

THE CALVIN FORUM

A MONTHLY

Princeton and Barthianism

Brunner's Appointment

South African Boers

Cloete's Book Evaluated

19th Century Painting

Its Background

German Church Struggle

The 1933-'34 Crisis

Economic Groups

Better Understanding?

Lecerf's Dogmatics

A Review

Books Reviewed

News and Comments

Verse

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 JELLEMA, Ph.D., PROF. DIEDRICH H. KROMMINGA, A.B., Th.B., PROF. H. HENRY MEETER, Th.D.; 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. 11, JUNE, 1938

EDITORIAL

Princeton, Barthianism, and Brunner.....	243
Realistic Fiction and Godless Propaganda.....	246
Modern Art and Christian Standards.....	246
Studying Calvinism in its Deeper Implications.....	247

ARTICLES

The Voortrekkers of South Africa. By J. Chr. Coetzee, D.Phil.....	247
Schools of Nineteenth Century Painting. By Henry J. Van Andel, A.M.....	251
The German Church Crisis. By Leonard De Moor, Ph.D.....	253
Toward Understanding. By Henry J. Ryskamp, Ph.D.....	256
Professor Lecerf on Religious Knowledge. By Jacob T. Hoogstra, Th.D.....	258

BOOK REVIEWS

Psychology and Pastoral Care.....	260
Calvinistic Philosophy Club.....	260
On Inspiration.....	261
An Exposé of Liberalism.....	261
Organizer of American Presbyterianism.....	261
A Lenski Commentary.....	262
A New Testament Introduction.....	262
Monkey Mileage.....	262
Paul.....	262

NEWS AND COMMENTS

Netherlands Church News.....	262
Religious News Items.....	263

VERSE

Light in Darkness.....	257
------------------------	-----

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

VOLUME III

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., JUNE, 1938

NUMBER 11

PRINCETON, BARTHIANISM, AND BRUNNER AN EDITORIAL

FOR the future development of Reformed Theology in America there is possibly no issue of greater immediate importance than the issue raised by Barthianism.

Barthianism is a new school of theological thought which has made a profound impression especially on the European Continent ever since its rise about fifteen years ago. Of late its influence has been felt increasingly in our own country. Even those liberals who have been loudest in repudiating its basic positions have often markedly undergone its influence. On the whole, however, the Modernists in our land have been quite averse to the main thrust of this type of thought. It is especially the mediating type of theological thought in the larger Reformed and Presbyterian bodies that has shown great sympathy for this new theology.

The most outstanding illustration of this attitude may be seen in the recent stand, policies, and appointments of Princeton Theological Seminary. This revered bulwark of the historic Reformed Faith, the school of Warfield and the Hodges, has suddenly been placed in the limelight by its unmistakable championship of the new point of view, call it Barthianism, Crisis Theology, Dialectical Theology, the new Existential Theology, or whatever you will. The Presbyterian (U. S. A.) leaders who had the reins in hand during the turbulent days of the "re-organization" of Princeton, resulting for one thing in the founding of Westminster Seminary, have largely pinned their hope theologically on Barthianism. Without in any way implying that everyone on the Princeton faculty has gone Barthian, it is beyond dispute that the new enthusiasm at this institution draws its inspiration theologically from this source.

The coming of Dr. John Mackay to Princeton as successor to President J. Ross Stevenson placed at the head of this venerable institution a man who had drunk deeply at the fountains of the new theology of Barth and Brunner. Under the title, "The Role of Princeton Seminary," the newly appointed President wrote as spokesman for the institution as follows:

Still more significant is the fact that the theological tradition which is most relevant to the deepest needs of our time is the theology that is ordinarily designated "Calvinistic" or "Reformed." In these days of the totalitarian state with its claim to absolute sovereignty, the doctrine of the sovereignty of God has a pungent, contemporary flavor. It is the theology of Karl Barth that put iron into the resistance of the Confessional church in Germany. It is Reformed theologians like Barth and Brunner who have smashed the presuppositions of theological modernism and rekindled faith in the Scriptures and historic Christianity.

And if this statement may be said to have left no doubt in the minds of the Princeton alumni (to whom it was originally addressed) as to the enthusiasm of the newly appointed President for the thought of Barth and Brunner, neither did he leave his audience in the dark as to his plans and ideals for instilling this new spirit in the student mind of today and of the future. He went on:

A strong graduate school of Reformed theology at Princeton is imperatively needed. The renaissance of evangelical learning which has flushed the horizon of European thought must come to America. Certain false conceptions regarding the Reformed faith which have been devastating in their influence must be dissipated. Our Seminary must seize the present providential opportunity to give vital theological leadership in our Church, our country, and the world today. If we are to match this hour, we who are Princeton Seminary alumni can do so, under God, only in close-knit comradeship behind our alma mater, and with the co-operation in teaching positions of the best minds that our Church and other Reformed churches can supply. We have a distinguished faculty today. Its distinction must be maintained and increased tomorrow. (*The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, Nov. 1937, pp 1-2).

If some of his audience may have been left in the dark as to the exact identity of the "certain false conceptions regarding the Reformed faith which have been devastating in their influence" and which "must be dissipated," none of the alumni were left in doubt as to the new President's determination to place men of Barthian leanings and sympathies in key positions on the Seminary faculty. Among the new appointments announced in the same issue of the *Bulletin* in which the above quoted address was reported there were no less than three men of pronounced Barthian sympathies. They were Dr. E. G. Homrighausen, Dr. Otto Piper, and Dr. Frederick Bronkema. It is interesting to note that, though two of these three are graduates of Princeton Semi-

nary, none of the three is really a son of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Dr. Bronkema, who is a son of the Christian Reformed Church and a graduate of Calvin College and Seminary, was appointed Instructor (not Professor in the place of Caspar Wistar Hodge, as some papers erroneously reported) in Systematic Theology. He received his Barthian sympathies under Professor Richard Niebuhr of Yale and wrote his doctor's thesis on some phase of Brunner's theology. Dr. Homrighausen is a son of the Reformed Church in the U. S., better known as the German Reformed Church. This, by the way, is the church in which a man of pronounced Barthian sympathies as George W. Richards is an outstanding leader. Dr. Homrighausen was elected to the chair of Christian Education. He is best known as translator of some of Barth's works and for his *Christianity in America, A Crisis*, a 1936 book. Dr. Piper is a German, having studied and taught at various institutions on the Continent. In 1929 he succeeded Karl Barth in the Chair of Systematic Theology at Münster. His appointment was only as Guest Professor for the year 1937-38 at Princeton.

The boldest move for the establishment of the Crisis Theology at Princeton Seminary, however, was made a few months ago with the appointment of Emil Brunner to the Chair formerly occupied by Charles Hodge, Benjamin B. Warfield, and Caspar Wistar Hodge. This appointment has been accepted by the Zürich theologian at least for the coming year, so that he will be Guest Professor at Princeton for the school year 1938-39, just as Dr. Piper was for the year that has just closed. In the course of the next academic year it will then be decided whether Dr. Brunner chooses to stay permanently. He is scheduled to deliver two addresses at an Autumn Conference to be held on the Seminary campus September 15th and 16th and will have charge, according to announcements, of a question box after each address.

* * * *

It can readily be understood that these moves toward the introduction and acclimatization of the theology of Barth and Brunner at what has ever been known as the oldest and most illustrious stronghold of historic Reformed Theology in the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. have made a profound impression upon Presbyterian and Reformed leaders in America.

And the reaction has been varied. What cannot be said of the Reformed Church in America, of the Christian Reformed Church, and the Presbyterian Church in America, is true of such bodies as the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. (Northern), the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. (Southern), and of the Reformed Church in the U. S. (*i. e.*, the German Reformed, which recently united with the Evangelical Church), *viz.*, that the theology of Barth and Brunner finds open protagonists as well as opponents.

