came into vogue during the Middle Ages, the studies prescribed by Plato were "to constitute the curriculum of at least ten mediaeval centuries." When one considers that basically the Greek mind separated knowledge and action and extended this division in many directions, and that this mind was essentially secular, no one can possibly estimate how much this pagan influence on the one hand shaped educational practice in a Christian civilization on a secular plane leading

to detached teaching and living, and how on the other hand the appearance on the scene of a Christian pedagogy integrated on a Scriptural basis was delayed and what harm was done. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) gloried especially in two most comprehensive concepts of Being and Life, and rightly so. But a secular mind which conceived of a liberal arts program and reasoned that the absolutely free man is the philosopher whereas the Christian believes the words of Jesus, "If the Son therefore shall make you free, you shall be free indeed," this secular mind controlling so much of school life for a thousand years could not but keep the Christian heart from a richer and more integrated enjoyment of that gift of heaven, the abundant life, brought by Christ when he said, "I came that they might have life and have it more abundantly."

### **Greek Dualism Prevails**

True, warnings were given not to copy too much from the Greeks and suggestions were made by the Church Fathers to take proper cautions in studying pagan learning. St. Basil (330-379) urged the Christians to select from Homer, Hesiod, and Socrates maxims good for Christians and draw honey from flowers carefully selected. And Origen (185-254) told two of his students how to regard profane sciences. "They are to be used so that they may contribute to the understanding of Scripture . . . We are permitted when we go out of Egypt to carry with us the riches of the Egyptians wherewith to adorn the tabernacle." Similar advice was given by others. Chrysostom (347-407) says he knows of no school in his neighborhood where study of profane literature can be found united to teaching of virtue. He argues that the choice lies between two alternatives: a liberal education which may be had in the public schools, or the salvation of the children's souls by sending them to the monks. And later in the Middle Ages noble Christian teachers like Vittorino de Feltra and Juan Luis Vives likewise stressed the reading of Christian authors and cautioned against some of the pagan writers.

But the liberal plan of the course of study prevailed. However much some of the leaders despised the Greek classics, others worshipped them, and most of them by far followed the Greek dualism of separation. Integration was hard to secure. Monastic schools were, it is true, among the first to unify all instruction and education in the spirit of Christianity. They united handcraft and study, and practical arts and contemplations; they fostered a Christian outlook; they organized a Christian body of knowledge—yet they separated from the world and in this dualistic practice fell far short of the goal of integration.

### **Liberal Arts Idea Not Christian**

The ever recurring refrain of "Liberal Education" and "Liberal Arts" in schools and in ever so many titles of books written on education clearly revealed that the Greek model of school practice was well-nigh indelibly stamped upon schools. Now the very idea of "Liberal Arts" as is implied in the foregoing is not conducive to a unified Christian pedagogy. The simple question, What is the central point of reference in these liberal arts? ought to reveal that

a Biblical answer is quite impossible. And I cannot but admire Dr. Waterink, who fearlessly makes the criticism that the concept of "liberal arts" is contrary to the concept of Christianity. His argument is that the very name is classical, reveals a classical spirit which so readily allies itself to the present day gerry-mandering in education. The very idea is representative of Greek culture making a separation between handcraft and the study of knowledge. This division is contrary to the Christian view of loving God above all and our neighbors as ourselves. It is contrary to the Christian concept of love, meekness, mercy, piety, consecration, faith. God's grace must raise the natural and human to a level of service to God with all our heart and all our soul and all of our mind. This "All" is all, and this point of reference is adequate for the greatest unity and widest integration.

The Christian Church accepted the idea of liberal arts from the Greeks in distinction from the non-liberal. The Knights in Mediaeval Society made a similar circle of separation and developed for their group a system of seven social arts; and by the end of the Middle Ages the middle class of people proudly pointed to their seven mechanical or industrial arts. All these divisions could not foster unity but made for disintegration as far as the whole of the Church was concerned. Meanwhile, the relation between Classics and Christianity remained unsolved. Before any advancement toward unity in teaching in Christian Schools could be noticed the Modern Age had to appear and with its arrival and growth more difficulties and even stronger barriers arose, making integration in the Christian's way an heroic task.

## **SUMMER SHOWER**

Armies of fairies marched upon the roof  
 And one gay marshal scattered all his clan;  
 Sometimes he lashed them, again he held aloof  
 As frolicking and rollicking they ran.  
 They clattered at the window—the impish little  
 things—  
 They even dared to trail into the rooms,  
 But suddenly they left again, and now their  
 perfume clings  
 While the house re-echoes with their tunes.  
 —JOAN GEISEL GARDNER.

## **SUMMER NIGHT**

The summer night has silver sound, the silence  
 comes alive;  
 The song of insects fills the air, cicadas shrill  
 their fife;  
 Small crickets strum their treble tunes  
 And though the wind is still  
 The leaves give voice in their own way  
 And from my window-sill  
 I sense the pregnant tide of birth,  
 The mystery that shrouds the earth.  
 Something goes on while humans rest, beyond our  
 reach—a timeless quest.  
 —JOAN GEISEL GARDNER.

# LETTERS

## CALVINISM AND THE ECONOMIC ORDER

### A Discussion

(*Explanatory Note:* In the June issue we placed a letter of Mr. Winsemius of Paterson in which he discussed certain matters in connection with our economic order and the propriety of promoting Christian labor organizations. Our readers may remember the editor made reply to this communication in the July issue (p. 283). In a letter of his placed in last month's issue (p. 44), Mr. Winsemius asks for space "to elucidate my standpoint and to free myself from the allegation that I am radical but uncalvinistic." Mr. Winsemius was promised such space in an editorial footnote and has availed himself of this opportunity by writing the following article. Our reply also follows.—EDITOR.)

### Mr. Winsemius Writes:

Our Editor, Dr. C. Bouma, in commenting on our recent communication, has raised some objections in THE CALVIN FORUM of July, 1937, regarding our standpoint in the struggle between employer and employee. The gist of the problem was the sit-down strike and how to cope with it. Since our Christian laboring men were advised to band together in the economic turmoil we have tried to point out that forming economic units to protect themselves from the onslaught of stronger economic units, is not the remedy for our economic ills. We admit that beneficial results have been obtained. Economic force pitted against economic force, or the law of the jungle, engenders hatred and hatred is the cause of all war and strife. The battle between these forces becomes more and more acute and we are now living in a period which exhibits in reality the survival of the fittest. It is in many cases not the struggle for existence but the heinous struggle for power. In the world of finance, business and labor it is "*à la guerre, comme à la guerre.*" The purpose of a Labor Union is, strictly economically speaking, to seek an object, namely, higher wages, shorter working hours and better working conditions. As such, then, there is no difference between the A. F. L., the C. I. O. and the C. L. A. Their strength or weakness lies in the proper or improper application of their power. There is strength in the closed shop and, once obtained, it is a weapon to bring the employer to terms if the employer is economically weaker. Many an employer has been ruined by this procedure. On the other hand both employer and employee have been benefitted. As long as Labor Unions are pure economic units they have a common philosophy. The C. L. A. does not make an exception in this case.

#### Natural Economic Law

Our competitive society, based upon the Natural Economic Law, holds this as its chief tenet: "The social affections are accidental and disturbing elements in human nature, but avarice and the desire of progress are constant elements. Let us eliminate the inconsistencies, and, considering the human being merely a covetous machine, examine by what laws of *labor, purchase and sale* the greatest accumulative result in wealth is attainable. These laws once determined, it will be for each individual afterwards to introduce as much of the disturbing affectionate element as he chooses, and so determine for himself the result on the new conditions supposed." (John Stuart Mill.)—In connection with this quotation it is interesting to read and to digest the article entitled, "All hail to the American System" in THE CALVIN FORUM, Vol. I, No. 7, page 154.—Notice in Mill's quotation this poignant dictum: "Let us . . . examine by what laws of labor, purchase and sale the greatest accumulative result in wealth is attainable." Here we observe the immoral equalization of labor, purchase and sale. Today, more than ever, the unionist and non-unionist alike sell their labor—often soul and body included for good measure—to the highest bidder. And if there is no demand for workers in our highly mechanized age, a union of workers in the economic sense ceases to exist, or their economic power dwindles to a minimum. How deep is this philosophy rooted in our American System, which many love so dearly and tenderheartedly!

The Supreme Court in 1892 handed down the following decision: "Whatever enthusiasts may hope for in this country

every owner of property may work it as he will, by whom he pleases at such wages and upon such terms as he can make; and every laborer may work or not, as he sees fit, for whom, at such wages as he pleases, and neither can dictate to the other how he shall use his own, whether property, time or skill." And not very long ago the Vice-Chancellor Maja Leon Berry ruled that the closed shop was illegal and unenforceable. He based his ruling upon the above-named Court decision of 1892. He made the following and most significant statement: "Under our basic laws property rights are entitled to the same protection as personal rights. The right of an individual to work at his chosen occupation is both a personal and a property right and as such constitutes his capital as truly as does the money with which his employer creates an industry. To that extent both employer and employee are capitalists." The honorable judge expresses himself unequivocally: "The right to work . . . constitutes his capital." Remember that these words are spoken upon the basis of Natural Economic Law, and by no means upon Moral Law. We also believe in the "right to work," but with the Moral Law as our basis. And believe it or not, we have proof that our Calvinist political brethren in the Netherlands adhere to the first Law and repudiate the latter as far as the "right to work" is concerned. But why not adhere to this philosophy consistently? If our memory does not deceive us we faintly recollect, that during the World War the "constituted capital of the worker" was ruthlessly confiscated while on the other hand the records show that the capital of many a Big Business man was enormously augmented by means of huge profits. If, then, according to Adam Smith the "laborer and the laboring cattle" are put upon the same plane; if according to John Stuart Mill "the laws of labor, purchase and sale" belong to the same category; if according to the Supreme Court decision "every owner of property may work it as he will"; and if according to the honorable judge "property rights and personal rights" are weighed in the same judicial balances, leaving out every religious, moral or ethical consideration, these "social affections" to be considered as "disturbing factors," what can we expect but an American society steeped in moral lawlessness. Why speak of "Communism and the Sit-down Strike," if the mother does not know her own progeny?

#### Calvin and Augustine Quoted

The labor struggle and the sit-down strike are manifestations of this system of thought. We have tried by means of quotations of Calvin's *Institutes* to point out that the Natural Economic Law must be checked or as much as possible eliminated from our society by Political and Civil Law, these laws again based upon the eternal and fundamental Moral Law of God. In studying Calvin's concept of Civil Government we must never forget that he was a product of his time. However, Calvin understood the changing of the times, of manner and customs, but the change should never be made to a Christian Anarchy. In fact he wrote: "Ceremonies might be abrogated without any violation or injury of piety, as the precepts of duties and love remain perpetual, notwithstanding the abolition of these judicial ordinances. If this be true, all nations are left at liberty to enact such laws as they shall find to be framed according to that perpetual law of love." (*Institutes*, Book IV, Chap. 20, Par. 15.) He then goes on to say what he considered unjust laws, since they were "outrageous against humanity itself." Whatsoever our interpretation of Calvin's writings may be, he made it perfectly clear that justice and mercy, based upon Christian precepts, must be the foundation stones or pillars of any political economy. Calvin did by no means propound a static order or disorder, God-willed or otherwise to be perpetuated at all cost. St. Augustine in his *Confessions* indicates the same fact. In Book III, Chap. VII, par. 13, he writes: "But man, whose days are few upon earth, for that by their senses cannot harmonize the causes of things in former ages and other nations, in one and the same body, day, or family they see what is fitting for each member and season, part and person, to one they take exceptions and to the other they submit." In par. 15 he further stresses the fact that it is lawful to enact laws which have never been enacted before and that obedience to these laws cannot be against the commonweal of the State. We are still waiting for a proper explanation whether the destruction and waste of commodities and human life is against the "Commonweal of the State" or beneficial for a certain class. Pierre Du Bois in the latter part of the 13th century pleaded in his *Du Recuperatione*, par. 49, that new situations must be met with new measures. Quoting Averroes he continues: "Therefore the laws and statutes of men vary with the varying places, seasons, and persons, and many philosophers have taught that this

should be so, because expediency clearly demands it, and the Lord and Master of all sciences, of the Holy Fathers, and the philosophers in order that He may teach us to do so without fear, changed many things in the New Testament, which He had ordained in the Old." Furthermore, Roger Bacon, Thomas More, John Wycliff, Tomasso Campanella, Marsilius of Padua, e. a., have during the Middle Ages developed different political systems. Dante and, last but not least, Machiavelli have also contributed to the mediæval political philosophy. But all these systems were supported both by political law and moral law. The error of the Anabaptists was that they excluded political and civil law from their system, thereby creating a political anarchy. Their contention was, that to live the "Lex Evangelica" was sufficient and would ultimately inaugurate the Kingdom of God on earth. Calvin had no objection against any political economic system—this is still a Roman Catholic maxim—but he insisted that a christian political or civil government must be based upon the Christian Moral Law, as this Law is the basis of all Law.