As for the German Reformed Church, opposition apparently is limited to a very small group of conservative, historically Reformed leaders, whose influence is not very great in their own body and who have their hands more than full just now fighting the battle against church union with its attendant undermining of the historic Reformed creed and Reformed church polity in their own communion. In the Southern Presbyterian Church may be heard the voice of Dr. Holmes Rolston of Rockbridge Baths, Va., who in the *Christian Observer* of March 9, 1938, wrote on "The Significance of the Coming of Dr. Brunner to America," and gave expression to his unqualified and unbounded joy at the prospect. He is the author of a 1933 book entitled *A Conservative Looks to Barth and Brunner*. On the other hand, Dr. W. C. Robinson, Professor at Columbia Theological Seminary, also of the Southern Church, points out in an article in the May issue of *The Mississippi Visitor* that though Brunner has undoubtedly done yeoman service in combatting liberalism in one way, he cannot be absolved from having succumbed to some essentially liberal positions nevertheless. Says he: "The conservative who wishes to see the doctrine of inspiration taught by our Lord and His authorized Apostles and the Virgin Birth maintained will have to find some other protagonist than Professor Emil Brunner."

It is not surprising that some of the most outspoken voices of protest and opposition against the new trend of things at Princeton should be heard in the two church groups that either are or have been most closely identified with Princeton Seminary.

In *The Presbyterian Guardian* there have for some time appeared articles in criticism of Princeton and its pro-Barthian standpoint. Professor John Murray, recently installed as regular Professor of Systematic Theology at Westminster Seminary, Philadelphia, has done so, and also Professor Van Til from the same institution. The latter has for some time used the same paper as a vehicle for his voice of protest in the matter. He has shown that in such basic doctrines as revelation, creation, and others there is no justification for identifying the Barth-Brunner and the historically Reformed position.

Nor have these Presbyterian voices of protest or questioning been limited to the Westminster group.

Dr. Craig, the editor of *Christianity Today*, has written a number of strong articles on the subject of late. He has pointed out that Dr. Homrighausen denies the infallibility and inerrancy of the Scriptures; that no one who does this has the right to appeal to Dr. F. L. Patton, as was done; and that his appointment certainly is in conflict with the acknowledged and historic doctrinal position of Princeton Seminary. His protest against the appointment of Dr. Brunner is couched in more cautious terms, owing no doubt to the influence of certain explanations which the latter had made of his views in a letter to the Trustees of Princeton Seminary.

nary. In the April issue (which, by the way, is the last monthly issue to appear, since the magazine is henceforth to appear only three times a year), however, he takes a strong stand against having the General Assembly confirm the appointment of Dr. Homrighausen in view of the fact that his stand is not in full accord with the Standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

* * * *

Two unexpected voices of leaders in the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. on this subject might well be mentioned before we close.

Dr. John E. Kuizenga, the successor of Dr. Van Til at Princeton in the chair of Apologetics, wrote two articles in *The Presbyterian*, the one of March 31st, the other of April 14th. The former is entitled "The Old in the New," the latter, "On Putting One's Harness Off." Professor Kuizenga has an interesting collection of pointed carpet tacks which he strikes squarely on the head, not always to the comfort and edification of the Barthians. Here are a few samples:

To say in Germany that the Church must break both with an impossible liberalism and with a stagnant orthodoxy in order to write theology anew, may be desirable and necessary; but for the "young Barthians" to make a similar statement here may prove only that "they know not what manner of spirit they are of."

Referring unmistakably to *The Christian Century* he delivers this thrust:

A widely read "religious weekly" seems to divide its time between frantic attempts to get hold again of "the gospel," and stertorous assertions that it is "not turning back to the old orthodoxy." That journal is not alone in its painful confusion. Not a few who shout from the housetops that "the days of a new orthodoxy are at hand" seem to know so little of the "old orthodoxy," that they fail to appreciate the statements of both Barth and Brunner they have only rediscovered the theology of the Reformation.

Rather facetiously the author then uses a little yarn to discomfit the all too confident Barthians. He writes:

My personal apprehension is, however, from the "Barthians." Some wag once remarked of student class room translations from Latin into English, that the students were translating from one unknown language into another. I see both "liberals" and "conservatives" who are so rapidly selling out to the "new orthodoxy," that I wonder whether they are not in the same case as the students.

Resorting to designations of current politics he goes on:

The "new dealers" hold rather high carnival with their alleged new discoveries—the otherness of God, special revelation, the deity and Saviorhood of Jesus Christ, the depravity of man, salvation by faith only, the imperfections of all "good works," and a sort of contempt of all human and Church activity. We ought to be thankful that they are at last willing to put this shining armor on—it has been waiting for them long enough, seeing that the Reformed theology had all that, and in a better form.

He pays his respects to the fetish of the paradox as follows:

To stress the "foolishness of preaching" is a dubious excuse for all the foolishness now preached; Christian Science is also

not bothered by the principle of non-contradiction; some truth is paradoxical, not every paradox is truth, and persistent paradoxing may be a pathological performance.

And then he winds up with a clever fish story which is not all fish:

To pour contempt on human nature is not the last word, until we have faced the question whether sin has destroyed the real nature of man. To ring the changes on the need of regeneration is a service, especially in an age which has too long stressed "salvation by education"; but to bring this to the old theology as a new find is to be a boy exhibiting his tiny perch in the fishmarket.

Another voice that is significant in this connection is that of Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse of the Tenth Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia. Under the title, "Some Questions for Professor Brunner," he writes an article in the May 5th issue of *The Presbyterian*. He says that he is "greatly disturbed" by some of Brunner's recent pronouncements. After contrasting Barth and Brunner (in which contrast the estimate of the comparative soundness of Barth is, in the estimation of the present writer, altogether too favorable) he points out that Brunner denies the historicity of Adam, the reality of the state of rectitude, the historicity of the fall, and then asks pertinently: "Is it possible for Dr. Brunner to have a proper concept of the Person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ after denying the Biblical concept of man in his original state, in his Fall and consequent necessity of redemption from original sin?"

In the same issue President Mackay of Princeton, having been invited to do so by the editor of *The Presbyterian*, makes reply under the title, "Some Answers for Dr. Barnhouse."

He takes up cudgels for Brunner in the latter's absence in Switzerland. Appreciating Dr. Barnhouse's acknowledgement that Brunner has done great service in opposing modernism, he continues: "It was the recognition of this same fact that made no less a personage than the late Dr. Machen such an enthusiastic admirer of Brunner's when the latter lectured at Princeton a decade ago, at a time when Dr. Machen was still a professor in this Seminary." Of Dr. Barnhouse's statement to the effect that Brunner is guilty of major denials of Christian doctrine, President Mackay then says that "he is making an affirmation which is positively and utterly untrue, and which I cannot allow to go unchallenged."

The rest of the article is strong in assertions but weak in real rebuttal. The real point of Dr. Barnhouse's criticism, *viz.*, the denial on the part of Brunner of the *historicity* of the first Adam, the *historicity* of the state of rectitude, and the *historicity* of the fall of man is not only not refuted but virtually conceded by President Mackay. What else can one read in this connection out of a statement like the following. "He [*i. e.*, Brunner] insists that in the story of the Fall, the ineffable mystery itself is clothed in symbolical language, as is the story of the Creation, and is, moreover, supra-historical in character." It is easier to accuse Dr.

Barnhouse of having succumbed to an "unwitting travesty of Dr. Brunner's position," as President Mackay does in this connection, than to meet the real objection, an objection, moreover, which Dr. Charles Hodge, whom Dr. Mackay quotes with such confidence and facility as being on Brunner's side, would share with Dr. Barnhouse if he lived today.

One of the questions that Brunner will have to face to give satisfaction to those who believe in the historically Reformed position of the Westminster standards is precisely: Is an appeal from the historical to the "supra-historical" (whatever that may mean!) in this connection in harmony with Scripture itself and the basic principles of a sound Reformed theology? Or, to change the question slightly: If the appeal from historic fact to myth in the Bible account of the fall is permissible, what is the difference between this sort of "mythologizing" of an allegedly Reformed theologian and the "mythologizing" of an Origen, a Hegel, a Schleiermacher, and a Reinhold Niebuhr?

C. B.

Realistic Fiction and Godless Propaganda

THERE is a place for realistic fiction, provided the realism is true to the realities of life and knows the bounds of decency. As a reaction against certain wishy-washy, unreal, and utterly unpsychological "Sunday-School" stories, the desire for fiction that shall picture life as it really is can be appreciated. But the present-day wave of "realistic" fiction cannot be justified from any such consideration. There is undoubtedly a good deal of wholesome and impressive realistic writing being done these days, but much of it is nothing but the literary gilding of moral filth. Especially sex is being exploited to the limit. In true Freudian fashion sex in its normal, but especially its perverted forms, is pictured as the mainspring of human desire and endeavor. Coupled with this sex-obsession there often is an outspoken hostility against the historic norms and standards of the Christian faith and of Christian morality. Blasphemy, profanity, and ridicule for religion runs as a scarlet thread through much of recent realistic fiction. The sensibilities of many a Christian, who finds himself in a position that he must read much of recent fiction, are outraged again and again, and it is to be feared that in the case of many a Christian youth the constant reading of such "literature" has a seriously depressing effect upon his religious beliefs and moral standards. The cynicism that marks many a sophisticated youth in our day can often be traced to a generous indulgence in the "realistic" fiction of the day. Not only that much of this fiction has a demoralizing effect, but much of it is propaganda pure and simple for irreligious thinking and living. There are many writers of fiction who under the cloak of "realism" are giving

vent in their stories to the essential godlessness that fills their hearts. Having denounced much of traditional, at least idealistic, writing as "unreal" and as prompted by religious and moral propaganda, these writers now in turn resort to the most vicious kind of propaganda for their irreligion, all under the mendacious garb of realism. In its most nauseating and revolting form, at least for the Christian, one can see this sort of propaganda in stories that depict persons known for their profession of religion as hypocrites and moral perverts. In such works of fiction atheistic propaganda is at its best and worst. After reading the article of Professor Coetzee of Potchefstroom, South Africa, appearing in this issue under the title, "The Voortrekkers (Pioneers) of South Africa," we now know that Stuart Cloete's recent novel on the Boers of South Africa belongs in this class. We take this occasion to thank Dr. Coetzee for his helpful and illuminating article. Those who have read Cloete's perverted picturization of our spiritual cousins in South Africa should by all means read Professor Coetzee's article. And—quite apart from Cloete's book—the article admirably serves to deepen our appreciation of the 19th century pioneers of the South African Dutch, with whose racial and religious heritage we have so high a degree of affinity.

C. B.

Modern Art and Christian Standards

TO the average person who has not enjoyed any technical training in the history, the principles, and the appreciation of art, modern painting is a perfect puzzle. In fact, it may be that even to many who can boast of such training. What is the meaning expressed in the fantastic productions of many a present-day artist's brush? What are the emotions, the aspirations, and the evaluations to which these artists give expression? These are questions of interest to everyone who has any appreciation of painting. The Christian, moreover, wonders what the underlying drift of recent movements in art may be. He wonders just what the connection is between the spirit of the age with its irreligious thrust and the products of the brush of the artist who is himself largely a child of the age in which he lives. In this study one should guard against two extremes. A superficial knowledge of the principles and technique of such an art as painting may lead a Christian to jump at hasty conclusions and unintelligent condemnation. On the other hand, it is common, especially with those who have immersed themselves deeply in modern art, to deny that art is a form of expression of convictions, evaluations, beliefs, and aspirations. If the former extreme leads readily to a wholesale condemnation of art without real knowledge of the subject, the latter as readily produces an attitude of mind which divorces art from all else, glorifies it on its own

account, "emancipates" it from all religious and moral standards, and hence refuses to see any "trends" in art that are expressive of the religious (or irreligious) and moral (or immoral) convictions of the age. The intelligent Christian should guard against falling into either extreme in his evaluation and appreciation of modern art. Professor Van Andel's article on Modern Painting appearing elsewhere in this issue is a fine analysis of the deeper spiritual trends of the last century and a half in their bearing upon the various schools in the field of painting. Articles like these—the present article will be followed by another on Ultra-Modern Painting—can be of inestimable value to the Christian who has been groping around for light on the subject of the religious and moral background of trends in modern painting. We commend these articles for thoughtful perusal to all our readers, whether they have enjoyed a technical training in art or not. Also in the field of art our evaluations and appreciations should be determined by the principles and standards of our Christian faith. C. B.

Studying Calvinism in Its Deeper Implications

ONE of the hopeful signs apparent among Calvinistic groups in various countries is the desire on the part of many of the younger generation to make a study of the deeper implications of their faith, the Reformed Faith. This faith should be preached from the pulpit; inculcated in the minds of the rising generation in home and church and school; and practically applied in missionary endeavor and in the affairs of government, of business, and of industry. But it should also be made increasingly the object of scholarly research and exposition. Calvinism is a world and life view. It answers the deeper questions which are raised by the thinker. It offers the only satisfying answer to the perplexing problems of life. Unless Calvinists

will take also this part of their task seriously, the movement will lose its deeper grounding and distinct identity and the institutions and organizations that were originally launched under the inspiration of the Calvinistic faith will be swept from their moorings. Calvinism must meet the challenge of the thought of the age by unfolding the spiritual resources of its own faith in the light of the issues of today and with the weapons, the intellectual tools, of the twentieth century. That this is the task of the institutions for higher education founded by Calvinistic groups is quite apparent. Those who teach in colleges, universities, and seminaries dedicated to the development and defense of the Calvinistic world and life view are privileged to have a direct share in this task. But there are also other means at hand for the deepening of our faith in the scholarly sense of the word. One of these is the organization of groups who make it their business to discuss together various aspects of Calvinism as a system of thought and life. Such discussion clubs, whether their meetings be public or private, can be a potent force for the clarification of the philosophical and theological implications of our faith. Such an organization is the Society for Calvinistic Philosophy in the Netherlands, of which Dr. Vollenhoven of the Free University of Amsterdam is the President. On another occasion we have called attention to the quarterly issued by this society and to a few of the works written by some of its representatives. (See THE CALVIN FORUM, Nov. 1937, p. 93; July 1936, p. 268.) Of late two clubs with similar aim, though quite independent of the Dutch society, have been organized in our own country. The one, under the leadership of Dr. C. Van Til, is located in the East. The other was organized recently in Western Michigan and has elected the undersigned as its President. It is hoped that these and other clubs will both individually and unitedly make their contribution to the deepening of Calvinistic thought, both in its historic and its systematic phases. C. B.

THE VOORTREKKERS OF SOUTH AFRICA

J. Chr. Coetzee, M.A., M.Ed., D.Phil.

Professor of Education, Potchefstroom University College, Potchefstroom, Transvaal, South Africa

IN THE CALVIN FORUM of February, 1938, Marianne Vos Radius reviewed two novels in which attempts were made to portray the Voortrekkers of South Africa, the one, *They Seek a Country* by F. B. Young, rather sympathetic; and the other, *The Turning Wheels*, erring on the side of antipathy. I read the combined review with great interest and equal appreciation, knowing how difficult it must be for an American friend exactly to gauge the value of these two books from a purely historical

point of view, especially since both authors claim to have written from first hand knowledge and experience. The reviewer did me the honor of appealing to me as the man on the spot for my criticism of the two books. I read both books and am happily in the position to accede to her request, also supported by the Editor, who sent me a marked copy of THE CALVIN FORUM as well.