#### The Precedence of Moral Law

We maintain, and always do maintain, that that Law must have precedence over economic law and especially over the Natural Economic Law. This does not mean, that we have in mind a government-owned and controlled society, or some form of collectivism. Nobody can persistently deny that a form of collectivism already exists. To clamor for collectivism is, therefore, not necessary. The phrase, "wealth in the hands of a few," is not new. Today we distinguish three forms of collectivism, namely, Capitalism, Fascism, and Communism. The second and third are the result of the decay of the first. All three are virtually based upon the same philosophy of Natural Economic Law. They are basically atheistic. Religious, political, economic, and social freedom in these countries (Russia, Germany, and Italy) are gone with the storm.

"Calvinism champions the greatest possible measure of freedom in every sphere of human society," etc., as our Editor has truly stated. But is this exposé based upon the Natural Economic Law, or upon the Calvinistic interpretation of Moral Law? To be specific: Should legislation, social or industrial, in fact all legislation be based upon the in our capitalist society accepted theory, that a human being is a mere commodity, which can be dispensed with at any time when he becomes useless for a certain class or group, etc.; such legislation enacted for fear or against actual revolt of the masses; or should all legislation be based upon the Moral Law of God, that man is created in the image of God with inalienable rights? Proclaiming from the housetops the latter and shrewdly or ignorantly adhering to the former, brings some very strange and contradictory results. In this case the government of the Netherlands does not make an exception. Its social and industrial legislation is based primarily upon the Natural Economic Law. Our economic problem will be with us and will become still more serious and grave if we fail to see the distinction between the Law of Life and the Law of Death. Our problem is not a problem of and for the laboring class to which we belong. The roots of our problem are deeper, much deeper. We can not go into details what we consider just and true laws or what political economic system we deem best for this time. The main issue was, that the Political and Civil Law based upon the Moral Law and Testimonies should be prior to the Natural Economic Law. Adhering to the first would ultimately show how much freedom and liberty we would have. Clinging tenaciously to the latter demonstrates clearly how much War and Death we have.

Calvin's political philosophy is in essence Stoic in character. He was undoubtedly greatly influenced by Seneca and Cicero. Therefore, let us conclude with a precept of the latter: "Let us not forget that even toward the humblest members of human society, justice must be observed. Injustice is shown in two ways, either by violence or deception. Deceit is the way of the fox, violence that of the lion, both altogether unworthy of man. But the more hateful is deceit. The greatest injustice, however, is committed by those who, while guilty of the most shameful deceit, pose as honorable men."

HARRY P. WINSEMIUS.

## The Editor Replies:

My dear Mr. Winsemius:

There is nothing more important for a fruitful debate than to keep the issue clear. Your article aims to clarify your position as over against my five points of comment and criticism of your earlier letter. The five points made by me (Issue of July, 1937, p. 283) were as follows: 1. It is clear from your letter that you are pleading for some form of collectivism; 2. This position, despite your citations from Calvin's *Institutes*, is radical (as you yourself called it) but it can in no wise be called Calvinistic; 3. Calvinism champions the greatest possible measure of freedom in every sphere of human society which is

compatible with justice to all and the protection of the weak; 4. A collectivistic order, in which economic freedom, private ownership of the means of production, and all competition are eliminated, leads inevitably to some form of dictatorship; 5. Your contention that the banding together of Christian laborers in a Christian labor organization is virtually subscribing to the class struggle, is quite unfounded.

I regret to say that you have not proved that any of these five contentions was mistaken or unfounded. Your latest article simply repeats in more extended form what you had already stated in your previous letter. What you say in the above communication confirms my previous comment at every point.

#### The Real Thrust

The unwary reader, by stressing certain statements in your article, might conclude that you are only pleading for the application (or the more consistent application) of Christian moral principles to our economic relationships. There are a number of statements in your article, which, taken by themselves, might lead one to interpret your plea in that fashion. For instance, you write: "Calvin . . . insisted that a christian political or civil government must be based upon the Christian Moral Law, as this Law is the basis of all Law." And then you continue: "We maintain, and always do maintain, that that Law must have precedence over economic law and especially over the Natural Economic Law." Now, if this were the real thrust of your plea, I need hardly assure you that I would be entirely on your side, and—I might add at once—in that case there would not be much chance for serious difference between you and any Calvinist.

But although the unwary reader may off-hand interpret your article that way, the careful reader—and the original author likewise, of course—knows full well that this interpretation is missing the real thrust. *The real thrust of your article is a condemnation of the present economic order as such (not merely some evils attendant upon it) and a covert plea for some form of collectivism in the place of it. And in conjunction with that main thrust you condemn every group of Calvinists (whether in Holland or in our own country) who have organized for the improvement of economic conditions through the application of the demands of Christian principles to our economic life as it exists today.*

If you were only interested in the more serious and more consistent application of the principles of the moral law (through appropriate legislation) to the existing economic order, and not in the substitution of another order for the present one, you would whole-heartedly support the Christian Labor Association, because you know that this is the avowed aim of that organization. You might conceivably be of the honest opinion that the C. L. A. should be even more in earnest about this great task, but then as a good Calvinist you would back it up in its attempt to accomplish that aim. What you say about the C. L. A. not being different from the A. F. L. and the C. I. O. only has point if you condemn (as you clearly do) every labor union (however Christian its principles) as long as it exists under the present capitalistic order. No doubt, that is what you mean by saying: "As long as Labor Unions are pure economic units, they have a common philosophy. The C. L. A. does not make an exception in this case." What you mean apparently is not that the C. L. A. does not strive to be a Christian organization (and, therefore, in that respect differs from the C. I. O. and the A. F. L.), but that under the present economic system it is not possible for the C. L. A. to be anything but a purely economic unit and that what we need is a different economic system from the present one, a collectivistic system, in which "purely economic units" would become "political units."

#### Plea for a New Order

That I am correct in stating that your desire for another economic order is the real thrust of your article and underlies the whole of your argument, is clear from the following.

1. "Our competitive society," which you hold to be based "upon the Natural Economic Law" comes in for severe arraignment and condemnation in your article. Seeing what you call "Natural Economic Law" is the source of all our misery, as you throughout contend, and seeing this is basic to "our competitive society," the conclusion is inescapable that we must get rid of the order designated as competitive.

2. In paragraph 2 in commenting upon a statement of John Stuart Mill, you do not merely condemn certain evils from which the laboringman suffers in the present economic system, but you condemn the system without qualification, as your rather cynical reference to Mr. MacNaughton's article, "All Hail to the American System," also shows. You clearly hold that "the immoral equalization of labor, purchase, and sale" can be remedied only by introducing a new order, a new "system."