In acceding to this kind request, I may be allowed to limit my criticism to a review of these books only

from a historical point of view. About the literary merits or demerits of these books I do not wish to express an opinion. *They Seek a Country* is a fair portrait, though slightly too sympathetic and romantic, and I do not intend to say anything more about it. The other book, *The Turning Wheels*, written by a man who bears a Dutch name and who is a descendant of the Dutch South African, but who is in fact an Englishman living in England, has aroused a veritable storm of indignation in South Africa, culminating in the suppression of the sale of this book in South Africa by decree of the Union Government.

I.

The author, Stuart Cloete, states that he wrote from first hand knowledge and acquaintance, having lived amongst the Boers for quite a number of years. His knowledge is, however, very superficial, and his acquaintance very flimsy. There is very little evidence in his novel that he knows the history of the Voortrekkers from original sources, and even that he knows the Dutch South African of today. The author gives an appendix to his book consisting of some fifty so-called "Africaans words with their English equivalents," and more than a quarter of this short list are spelled wrongly, e. g., "voorslaag," "laager," "roinek," "meilies." The most common Afrikaans names are spelled wrongly, e. g., de Wett, Kleinhouse, Zwarte Piet, Jakalaas. Such errors are not very reassuring. The Afrikaans phrases and sentences interspersed in the English context are practically all wrong and make a very childish impression on one who knows our language.

In a press statement on the ban put on his book in South Africa the writer, interviewed in London, stated that his book was not meant to be a history of the Great Trek, but that it is nothing more than a mere novel. Now this statement should be examined. As a criticism of the book, it is perfectly redundant, because there is practically no truth in the whole story. As a justification for the nonsense written, it is still worse. Any book, be it history or novel, that claims to portray the Voortrekkers should be true to fact, and there is not a scrap of historical evidence to support Cloete in this fanciful portrayal of Voortrekker life, men and women.

Marianne Vos Radius very aptly summarises the whole position in stating: "*The Turning Wheels* is a story of murder, of adultery, of rape and of perversion. . . . I would not know where to look for another group of characters so sex-obsessed as these are." To my mind the book of Cloete is a thoroughly bad book, from whatever point of view considered. Judged from an ethical point of view, it is about the worst instance of the modern psychopathic sex novel: there is not a single character in the book that is not sex-obsessed. The leader, Hendrik van der Berg, Sannie van Reenen, Zwart Piet, and the whole string form just one group of loose, lascivious individuals. Somewhere on earth, and quite evidently in the fertile imagination of this

author, there may have congregated such a crowd of infamous individuals. But to anyone with just a scrap of accurate knowledge about the history of the Boers at the time of the Great Trek, such a characterization of the Voortrekkers as given by Cloete in this novel of his is without any historical foundation. From a purely literary and aesthetic point of view the book is a bad production. Any historical novel, and for that matter any novel, should describe real and typical characters. In this sense Cloete is not a realist, because the type he thought fit to describe is not true to fact. I take it that any person who wants to write a romance on the Voortrekkers should be able to discover amongst the emigrants the good as well as the bad. A writer who portrays only bad characters is just as unreal as he who portrays only good ones. And it goes without saying that amongst the Voortrekkers there were both good and bad people, and I may inform my American friends that the good ones far outnumbered the others. *The Turning Wheels* is a bad book, because it lacks the essence of truth, goodness, and beauty.

II.

Allow me at this point to interrupt my criticism of *The Turning Wheels* by interpolating a brief, objective history and characterization of the Voortrekkers of South Africa.

The first European settlement at the Cape took place in 1652 when Jan van Riebeeck was sent out by the Dutch East India Company to occupy the Cape as an intermediate station between Holland and the East for the purpose of providing a plentiful supply of fresh meat and vegetables for the crews of the passing vessels. Gradually, however, the Directors of the Company came to the conclusion that it would be wise to encourage a policy of colonization of the Cape, if only for the sake of strengthening their hold on the Cape. In furtherance of this policy some of the Company's servants were allowed to settle at the Cape as Free Burghers in order to cultivate the soil. Their main occupation was to be agriculture, and so they became farmers (boere). And so began the history of the "Boere." This policy and process of colonization and rural settlement developed throughout the eighteenth century, and at the onset of the nineteenth century we find here a distinct type of population, the so-called "Boere," farmers, landlords. These people were farmers, whose main possession consisted of sheep and cattle. Naturally they needed plenty of space for their grazing, and naturally they started moving inland, northwards and eastwards. The type of person thus moving away from the capital and hence from all the amenities of civilization was mainly the farmer, the owner of large flocks of sheep and large herds of cattle. But just as naturally there were also other sorts moving onwards and inland. Besides the real farmer, the solid, sturdy, dependable, good type, there were also those who, while professing a love of farming in order to be set free, did

so with no other aim than to live on the frontier, far from law and order, free to do as they liked, bartering and smuggling with the aborigines. There is no doubt that on the frontiers inland also existed a class of undesirables, but history tells us that they were a very small class.

In 1806 the Cape changed hands and became a permanent British colony. Many of the Boers in the interior were opposed to this annexation and were further antagonized by the attitude of the British authorities at the Cape during the first two decades of British rule, and their natural tendency of trekking on was not thereby checked. Things were getting worse and worse, and by 1830 a fairly untenable point was reached, and between 1834 and 1840 some 10,000 Boers left the Cape for better parts—the so-called Great Trek of the Boers. And now you should understand the use of the term “Boer” for the Dutch South African. Practically all who participated in the trek northwards were from the farming (boerende) community, and hence the trekkers were collectively called the “Boere,” a term that has come to mean the Dutch South African section of the bi-racial South African nation, a term that today does not cover any longer the Afrikaans-speaking section of the population, because so many of us now live in villages, towns or cities. We, Afrikaans-speaking South Africans, sometimes call ourselves by the proud name of “Boere,” though many of us are not farmers (boere).

III.

It lies fairly well outside my present aim to go into the causes of the Great Trek, because that is not the point at issue in *The Turning Wheels*. My further task will now be to give my readers in America a brief sketch of the Voortrekker “people and their leaders” to judge in how far Cloete has given us a fair and true portrayal of the Voortrek. And my characterization does not intend to be romantic or novel-like, but strictly historical and as far as possible objective.

The Voortrekkers of South Africa then were persons of Dutch descent, mainly farmers, living on the north-western frontiers of the Cape Colony, trekking away from the Cape Colony in the thirties of the previous century with their families and movable earthly possessions northwards and eastwards to settle down after a long, strenuous trek and a deadly struggle with the “natives” (the Bantu, or black, races) in the interior of South Africa, in the territories now known as the Orange Free State, Natal and the Transvaal.

The Voortrekkers have always been held in the highest esteem by us, their descendants, and by the Afrikaans-speaking people as a whole, as well as by the people in the land of our origin, the Netherlands. And there is no doubt that they were and still are entitled to such esteem and respect, not only of their direct descendants and of all people of Dutch

descent, but also of all South Africans. Indeed, in the annals of pioneering throughout the world there are none who for fortitude and endurance, for godliness and moral integrity rank higher, there are none who deserve our praise and respect as a colonizing and civilizing power and influence more than do the Voortrekkers of South Africa. Such pride on my part and that of my fellow Dutch South Africans is not based on a narrow racialistic or nationalistic feeling and point of view, but on the historical fact that they were the trail-blazers into the African wilderness, where, after the greatest suffering thinkable, they established permanent homes for themselves and for us, their descendants, and for all who after them came to this land to make it their home. They were the bearers of the banner of Christ, our Lord, and of European culture and civilization into dark and heathen Africa.

The Voortrekkers were very strongly imbued with religious feeling. Their religion was part and parcel of themselves, and it was genuine. They were on the whole very serious about all religious matters. God was to them a great Reality. When they went on trek their constant companion was the Bible, which they read for guidance and for service of their God. They were not religious hypocrites, like this leader of Cloete, who could consult the Bible for guidance in his sinful deeds. Daily prayer was their rule of life. Not one act of importance, in private and in public life, was undertaken without prayer to the Almighty and without raising a psalm in His praise. Before the decisive battle of Blood River on December 16, 1838, the Voortrekkers gathered and took a solemn vow that in the event of a victory over their barbaric enemy, they would erect a house of prayer as a memorial to Almighty God, and after the victory they gathered in thanksgiving, and when the time arrived they actually built this church in Pietermaritzburg, Natal, where their descendants up to this day still observe the 16th of December as a yearly day of thanksgiving. The observance of this day, so called Dingaansday, has become an annual popular function wherever Dutch South Africans live. To return to our forefathers, one of the deprivations of which they were acutely aware and about which they always complained in their private correspondence, was the want of teachers to instruct them in the Word of God; and the older people always tried to remedy this defect by instructing the young themselves, wherever any opportunity was offered them. The relations of the Voortrekkers with the missionaries were generally very friendly, as is testified to by the Rev. J. Archbell of the Wesleyan Mission, who, like his colleague, the Rev. D. Lindley, actively labored for a long time among the Boers themselves.

Morally the Voortrekkers stood very high indeed. Their yea was yea and their nay, nay. They trusted one another to such an extent that they never asked for a written confirmation of an oral agreement. Murder was quite unknown among the Voortrek-

kers. We could trace not a single instance of murder on record. Not a single case of divorce can be found in the records of that period among the trekkers. Instances of illegitimate children and of adultery were so rare that the occurrence of it was an event of the most serious character, and the culprits were very severely punished, if not totally cut off from general intercourse. Such people were branded for their whole existence among their fellowmen and women. This group of sex-obsessed characters thought out by Cloete in *The Turning Wheels* could never have existed among the Voortrekkers of South Africa. They are creatures of his perverse imagination pure and simple. *The Turning Wheels* as a story of murder, of adultery, of rape, and of perversion is purely imaginary. There is not a single scrap of historical evidence to support the whole conception. If the author had gone to the trouble of consulting the records in our Archives and even of consulting any of our best known historians, like Theal, Cory, Preller, Gie, Walker, he would have discovered his awful error.

In the nature of things few Voortrekkers had any real formal education. They had lived all their lives on the frontiers where books and teachers and opportunities were few and far between. And yet they could all read their Bible, write, and do some elementary calculations. Their wandering life made it quite impossible for them to establish permanent schools, and yet in all documents of that period we find an oft-repeated cry for teachers and ministers. Although far away from any of the amenities of civilized life, yet their daily life was most respectable; they were clean and well-dressed in a quiet sense of the word; usually every man had two suits, one for daily wear and of the Sunday best for going to service or for visiting neighbors on free days. The children were well behaved, especially in the presence of their elders; they were to be seen, not heard. They had to attempt the impossible task of keeping their clothes unstained for a whole week, and mother was rather severe on those that spoiled their dresses.

Among the real Voortrekkers there was no place for such a degraded humanity as portrayed by Cloete in his novel.

IV.

Let me conclude my account by briefly examining the possible existence of such a leader as this Hendrik van der Berg of Cloete's.

The Great Trek itself consisted of several smaller treks, each with its own leader. The first trek took place under Trichardt and van Rensburg; neither of these two can serve as the prototype for Cloete's fanciful leader, because they were known as upright, morally high-standing men. They trekked in a sense independently and did not form part of the essential Great Trek itself. The principal parties were those led respectively by A. H. Potgieter, the founder of Potchefstroom; G. Maritz, after whom

Pietermaritzburg was jointly named; Pieter Retief, the great leader of the Trekkers, who was murdered by the Zulu chief, Dingaan, in February, 1838; P. Jacobs, J. L. Uys, and a few others, and finally Genl. A. H. Pretorius, the conqueror of the Zulus. And these leaders, one and all, were men of the highest moral integrity. There is not the slightest evidence that they were anything else. In all the available historical documents we cannot trace a single leader among the Voortrekkers who even in the faintest way resembles this leader of Cloete's imagination.

Mr. Editor, you have asked whether this portrayal is a caricature. That is a too high-sounding name. A caricature is a skewed portrait, but merely accentuates a true fact. This book of Cloete's has no factual basis and hence cannot be a caricature. It is an insult to the memory of people who deserved from a man with a Dutch name, even if they were as bad as that, some esteem and respect for what they were and for what they achieved.

I may state in conclusion that 1938 is to us Dutch South Africans a year of sad and endearing remembrance. It is the centenary year of the murder of our great Voortrekker leader, Retief. But it is also a year of rejoicing and thanksgiving, being the centenary year of our victory over the barbarian Dingaan. No wonder that the appearance of such a book at such a time aroused the bitterest feelings among the descendants of the Voortrekkers of South Africa.

V.

My answer has already exceeded the bounds of common sense, and yet there are two very pertinent references that I cannot allow to pass by without bringing them to your patient attention.

The first reference concerns an American missionary, the Presbyterian Daniel Lindley, who lived and worked among the Voortrekkers. The Rev. Mr. Lindley was ordained by the Presbytery of Concord in North Carolina especially to labor in South Africa. He left America in December, 1834, to take up his work here, and rather than continue his labors on behalf of the heathen natives, he voluntarily became the first minister of the Calvinist Voortrekkers. The first children born to the Voortrekkers were baptized by him, and the baptismal records of that time bear his handwriting. His memory is held in sacred reverence in South Africa even today, and in the Orange Free State a town has been named after him.

The second point concerns the opinion of Sir Benjamin D'Urban, governor of Cape Colony in 1836, who characterized the Dutch emigrants as "a brave, patient, industrious, orderly and religious people, an incalculable loss to the colony in whatever view they may be regarded, whether as the cultivators, the defenders, or the tax-contributors of the country which they have quitted."

SCHOOLS OF NINETEENTH CENTURY PAINTING

Henry J. Van Andel, A.M.

Professor of Dutch History, Literature, and Art at Calvin College

OPINIONS differ as to the date of the appearance of real modernism in art. The older authorities contend that the first traces of modernism, in painting at least, are found in the third century of the Italian Renaissance, the so-called High Renaissance, when the humanistic spirit spread over the learned world and found such able prophets as Machiavelli and Erasmus, and when art decidedly turned its back upon the church and became secular.

Of late certain scholars and critics have turned the limelight on Calvinistic Holland of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Karl Scheffler, perhaps the ablest of them, has written a book on the Netherlands and its painting to stem the tide of *die neue Sachlichkeit*, and to point out that the foundations of the modern technique and the modern outlook in art were laid by Hals and Rembrandt, Vermeer and De Hooch, Ruysdael and Hobbema. Besides those there are art historians who see the modern trend of naturalism emerging more clearly with Romanticism and still more strongly with Impressionism and Expressionism. And, finally, there is a group of younger authors who contend that the real revolution came in the year 1905 when the so-called Fauvists, or "Wild Beasts," as they were popularly called, gave their first exhibition in the autumn salon at Paris.