3. In your letter of explanation accompanying your article you write: "Enclosed you will find a short expose of the philosophy upon which our capitalist system actually rests. . . . But these problems can never be solved unless we reach a sound basis upon which we can work together and agree upon

a new political economic philosophy." Can these words be interpreted in any other way except as stating that you champion the substitution of some collectivistic order for the present capitalistic and competitive order?

4. In your letter placed in the September issue (p. 44) you say, (and the underscoring is your own): "I assure you that my concept is truly democratic; not communistic or fascistic. But to be a true democrat I am willing to prove that it is absolutely necessary that we must have some things in common." It is quite apparent that this is your own statement of what you proposed to prove in the article later submitted and herewith published. Now, surely it makes no point to apply this alleged absolute necessity of having some things in common to, say, the government ownership of certain public utilities or railroads, or the like. We have that already and the evils against which you inveigh (and rightly so!) continue. The only sense that these words allow is that you are in favor of some collectivistic order in distinction both from the present capitalistic order and from a communistic order, which you disavow.

#### What is Collectivism?

5. In the second from the last paragraph you write: "This does not mean that we have in mind a government-owned and controlled society, or some form of collectivism. Nobody can deny that a form of collectivism already exists. To clamor for collectivism is, therefore, not necessary. The phrase 'wealth in the hands of a few' is not new. Today we distinguish three forms of collectivisms, namely, Capitalism, Fascism and Communism." Now in this sentence you say in so many words that you are not pleading for any form of collectivism. But I would like to ask you how much this statement means when it is clear that you are simply juggling your terms in this paragraph. Let me prove this. First you say that you do not plead for collectivism. Then you explain that under the present (capitalistic) system we already have some form of collectivism. What this collectivism must be like of which you say that you are making no plea for it, is not made very much clearer when you add that Capitalism, Fascism, and Communism are three forms of collectivisms. Surely you know better than to make a statement like this. There are various forms of collectivism, to be sure, but capitalism is not one of them. My charge that you have been pleading for some form of collectivism may also be restated: you are putting up a plea for socialism.

That you are quite mistaken in your use of the term collectivism and that your consequent attempt to refute my charge must be declared abortive, you need not take on my authority. Let us just turn to the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Allow me to transcribe what this recognized authority has under the heading "Collectivism" (Vol. 6, p.16). "Collectivism, a theory that society and industry should be based upon the collective, or national, ownership of land and capital, i. e., of the means of production, distribution and exchange. Under such a system, the private ownership of capital would be abolished, but private property in personal goods would remain. . . . Collectivism is thus not the common ownership of wealth, but the common ownership of the means of producing wealth. For a full discussion of the points involved see Socialism." From all this it is apparent that, despite the mystifying and confused use which you have made of the term collectivism, it has a very definite meaning and that meaning is not the equivalent of capitalism but of socialism.

#### "Pagan or Worse"

6. And if there still is doubt in anyone's mind whether I am justified in my statement that you are pleading for the substitution of a socialistic (collectivistic) for the present capitalistic order, there are two statements of your own, made on an earlier occasion, which are more explicit and outspoken than any you have apparently since made in print. In a letter on "New Deal Philosophy" in THE CALVIN FORUM of March, 1936, you wrote these words: "A fact remains that the economic weak will go down in competitive society often dragging down with him not a few of the population. This will continue under the New Deal unless 'the tools are placed in the hands of those who can use them.'" (Ruskin.) Then the New Deal will work, but not otherwise." (p. 188.) And in another letter from your pen in the June, 1936, issue, after you have taken Prof. Ryskamp to task on what you claim to be an inconsistency of his, you continue: "The profit motive and consequent profit system, alias capitalistic system, into which it has degenerated, stands, in my opinion, and according to my conviction, squarely and unreservedly condemned, not only upon scientific but also and decidedly upon moral and ethical grounds. Personally, I condemn it as absolute unchristian, nay, pagan or worse." (p. 258.)

I think you will agree that, in the light of all this, it is only fair to our readers, to yourself, and to me to have the real thrust and momentum of your article laid bare. In the abstract I leave the possibility open that I am all mistaken in this analysis and exposition. The pages of THE CALVIN FORUM will be open to you at any time to state and prove that I am

wrong in this interpretation. But if you should proceed to do so, I think it only fair to state that this is to be done on one condition, viz., that you state clearly and unequivocally what your position is on this important issue. Surely you will grant me that to play hide-and-go-seek with this serious and basic question, so determinative for all one's further ethico-economic evaluations and judgments, is not playing fair either with your public nor with your opponent. To write indictment upon indictment of the whole capitalistic order as such, and to repudiate it as "pagan or worse," and to have in such a lengthy communication no more to say about the new order that you do champion than the meager sentence: "We cannot go in details what we consider just and true laws or what political economic system we deem best for this time"—this is a procedure which condemns itself to any thoughtful person. And it becomes doubly dubious when in addition you disavow and affirm your collectivistic convictions. In these serious discussions we should have the courage to mean what we say and to say what we mean.

#### The C. L. A. and the C. I. O.

In the light of this socialistic bias of yours, it will readily be clear to our readers why you condemn the Christian Labor Association and why you condone the sit-down strikes inspired by the C. I. O. In this light also the unwarranted attack upon "our Calvinist political brethren in the Netherlands," occurring twice in your article, can readily be understood, though not justified.

Let there be no misunderstanding. To hold to this socialistic view is your perfect right as an individual. If you feel that collectivism is the true solution to our economic ills and you feel you have sufficient grounds so to hold, no one will dispute you that right. But I must in the name of truth and fairness dispute you the right to hitch John Calvin to your socialistic cart and to malign, in the name of that same economic philosophy, the character and aim of so fine a Christian organization as the Christian Labor Association.

A word on each of these two points before I close.

You have no right to represent the Christian Labor Association as being prompted in its endeavor by the same feeling of hatred and class struggle as the C. I. O. Its avowed principles refute this, and its actual practical methods give this charge the lie. If you persist in making this charge, the least that can be expected of you is that you prove your case and that on both scores, viz., the avowed principles and the actual practice of the C. L. A. To distil so grossly unethical a charge out of the stuff of one's abstract economic prepossessions, without any reference to the actualities of the party concerned, cannot pass the muster of Christian propriety.

#### As to Calvin and Calvinism

And as for your quotations from Calvin in alleged support for your contentions, I am certain that the Genevan reformer would turn in his grave if he knew how his words are being distorted to buttress the anti-capitalistic, collectivistic views which you have propounded. Weber and Troeltsch, Tawney and Robertson—these names call to mind the great controversy as to Calvin's direct or indirect responsibility for the modern capitalistic system. But however great the difference in the conclusions of these scholars on this score, none of them denies that Calvin was committed to the capitalistic order of economic society. If you will read the passage you quote from the *Institutes* and that from St. Augustine's *Confessions* in their context, you will recognize that these quotations are beside the point as far as your main contention is concerned.