Modernism in Art and the French Revolution

We shall take the position that real modernism starts with the French Revolution of 1789. The secularization of art during the High Renaissance in Italy and in the Netherlands was more a step forward than a break with the past, and the new technique and outlook of the Dutch painters after 1600 was indeed not a revolution, but a remarkable improvement. Historians have abused the term revolution by calling even the Reformation the Protestant Revolution. But we ought to distinguish between advancement and rebellion, between reformation and revolution. It is true that the Italian Renaissance and the Nordic Renaissance, and the Dutch Reformation brought about a new world in many respects, but fundamentally the mode of thinking of Western Europe remained religious. And it was not till the French Revolution and the Romantic Movement that such fierce cries were uttered as, *Ni Dieu, Ni Maitre*.

The ultra-modern art between 1905 and 1930 may be called a devolution and a catastrophe (Herbert Read, *Art Now*). The change in 1905 was much more radical than in 1789. We ought to distinguish between the mild modernism of the nineteenth century and the wild modernism of the twentieth. The

significance of 1905 is that modern art then lost its balance. It went mad. Twentieth century art and the World War have shown to what lengths a perverse generation may go. The nineteenth century was revolutionary. The twentieth was insane, says Prof. Huizenga in his new book, *In the Shadows of the Morning*. The twentieth century made Oswald Spengler write his prophetic *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* (1921). Indeed, modern art, modern war, modern fascism and communism, and modern depression seem to justify Spengler in his verdict that progress has come to an end. But, nevertheless, we must maintain that the beginning of this modern chaos and misery is not simply of 1905, but of a century earlier, and that already nineteenth century art plainly shows that mankind in 1789 set its feet on the path of unbelief and revolution.

We shall discuss the chaotic art of the twentieth century later, and shall also point out the hopeful signs of recovery, but first we shall try to trace the new ways of the artists since 1800.

Up to the nineteenth century all artists with a few exceptions believed in objective standards to which individual genius must conform. These standards were such as the following:

1. There must be balance of intellect and emotion.
2. Of content and form.
3. Of the beautiful and the good.
4. Of vision and expression.
5. Of unity and variety.
6. Of light and shadow.
7. Of colors and tones, or of both.

We have enumerated the laws of art in this order because the successive movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries overthrew them in the order mentioned.

Romanticism, Impressionism, and Expressionism

Romanticism revolted against the balance of intellect and emotion. The first phase of Romanticism, also called Pre-romanticism, delighted in subjects of a melodramatic nature, storms, fires, riots, murders, battles, decapitations, struggles with dragons and devils, passionate love scenes, and other exciting experiences. When the revolutionary spirit subsided, and pure Romanticism appeared on the stage with its historical and nature subjects, feeling kept on rebelling against reason. Even Post-Romanticism, or Classical Romanticism as it revealed itself in the imitation of seventeenth century Dutch landscape and *genre*, and in the Barbizon School under Millet, Corot, and in Holland

under Gabriel and Roelofs, maintained the predominance of feeling over reason.

An intenser revolt came on with Impressionism. This movement puts the emphasis on mood, or impression. Lines and colors become indefinite. The painters did not do away with definite content, but made it altogether secondary. And thus many of the impressionistic products became vague, and strange, and remote. Worse was the decided break with the *Kaloskagathos*, the rejection of the balance of the beautiful and the good, or, the proclamation of art for art's sake. This does not mean that all impressionistic products are of an immoral nature, but it means that the principle in many cases led to an over-emphasis upon the sensuous, and even the sensual, which came to a more intensive conflict with conventional morality in the following movements.

Expressionism with its bold colors and bold lines, as represented in Cézanne, Gauguin, and Van Gogh, for instance, has given us many a painting which is not even fit for art galleries. The revolt against decency and modesty went hand in hand with the revolt against the law of the balance of vision and expression. The Expressionists preached the gospel of distortion. If this meant only that art is not photography, and that an artist has the right to change colors, light, arrangement and lines, to bring about more unity, we would not object. But distortion meant real distortion, the right to make artistic products ugly to suit the urge, the whim, or the impulse of the artist. It is this principle of distortion which, at last, overthrew all the other standards.

Under the leadership of Matisse and Picasso, and many others, the twentieth century has seen the laws of unity, light and color trampled underfoot. This has led to the chaos of fauvism and cubism, not to mention many more fads and stunts, which came upon the world after 1900.

A Revolt Against Spiritual Standards

The revolt of the nineteenth century, however, was more than a technical revolt. It was also a rebellion against age-old spiritual standards.

One might conveniently divide this century's art into incipient and radical modernism, into tame and daring manifestations of the spirit of revolution, into a romantic and a realistic period. It is true that the bold and aggressive break with the past does not come until 1905. But it cannot be denied that the rebellious tendencies started already a century earlier. We are reaping the harvest of the ideas sown by Rousseau and Kant, Goethe and Schiller, Shelley and Keats, the protagonists of subjectivism.

It has been said that the keynote of Romanticism was the reaction against the institutionalism of the eighteenth century. It was in the age of whigs and laces that young people were taught to obey a system of laws and rules foreign to their nature. Ro-

manticism was the cry of the heart, the revolt against legalism and reason, the proclamation of individuality. Rousseau called men back to nature and to common sense. Kant argued for individual morality and judgment. Goethe held that personality was the apex of human happiness. The basic note of all these thinkers was a protest against the tyranny of objective law as imposed by state and church, by educators and artists.

Subjectivity—Humanism—Pantheism

It is this spirit of subjectivity which asserts itself successively in Romanticism, Post-Romanticism, Impressionism, and Expressionism. *Romanticism* in painting was governed by a return to natural and historical subjects, but mostly of an exciting character. It was a clamor for action, change, experiment, passion, and personal expression. It was a bold denial of the everlasting prerogative of the Greek horizontal and the Greek curve with their implications of balance, calm, quiet, equanimity, *mevden agan*, restfulness; but also a thrust at the objectivity of law and order in the realms of morality and culture.

Post-Romanticism, with its interest in landscapes, *genre*, and pastoral subjects, was not only a protest against the turmoil of the city and the upsetting element of the preceding revolutionary period, but its underlying tenor was that culture spoils man, and that nature cures him. The post-romantic authors and painters believed in the innate goodness of man. Nature to them is not a means to lead man to God, but to bring man back to himself by making him believe in "the simple life."

Impressionism is closely allied to Post-Romanticism, and especially to the Barbizon school. In fact, it is hard to draw the line between Corot and Courbet, and Millet seems to belong to both schools. Impressionism, one might say, is Nature at twilight. It believes in the golden dusk of dawn and sunset. It does away, gently but determinedly, with the clear light and firm line, remnants of classical art. It makes the atmosphere hazy and *unbestimmt*. It breaks down the barriers completely. It makes one believe that everything, but especially the sensuous, is an avenue to the eternal, and that the avenues are identical. It is the embodiment of a subtle Pantheism which casts its spell over the moody, drowsy soul of the pilgrim who is wearied by the long journey, and who cannot believe in the gruesomeness of sin, and the necessity of a Redeemer.

Expressionism—Titanism—The Ego

But the vague pessimism of the seventies did not last. Within two decades the human soul had gathered new courage, and at the turn of the century art broke forth into bold colors, into daring lines, into new and strange subjects. Man turned away from the vagueness of an impersonal god who left him helpless to the definiteness of a new technique

which dazzled the eye. New inventions appeared on the stage. Men began to fathom the significance of auto and radio, of electricity and research. Education was going to bring salvation. Progress was inevitable. Paradise was awaiting the questers for truth. The acme of a civilization was to descend upon a struggling world. At last there was going to be real achievement, bread and work for all, training and culture for whoever was interested. And man was to be his own god.

It is this spirit of titanic enthusiasm which has brought forth the movement of *Expressionism*. On the surface it may look tame, when compared with Fauvism, or with any other sadistic or fantastic fad that asks our attention between 1905 and 1930, but at bottom, it is the cry of Cain and Lamech. It is not the revolt against central or direct light, and against gradation and *chiaroscuro* that makes Expressionism often distasteful, for the colorism of Vermeer and De Hooch is equally subversive of Italian Renaissance standards. But it is that frequent destruction of visual unity, that abuse of the thick stroke and of the bright colors, especially red and blue and violet, and that rebellion against decency and humanity, that terrible assertion of the ego which makes one feel uneasy in the presence of

many an Expressionist. After all, artists are not the only ones who have a right to be aggressive. There are the millions of *hoi polloi*, and the thousands of aesthetes, i. e., artistically inclined people, who ask—and with a certain right—what the geniuses have done with their talents. Art must be heroic, but why should it be selfish, or offensive?

The Seed of Subjectivism

We shall not lay the blame for the chaotic first quarter of the twentieth century, therefore, exclusively at the feet of the Fauvists and Cubists, of Matisse and Picasso and the host of their followers. The real revolution in art begins with Romanticism, with Kant and Rousseau. It continues through Post-Romanticism, Impressionism, and Expressionism, and comes to a climax in our own day. Rousseau and Kant have scattered the seed of subjectivism, "Let us break their bonds asunder, and cast away their yokes from us." Rousseau and Kant have sown the storms. We reap the whirlwind. The bold assertion of personal or subjective expression has at last led men like Cézanne, Gauguin and Van Gogh to preach the gospel of distortion. And it is this principle of distortion which has brought about the mild chaos of our own days.

THE GERMAN CHURCH CRISIS

Leonard De Moor, Ph.D.

Minister Reformed Church, North Blendon, Michigan

PERHAPS a helpful way of introducing this subject is to share with you excerpts from a letter I received from a German friend, whose fellowship I was privileged to enjoy both in this country and in his native land. The letter was written six months after Adolf Hitler came to power as the Chancellor of the Reich, by means of the revolution of January, 1933. In the heading of his letter my friend omitted his home street address in Leipzig, in the place of which he had inserted the note: "The address is the same, I don't write it because of the censor." How he managed to smuggle the letter through is still a mystery to me, except for the fact that he stated that he was sending the letter from some point on the Baltic Sea, where he was leading a camp of boys at the time. The post-mark was too indistinct to decipher. As pastor of a Lutheran Church in this largest city in Saxony, he unburdened his troubled heart concerning National-Socialism and its relation to the Church in his Fatherland by saying (and I give it just as received):

I will give up my position because of the new church we have here. Why I intend to leave the German church? The National-Socialist movement is total. It means that from this new *Weltanschauung* everything will be perfectly changed, especially religion. The *deutsche Christen* state that Christian

belief is influenced by the Jewish spirit. We need a really German religion, a religion which is an expression of the new Teutonism, the National-Socialist movement. The revolution creates a new religion because it is a religion. Consequently, the church is a function of the state, the preaching an expression of the national spirit, "Volkstum." And religion is a decoration of political conviction. All the events of the last months are the admirable consequences of this position. I call the situation hopeless. The Lutheran church is not more. The catastrophe of the evangelical church is, of course, a consequence of our unbelief—our sin, our fault, our weakness in the preaching and leaving (what we have failed to say and do). But I see that God takes the gospel from Germany. Atheism in the secret form of political religion has been the consequence of the political domination of the last times. Will not God give the gospel to other peoples which are younger? I don't know. But I know that paganism is reigning, and I believe in the independent power of the devil. The personal consequences are clear. But let me close this letter with the expression of the conviction that God reigns.

Hitler's 1933 Church Election

So far away from the scene of action, I did not, at the time, appreciate the external circumstances which occasioned this decision of my friend. But a subsequent review of events which took place in Germany immediately previous to the writing of his letter on the 29th of July, 1933, explains what was going on in his mind. For on the Sunday before, July 23rd, he himself, and the people of his parish, and church members in entire Germany,

envelopes in their hands, had marched down church aisles in the Third Reich and had come to the altar before which ballot urns stood on six tables. The election officials checked their lists and tossed the envelopes into the receptacles. German Protestantism was voting. It was pledging its confidence in one of two parties. The first was the "German Christian" ticket; the other "Gospel and Church," with the slogan, "Church Must Remain Church." The latter group is also known as the "Young Reformation Movement," the chief party of resistance to the Nazification of the Evangelical Church. It is headed by the much persecuted Martin Niemöller of Dahlem, a suburb of Berlin.

The results of this election were a foregone conclusion. For, on the Saturday night of July 22nd Chancellor Hitler spoke over all German broadcasting stations between 11:30 and 11:45 o'clock. Among other things, in explaining the motives which prompted him, a political leader, to raise his voice in a church election, he said:

It is clear that the church itself must take a stand in this folkic and political revolution. This presupposes that a single Reich church will take the place of the large number of Evangelical Churches. . . . Actually the *German Christians* represent a movement which has raised itself up with the will to do justice to the great tasks of the age. I view the rebirth of the German nation as inseparably bound up with the National Socialist Movement, and I wish it understood that the new church elections will by their results support our new folkic and state politics. Since the state is ready to guarantee the inner freedom of religious life, it has the right to hope that those forces in the confessions will enter the side for the freedom of the nation. . . . Let us have no toleration which is coerced but a living affirmation. (Quoted by Paul F. Douglass, in *God Among the Germans*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1935, pp. 210-1).

When the ballot urns were carried from the chancels of the churches throughout the Fatherland, the paper verdict was that the Protestant Church had placed itself solidly behind its leader, Adolf Hitler. It was a victory for the *German Christian* group. But it was also the signal for the awakening of the true church. From then on a struggle began in greater earnestness than before, especially between these two groups, but involving the whole of German Christendom,—a contest in the course of which many concessions were wrested from the apparent victors, and resulting in the gradual strengthening of the truly evangelical church. And all this took place in a relatively short period of time. For only six months after his letter of despair, my German friend dared to write me on a postal card, with his address stamped upon it:

The breaking down of the Nazi church and the *deutsche Christen* is a sign of great hope. The *ecclesia invisibilis* is living, a great secret church is among us. How impossible to judge the surface of the church!

De Lagarde and the "German Christians"

It is essential, especially because of the official encouragement which the *Fuehrer* himself has given to the "*Glaubensbewegung der Deutschen Christen*" (Faith Movement of German Christians),

that we review the chief tenets of this group. The roots of this way of conceiving Christianity go back as far as the teachings of Paul de Lagarde, who became professor of Oriental languages at Göttingen in 1869. He had taught that there were certain values in Protestantism and in Christianity worth conserving, but that this could be done only by fusing them with the Germanic folk-genius.

In the post-war period these efforts took organized expression in the formation of the "*Bund fuer deutsche Kirche*" (Federation of German Churches), founded in May, 1921. The express purpose of the Federation was to work for a renewal of religion and of church life by the adoption and cultivation of native German ideals. Included among the essential features of this German Church religion were the heroic world-view, and a conception of Nordic religion as a striving toward the light with a mystical, inner experience of God. The Jewish calculating spirit and the Old Testament ideas of moral retribution were rejected. Professor J. K. Niedlich of Berlin, one of the most prominent leaders of this group insisted that

"the path to the Saviour which goes by the way of our folklore is much cleaner than the way which leads through the stories of the Old Testament patriarchs." (Article on "*Deutsche Kirchliche Bewegung*" in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Vol. I, by Weinel).