"Calvinism champions the greatest possible measure of freedom in every sphere of human society (family, church, school, business, industry, politics) which is compatible with justice to all and the protection of the weak." In these words from my previous reply lies the reason for the incompatibility of Calvinistic principles and any communistic or collectivistic (i. e., socialistic or fascistic) set-up. And these words, with which you say you agree (though you significantly leave off the latter part in your citation of them), you may also find the answer to your query whether this statement is to be taken in the moral or in the purely economic sense. It would seem that "justice to all" and "protection of the weak" are distinctly moral conceptions and standards. There is no room on that Calvinistic basis for considering the laboring-man only a commodity. Calvinism, historically, in principle, and in actual organizational practice maintains that the relationship between employer and employee is a moral one. It champions the right of the laborer to a decent wage. It adjures the employer to be concerned about the moral and spiritual welfare of those who are economically dependent upon him. It recognizes certain economic laws (just as it recognizes certain natural laws), but it ever places the demands of the moral law of God in the foreground for everyone in the political and economic relations of life and never sacrifices these to any alleged law of economic necessity.

And for the achievement of these moral ends in economic society neither 16th nor 20th century Calvinism has ever flirted with a collectivistic set-up.

C. B.

# BOOK REVIEWS

## WORSHIP—MYSTICAL OR REFORMED?

WORSHIP. By Evelyn Underhill. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1937. Price \$3.00.

A CALVINIST cannot but welcome a work on Worship, particularly if it be as informative and suggestive as Miss Underhill's book on the subject. It is Calvin's chief contribution to the thought of the Christian church, that he stressed the awful majesty of the Most High God and gave it centrality and dominance in his system of theology: the Reformed faith. He inculcated in his followers the bounden duty of responding to God's sovereign majesty in glowing adoration and to honor it in loving obedience. According to Calvinism the Jachin and Boaz of Christian life are the adoring worship and the devoted service of God. The two are closely related, though not identical. Worship equips for service and service prepares for worship. God is central to both. Christian life is a unity because it has its center of gravity in God. The bifurcation of worship and service, far from disturbing that organic unity, is but the response of man as God's image to the inseparable connection there is between the infinite majesty of God and His absolute sovereignty. God's majestic glory is the effulgence and resplendence of His absolute supremacy; and His absolute supremacy is the adequate basis and qualitative source of His incomparable honorableness. Both God's absolute sovereignty and its reflection in the beauty of His holiness have a definitely revelational reference to creation at whose center and summit He placed man. But they are none the less rooted and grounded in the infinite being of God, as it turns upon itself in the absolute self-sufficiency and splendid isolation which are the hall-marks of genuine deity.

The study of worship and its fitting expression liturgically is the order of the day in well-nigh the entire Christian Church. It is generally realized that Christian service is neither the whole round nor the relatively pre-eminent part of the duty we owe to God. Throughout the nineteenth century the cry of the Christian heart was: "To the *Work*, to the *Work*, we are servants of God." Since then the diapason of Christian life has increasingly become: "At Thy sacred *altar* bending, God, my God, my boundless joy, harp and voice in *worship* blending, for Thy *praise* will I employ." Due to the providential impulse to worship God more and better, the Christian mind has put itself to great exertion to ascertain two things. *First*, what is the constitutive principle of worship religiously; what is the psychological instrumentation that renders the soul of man capable of worship; and what is the place of worship religiously true and psychologically correct, in the scheme of life in this world. And *second*, how may greater justice be done methodologically and technically to the expression of worship: its embodiment in artistic forms, ritual elaboration and logical sequence, and these encased in proper architecture. After nineteen centuries of liturgical thought and practice there still is room for the study of worship both public and private, as those know best who are familiar with the history of Christian worship and the principle upon which historic worship is based. Even in the Roman Catholic Church there is a Liturgic Reform movement of considerable strength. In the Reformed churches, too, it is felt that the last word regarding the seemliest way of rendering corporate worship to God has not yet been spoken. It may be added that the measure of momentum the liturgical reform movement has already gained in practically all ecclesiastical provinces of Christendom, afford incontestable proof of the tremendous spiritual energy that is at work. For it is a commonplace that religious conservatism is nowhere stronger than in the field of church worship. Efforts at liturgical reform have more than once in the past been abortive. Even today the movement has not yet passed appreciably from the theoretical theological to the practical ecclesiastical stage. On the part of orthodox Christians there is considerable sus-

picion that liturgical reform agitation is symptomatic of theological modernism and unsound mysticism. Needless to say, one can be perfectly orthodox and yet believe that liturgical improvement is imperative. But it cannot be denied truthfully that liturgical reform has been largely and most insistently demanded by such as are not distinguished by loyalty to the faith of the fathers. It is not fanciful, however, to believe, that in the course of time there may be a practical precipitate of the extensive and intensive study of matters of worship that we are witnessing in our age and day. Orthodox loyalists may eventually overcome their prejudice and apply the sound protestant principles of progress to liturgical matters no less than to matters of doctrine and polity. Meanwhile it is in order to warn those who tremble at the Word of God in holy reverence and shudder at the very thought of displeasing God in the highest exercise of religion of which they are capable and to which they are divinely called, namely, worship, against the rationalistic and mysticistic basis upon which a good deal of the liturgical reform propounded nowadays manifestly rests.

The Reformed churches must not elect Miss Underhill their liturgical counselor, though Reformed theologians should by all means closely study her book on Worship. For none who have read *Worship* and are able to judge of matters liturgical, would care to deny that the book is packed with relevant information; that it palpitates with sympathetic interest in worship; that despite its fundamental errors it bristles with fine statements born of keen and correct insight into the psychology and even into the spiritualities of worship; that, though firmly maintaining Miss Underhill's own conception of worship, it evinces at once a delightful restraint in criticizing contrary liturgical principles and a wholesome appreciation of admitted elements of truth in opposite liturgical convictions; that, last, but not least, it kindles interest in the subject it discusses and stimulates eagerness to pass from its reading to further and detailed study of the subject. No thoughtful reader can rise from its reading without having learned, afresh or by repetition, that the worship of God is a matter of superlatively transcendent importance and that its sympathetic study is accordingly an inestimable privilege as well as a religious duty. To leave such an impression with the reader is itself no mean achievement on the part of the distinguished author.

But Miss Underhill cannot serve as the liturgical monitor of those who are Calvinists by the grace of God. This will appear, to begin with, when we call to mind that her book is a part of "The Library of Constructive Theology," edited by W. R. Matthews and H. Wheeler Robinson. The editors of this Series confessedly disavow Scripture as the exclusive principle, that is, only source and absolute norm, of theology. They frankly stand committed to a rationalistic construction of religious thought and practice and tell us that the several authors of the volumes constituting the Library concerned, take this ground. Miss Underhill certainly does. Though she repeatedly mentions Scripture and often expresses a deep appreciation of its liturgical materials, it is very evident indeed that in her estimation it is not God's infallible Word in which He instructs us authoritatively and sovereignly concerning the worship that is well-pleasing in His sight. The neglect, if not the express repudiation of Scripture as the absolute canon of worship, is an error that goes to the very root of the matter and must in deference to God's Word be construed as irreverence and by that token contrary to the spirit of divine worship, though, of course, not so intended. Miss Underhill's work cannot be catalogued as theology. For theology is the scientific reconstruction of the data of biblical revelation as comprising the infallible Word of God given by Him unto men for their salvation to the praise of the glory of His grace. But *Worship* is an answer to the question how the learned author thinks God should be worshipped. Her opinion

may be interesting. It is. But Bible-believing Christians are infinitely more interested in the will of God respecting His worship as revealed in Holy Writ, than in the lucubrations of men, no matter how well-informed, liturgically gifted and temperamentally sympathetic to the subject in hand.

Miss Underhill's wrong attitude toward Scripture does not prevent her from making use of Scripture material and being in harmony with Scripture upon more than one occasion. But that she does not lead her liturgical thoughts captive to the obedience of faith in Scripture as the very Word of God Himself, may be readily gathered from the patent fact that she consistently ignores and neglects the great biblical doctrines of sin and atonement. Yet these cardinal truths bear very directly upon the worship of the God of all grace who was in Christ, that is, through His atoning death, reconciling the World unto Himself and to Whom adoring and grateful worship is rendered by pardoned, regenerated and sanctified sinners.

The author sponsors the sacramentalistic conception of worship. It would carry the present reviewer altogether too far afield to engage in a critical discussion of Sacramentalism. The above remarks are intended as an announcement calculated to fix attention upon the book under discussion and to prepare THE CALVIN FORUM readers for its discerning lection. A critical review of the book would hardly get its due unless it expanded at least into a booklet. Miss Underhill's volume fairly teems with challenges, as a Calvinist sees matters liturgical, just because it is heavily freighted, indeed, with solid thought and is exceedingly well written. On condition that the book be read with incessant discrimination, the present reviewer wishes it a wide sale and close study.

S. VOLBEDA.

### THE PROBLEM OF PRAYER

HOW CAN GOD ANSWER PRAYER? *By William Edward Biederwolf. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan. pp. 287. Price \$1.50.*

WHEN one takes up a work of Biederwolf, one expects to find in it a scriptural representation of the truth. He is in the best sense of the word a scriptural theologian. In distinction from many others he is not satisfied with a loose and superficial quotation of scripture passages, resulting in the most arbitrary interpretations, but usually bases his opinions on a careful exegesis of the text. One may not always agree with his interpretations, but will have to admit that he strives earnestly to understand and to fathom, as far as may be, the meaning of the Spirit; and that his expositions seldom make the impression of being arbitrary and far-fetched. He is a sane interpreter and one that is always willing to bring "every thought captive to the obedience of Christ."

The present work deals with an important subject, the subject of prayer; and the question to which it seeks to give an answer is one that is frequently heard in these days, in which many have lost the sense of the reality of things spiritual and eternal. Some ask it in a spirit of mockery, but others in all sincerity under the influence of the prevailing confusion. However, the author not only desires to help those who are confused in their thinking about prayer, but also to lend those who believe in the power of prayer to a better understanding of the nature and value of prayer, and to a greater appreciation of the privilege of drawing on infinite resources for their material and spiritual needs.

The writer first directs attention to the fact that it is a privilege to pray, and that prayer has always been co-extensive with religion. Wherever people believe in some higher power, they also pray. He reminds us of the sad neglect of prayer in our day, and considers the reasons that are usually given for this negligence.

Coming to the subject proper in the second part of his book, he takes issue with some modern conceptions of prayer and points out that the element of petition, ruled out by some, is after all the most essential, and is prominently in the fore-

ground in Scripture. While freely and fully recognizing the reflex influence of prayer on the person praying, he stresses the more important point of the influence of prayer on God.

The third part of the book is devoted to a consideration of the question, how can God answer prayer. This part will be of particular value to many in our day, since it provides an answer to the oft-repeated assertions that God cannot answer prayer in view of the universal reign of law and of the fact that He himself has predetermined all things.

The fourth part of the book, which is the largest, answers the important question, How to pray. It is full of valuable instruction for believers, valuable especially because it is directly based on the Word of God. The work of the Holy Spirit in prayer comes in for due consideration, and the scriptural conditions of true prayer are clearly set forth. Every Christian will do well to read and ponder this part of the work, since it is invaluable for proper guidance. This part contains some very interesting exegetical discussions.

The perplexed Christian who feels that God does not answer his prayers had better read the fifth part of this book before he draws any hasty conclusions. It may contain the cure for his perplexity of soul and place him once more on solid ground. We heartily recommend the reading and study of this book. May it be a source of rich spiritual blessing for many.

L. BERKHOF.

### ON GOD'S ETERNAL ELECTION

DE L'ÉLECTION ÉTERNELLE DE DIEU, ÉDITIONS LABOR, Genève. Paper, 318 pp. Price: Fr. 4:40, postage 50c (equivalent to \$1.13).

JEAN MOURA et Paul Louvet in their book *Calvin* tell us how Farel had found a wife satisfying every stipulation set by the great Reformer. Unfortunately she did not know French, and Calvin did not know German. The match, of course, was off. The American spiritual sons of Calvin, however, must converse in three foreign languages to enjoy to the full the activities of the Calvinistic family. At the same time we do not have to disown each other for all the main addresses of the Calvinistic Conference of 1936 have been translated in the form of a resume in languages in which the essay was not given. "The Eternal Election of God" is the title given to the Acts of the Genevan Calvinistic Conference of 1936. The morning Bible discussions, and the evening popular lectures are not translated. The resumes of the main addresses are rather comprehensive. The instructive and revealing discussions which followed the delivery of an essay unfortunately could not be translated.

The schedule of discussions is found on pages six and seven. At nine in the morning some passage of Scripture was expounded. At ten o'clock the doctrine of Election was studied systematically. At four o'clock this same doctrine was related to pastoral work. At eight-thirty popular lectures, suitable to the needs of a congregation, were given in the *Temple de la Madeleine*. The only lecture that did not interest itself in the doctrine of election was that of Prof. V. H. Rutgers of the Free University of Amsterdam who spoke on "Calvinism and the State." He made a popular but clearcut plea for the political principles of the Anti-Revolutionary Party of the Netherlands. One regrets that this lecture is in French.

The first two Bible discussions are in French, the third is in English, and the fourth is in German. The French are more expository, the English is more topical, and the German is more exegetical in method.

The systematic treatment of the doctrine of election begins with the Biblical basis of Calvin's doctrine of predestination (German), then "Predestination in Calvin's dogmatics" (English), and finally the same subject treated not historically but systematically (French). The resumes are very good.

The afternoon discourses center around election and pastoral theology in the widest sense of the term. The interesting thing, not unintentional, is that in the afternoon meetings the term election is employed instead of predestination. The titles

of the subjects are: "Election and Vocation" (English); "Election and Preaching" (German); "Election and Sacraments" (French); and "Election and the Cure of Souls" (German—Cure of souls translation of *Seelsorge*). The resumes do justice to the essays.

The evening speeches are of deep interest to the everyday Christian. As could be expected, these were delivered in the French language, the vernacular of Geneva. "Election and Faith"; "Election and the Church" were given a popular but very instructive presentation.

In reviewing this book one is reviewing the Acts of the Calvinistic Conference of Geneva. There are certain very favorable impressions. Modernism has no use for the doctrine of predestination. We are thankful that the continental theologians discussed an old topic in a modern way. After reading this book one is impressed again with the greatness of the man Calvin. The Bible discussions reveal a recognition of the danger of self-complacency. Many discussions testify of a genuine love for the doctrine as taught by John Calvin. The minds of scholars moulded the conference. One also rejoices to read that practically all insisted upon preaching that God has no desire in the death of a sinner no matter how difficult this may be for human minds to reconcile with God's sovereign election. Finally, the very attempt to relate one doctrine so fundamental to all phases of our religious life is certainly commendable. To understand modern Calvinism this book will occupy an important place in our studies.

One would sincerely wish that the foregoing is all that should be said about this conference. A great value of this book is its revelation of differences within the Calvinistic family. Barthianism seems more disintegrating than progressive. If one wishes to study Barthianism and Calvinism these Acts would constitute a primary source. The Rev. Peter Barth opens up the issue rather moderately. As the discussions progress a certain M. Hommes exclaims that if Mr. Peter Barth's position were normative, the entire Congress could be called a congress for anti-calvinistic theology (p. 248). Mr. Oorthuys, after praising Mr. Barth for many things, fears that Mr. Barth with his fear for "pro" or "pre" in predestination will arrive at no other conclusion than Arminianism and Helagianism. This book shows that there is a vital understanding of the differences involved.

Many of the discussions centered around familiar topics: Natural theology; "infra and supra," although useless from a Barthian point of view; Word of God; the Bible; Election and the Word of God.

It is advisable for any novice to ask what does the author mean when he employs a term no matter how the term may have been taken in the past. For example, take the term eternal counsel. Eternity is something beyond the law of causation. Eternal election simply means that election is independent of anything causal. For a Barthian, eternal counsel does not mean what we think it does when we say we are elected before the foundation of the world. In this connection we must bear in mind a Barthian phobia for anything like a system. A system would be cause and effect, and this would limit God. Election is also associated with the Word of God as interpreted by Barthians. How this is related to the eternal good pleasure of God is hard to ascertain. All that election means to some is that in the act of preaching God opens the heart of one, and closes the heart of the other. P. Barth even suggests in a discussion (p. 247), whether or not we must include the term election in the things we see in a mirror in the sense that the word election conceals more than reveals.

The Rev. Prof. A. LeCerf distinguished between the old and the new Calvinists. Frankly, an old Calvinist happens to be the present reviewer.

JACOB T. HOOGSTRA.

Englewood, N. J.

## FOSTER ON E. A. PARK

THE LIFE OF EDWARDS AMASA PARK. By F. H. Foster. Revell, 1936.

IN this posthumous volume Dr. Foster presents us with a biography of a key man in the history of American theology. Dr. Park came from generations of New England Puritans. He was thoroughly at home in the New England theology, fully aware of its distinctive character, and enthusiastically persuaded of its truth. His life covers the years from 1808 till 1900; the period, in which our nation outgrew its colonial provincialism and gradually gained recognition by the European nations as their equal. As professor at Andover, between 1836 and 1881, he shared in the training of upward of two thousand theological students. In those years the Congregationalists led in educational endeavor, and Dr. Park was successful in placing a great number of his students in influential educational positions. In as far as the New England theology has put its stamp on American Christianity, this is in no small degree due to the influence of Dr. Park.

It would have been difficult to pick a man better qualified to write a biography of Dr. Park than Dr. Foster. He had himself studied under Park, and the whole "Life" throbs with the reverence and affection of a grateful pupil for a teacher of rare nobility of character and outstanding pedagogical gifts. We owe him the laborious work on the Genetic History of the New England Theology, in which he communicates to us of his minute knowledge of the systems of the New England theologians and of the theology of Dr. Park. How close he must have been to Dr. Park and how sympathetic to his theological position, is revealed in the fact, that Park proposed him as his successor in the chair of systematic theology at Andover. At the same time, subsequent dissent from the views of Park secured for him a great measure of objectivity in estimating the value of Park's positions and work. Dr. Foster has had access to a great mass of biographical material in manuscript form, and he does not fail to acquaint his readers with its nature and contributions.

The book captivates the reader, and yet through it runs a note of sadness that reflects the great tragedies in the lives of both, its subject and its author. Professor Park lived and labored for the purpose of perpetuating and making triumphant the New England theology. Through periods of strife and years of renown, amid gloom and joy he was sustained and stimulated by the confident hope that this would be attained. But his years of active service ended with the discovery, that the men in control of the seminary, and its faculty, were no longer behind him, and his life lingered till it was manifest that his former students revered him far more for his success in making them think than for the system of thought which he had tried to instil in their minds. Dr. Foster shared with his teacher the great disappointment of being rejected as Park's nominee for the succession of Park. And seven years after his teacher's death he publicly declared himself no longer in agreement with the theology which Park had so zealously advocated.

Some underlying causes of this sudden and tragic collapse of the endeavors of Dr. Park at the appearance of modernism and liberalism in theology Dr. Foster points out to his readers. One is the compromise position upon which Andover Seminary was founded: it tried to straddle both, the Westminster Confession and the New England theology. Another is the incompatibility of a static system of theology with the creedal freedom of Congregationalism. As to a third underlying cause we might point to the fatal defect that characterizes the New England theology as a whole: its tendency and persistent endeavor completely to rationalize revealed truth. It was above all this weakness, that drained it of the power of offering rational resistance to the modern denial of special revelation. Dr. Foster would, of course, not acknowledge this trait as a weakness of the New England theology. But this difference on fundamentals does not lower our estimate of the volume under review as a splendid biography. Its publication was made possible by the donations of friends who hoped thus to rescue the memory of Dr. Park from oblivion.

D. H. KROMMINGA.

## DUTCH CHURCH HISTORY

VADERLANDSCHE KERKGESCHIEDENIS. *By G. Vander Zee. J. H. Kok, Kampen, Netherlands. 2 vols. 1935/1937. Price: Vol. I, fl. 5.80. Vol. II, fl. 7.50.*

THE appearance in print of this comprehensive work on the history of the Church in the Netherlands is a welcome event. Its publication was motivated by the consideration that the older works on the same subject are out of print. We may add, that the most recent of these, the volume by J. Kuiper, though covering the entire field with great fulness, suffers seriously from the lack of proper organization. This new history of the Dutch Church does not show such a defect. Its author has combined the results of earlier with those of more recent research, and has succeeded well in uniting scholarship with popularity. The style is lucid, and the two volumes which have so far appeared are both very readable.

Together, they carry the history down to the great Synod of Dordt, held in 1618 and 1619. The first volume is devoted to the Mediæval period, and the second to the century of the Reformation. The outstanding feature of the first volume is the light shed on obscure phases of the history of Christianity in the Netherlands. Where lack of sources make it impossible to clear up confusion, as in the case of the ages of the inroads of the Northmen, the author at least makes the cause and unavoidableness of obscurity clear to his readers. Of the second volume, the most striking trait is the polemics against both, the Roman Catholic, and the Liberal reading of the history of the Reformation. Here particularly the author shows himself to be a convinced adherent of the Reformed faith and a zealous supporter of the national Dutch ecclesiastical organization, in which he is serving as a minister of the Gospel.

Those two volumes are to be followed by a third, which presumably will complete the history of the national Church of the Netherlands to the present. While fervently hoping, that the author will be enabled to at least carry out his plans, the present reviewer sincerely wishes, that he may be moved and enabled to do more. Undoubtedly, as the material relative to the Reformation age has grown upon him, so will the material of the subsequent centuries. The period between the Synod of Dordt and the reorganization of 1816 would seem to furnish an abundance of developments in both, the field of theological thought, and the sphere of the interrelation of the Church and the State, the proper presentation of which in the interests of a sound understanding of the modern situation will easily fill a third volume comparable in extent to one of these first two.

And since the latter date another one hundred and twenty years have elapsed, which are crowded with events of significance for the Church of the Netherlands. Just how much of this material the author would desire to incorporate, naturally can not be guessed. It is possible, that the adjective in the title of this work is intended strictly as a modifier with the concept of the Church, and not with the concept of the history, so that we should look for a history of the National Dutch Church rather than for a comprehensive history of the Christian Church in the Netherlands. The work would then in so far be like unto that written in 1884 by G. J. Vos, Az. There are indeed indications that suggest, that such is the intention of Van der Zee. But even so his strictly orthodox Reformed position would lead one to look for a rather full treatment of the organizational and doctrinal deterioration of the national church and of the various attempts at reformation, the failure of which issued in secessions from the national Church, as well as of the subsequent revival and increase of orthodoxy within the national organization.

To compress all this material into one volume, comparable in size to one of the two that have so far made their appearance, appears not at all desirable. We of the Reformed persuasion, and particularly we of Dutch ecclesiastical antecedents, accept these two volumes with gratitude and look forward to the promised third volume with hopeful expectation, because we feel that the writer interprets Dutch Church history fundamentally from our own standpoint. Our appreciation and grati-

tude would be all the greater, if Rev. Van der Zee could favor us with the fuller treatment of the more recent material.

D. H. KROMMINGA.

## BELIEVING THE BIBLE

WHY I BELIEVE THE BIBLE. *By Michael MarYosip. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan. pp. 136. Price \$1.50.*

THE writer of this book informs us that he was born and reared in the Syriac-speaking Church, which spoke an Aramaic dialect similar to that spoken by our Lord. He is now pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, U. S., Temple, Texas. The four hundredth anniversary of the printing of the Bible in English was the occasion for writing the book.

In the opening chapter of the book the author complains about the widespread neglect of the Bible in our day and about the resulting ignorance of its teachings. He speaks of it as the central theme of his book "that God has spoken in the Bible as He has done in no other book." His belief in the Bible is not grounded in the conviction that it is in all its parts and words the infallibly inspired Word of God, but rather in the fact that the Bible is God's revelation in a unique sense, that in it God speaks to us as He does nowhere else. He does not emphasize inspiration, but revelation.

There is something Barthian in this emphasis. In fact, there are several passages in the book that remind us of Barth as, for instance, its correct insistence on the fact that the central fact in religion is not that man seeks and finds God, but that God approaches man with His self-revelation; its lax view of inspiration, leaving ample room for the operations of higher criticism; its refusal to identify the Bible with the Word of God; and its belief that God still continues to reveal Himself by His Spirit.

The author has evidently read widely on the subject under consideration, and is relatively conservative in his presentations of the truth. Yet he reveals a very evident tendency to adapt himself to the critical studies of the Bible right up to and even beyond the danger-point, which he, of course, does not recognize as such. He finds the arguments for his belief in the Bible in the land of the Book, the people of the Book, the prophets of the Book, the God of the Book, and the Christ of the Book.

The book is written in an interesting style and testifies to a well-balanced mind. The writer is not an extremist, and his work may have a steadying influence on some minds. There is much in the work that deserves appreciation, but a Bible believing Christian will hardly be satisfied with it. The good things which the critics still say about the Bible are played up, and little attention is paid to what the Bible says for itself. Kenneth J. Foreman says in the Introduction to the book: "The present work is devoted to showing the direction in which reason points." And reason can hardly be called a satisfactory ground for one's faith in the Bible.

L. BERKHOF.

## COW-OLGY, AND SO FORTH

WATCH YOURSELF GO BY. *By Edward Kuhlmann. Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio. 174 pages. \$1.00.*

THIS little volume contains 56 musings on human thought and conduct. For the most part these short essays consist of moralizings on some interesting incident or story. The titles are invariably catching. The reflections upon a man who worked himself to death in the service of Mammon are headed: "Kicked by a Golden Calf." In "A Snowman Talks to Me" striking analogies calculated to promote a wholesome spiritual life are presented. "A Scab Sermon" draws lessons from scabs that cover skin abrasions. "Cow-ology" informs us how to eat grass and avoid the weeds in the pastures of life. These illustrations will suffice to characterize the essays. They are the kind that make one want to read the next and then the next one. Pointed illustrations are they, that could be used for driving home moral and spiritual lessons. H. S.