To try to find in the Old Testament any German or Christian spirit was regarded as highly dangerous.

It was to ideas such as these that the *German Christians* fell heir, and with these conceptions they played such a spectacular role in the history of the German Protestant Church during the years 1933 and 1934 particularly. Encouraged by Hitler from the moment he came to power, the *German Christians* in May, 1933, issued a statement in which, among other things, they expressed it as their objective to realize the following goals:

The Evangelical Reich Church is the Church of *German Christians*, that is, Christians of the Aryan race. . . . The preaching of the Gospel to foreign groups is the concern of foreign missions.

The Evangelical Reich Church shall have the confidence of the people and be led by a Reich Bishop. . . . He shall be a Lutheran.

All Protestant Church members . . . shall be eligible to vote upon the new constitution and the person of the Bishop, who is to be nominated from the ranks of the *German Christians*. Excluded from eligibility are Christians of non-Aryan extraction. (Friedrich Wieneke: *Die Glaubensbewegung Deutsche Christen*, 1933, pp. 33-8).

The Nazi Program and the German Church

In seeking to bring the Church into line with the Nazi program, the state has always professed an interest solely in reorganizing the Church on a national basis in line with the Nazi revolution, and has declared that it would not interfere with, but, on the contrary, would support the Christian confessions. As early as February, 1920, when Gottfried Feder drew up the so-called unalterable Twenty-five Points of the National Socialist Program, which Hitler, on the 24th of that month read

to a political gathering of 2,000 people in the gigantic Munich beer hall (Hofbrau Haus), point 24 stated:

We demand freedom for all religious sects in the state in so far as they do not endanger the state or work against the customs and morals of the German race. The party as such represents the point of view of a positive Christianity without binding itself to any particular confession.

(Gottfried Feder: *Das Programm der N. S. D. A. P. und seine weltanschaulichen Grundgedanken*. München, 1933. Translated in Foreign Policy Reports, July 19, 1933.)

Essentially this same position was enunciated by the responsible Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs of the Reich, Dr. Kerrl, as late as December, 1937. To remove any doubts that might still exist in connection with two speeches which the latter gave in Fulda and Hagen on the Church Policy of the Third Reich, this Reich Minister granted the editor of the *Niedersächsische Tageszeitung* an interview. When this journalist remarked that it was constantly being alleged that the intention of the National Socialist State evidently was the replacement of religious communities now in existence by a State Church, the Minister defined the real position to be the following:

Neither Party nor State have any intention of setting up a state religion or a state church. The Party and State take their stand upon a religious, but not a confessional basis of a Christian faith. . . . It respects the right of the individual to create for himself his conception of God and to be free to decide to which religious persuasion he is to give his allegiance. . . . But it must demand that no confession interferes with the principles which every member of the community is enjoined to carry out for the attainment of the common goal—to ensure the security of the divinely ordained community of the German nation.

("News in Brief"—Reports and Documents on Contemporary Germany. Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst, Berlin—Vol. 5, No. 23/24, Dec. 31, 1937, pp. 207-8).

Struggle Between Church and State

Fair and reasonable as such a policy is, the actual course of events under the Nazi regime has caused an ever-increasing number of Protestants to protest that church doctrine was being violated in the attempted *Gleichschaltung* or regimentation of the church, so that they must, for conscience' sake, oppose the temporal power. The crucial points contested are:

- (1) The idea of applying the so-called "Aryan paragraphs" to the church; and Nazi criticisms of the Old Testament.
- (2) The idea of imposing a "leader" upon the church in the form of a Reich Bishop whose authority derived virtually from the state rather than from the church.
- (3) The use of forcible methods in reorganizing and disciplining the church.
- (4) And, though often hidden, still the real issue underlying all the others,—a conflict between the Christian world-view and the Nazi program of the indoctrination of the whole nation in the world-view of Teutonism.

The year 1933 witnessed a veritable politico-ecclesiastical crusade led by the *German Christians*, and supported, or at least encouraged, by the Nazi government. The leaders of that movement were the founder of the group, the Rev. Mr. Joachim Hossenfelder and military chaplain, Ludwig Müller, who, by the way, was also from the start the choice of the *German Christians*, and of Hitler himself, for Reich Bishop. And nothing shows more clearly how the Nazi party, working through the *German Christian* group, forced its will upon the church than the refusal to allow Dr. Freidrich von Bodelschwingh to continue to hold the office of Reich Bishop, to which position he had been legally appointed by the only group that had the right to appoint him: the commission of three for church reform created by the executive committee of the German Evangelical Church Federation. The more so is the unreasonableness of this procedure observable from the fact that the plebiscite later held in all the 28 German territorial churches gave Dr. von Bodelschwingh an overwhelming majority of votes. To get its own way in the appointment of Müller as bishop, the *German Christian* group, constantly supported by the assurance that the government would back it up, resorted to a complicated line of tactics, with the recital of which I will not trouble you.

But in the melée which followed there came the forced resignation of von Bodelschwingh. For his position became impossible when the government appointed Dr. August Jaeger as state commissioner for all Evangelical churches of Prussia. In accordance with the summary procedure of a commissioner, he dissolved all the church consistoria of Prussia, and filled the key positions with *German Christians*. And though the Prussian General Superintendent, Dr. Dibelius, at first courageously refused to obey Dr. Jaeger's order to resign, pressure was forthwith brought to bear upon him, so that no other course was open. The general situation became so serious that President Hindenburg himself had to proffer his offices of conciliation. In the end this resulted in the formulation and approval, on July 14, 1933, of the New Constitution of the German Evangelical Church.

Protest and Ouster of Karl Barth

Almost at the same time Karl Barth opened up a cannonade upon the reforms which he claimed were being forced upon the Evangelical Church, and which threatened to deprive the church of its "theological existence." His claim, consistent with his theology, was that any reform must arise from the inner needs of ecclesiastical existence, from obedience to the Word of God, or else it is not ecclesiastical reform. He outspokenly condemned the whole agitation and gave an impassioned but devastating reply to the German Christian doctrine that the German Reich Church must be the church of the Christians of Aryan race. He expressed it as his opinion that

"it would be better if the Evangelical Church were reduced to the smallest handful, and were to go into the catacombs, rather than conclude even a distant peace with this doctrine." (Karl Barth, *Theologische Existenz Heute*, Kaiser, München. Heft 1, June 25, 1933, p. 23).

Ultimately also this voice crying in the wilderness was muffled by the government, and made to pay the price of his bold prophesying. In November, 1934, Dr. Bernhard Rust, Prussian minister of Culture, acting personally as prosecuting attorney and the disciplinary court expelled Karl Barth from his professorship in the University of Bonn. Ostensibly this was not because of his opposition to Nazi church doctrines, but rather because he had refused, as a servant of the state (as all university professors in Germany are), to take the oath of personal loyalty to Chancellor Hitler as provided in a law of August 21st of that year. The text of that oath reads in part:

"I swear this oath to God that as a truly appointed servant of the church, I pledge fidelity and obedience to the Leader of the German Folk and State, Adolf Hitler, and solemnly declare that for the German Folk I will make every sacrifice and render every service due from a German Evangelical man." (Cited by Douglass, *op. cit.*, p. 245).

Barth had not refused to take this oath, but had merely wished to qualify it by adding: "so far as I can defend it as an Evangelical Christian." This was not acceptable to the government. For Dr. Rust

as its spokesman insisted on allegiance to Chancellor Hitler "without regard to religious scruples and religious teachings." The verdict stated that Barth had

"acted contrary to the duties of his office and had shown himself to be unworthy of the confidence essential to his profession." (Cited by Douglass, *op. cit.*, p. 270).

And then, following upon Barth's June utterances, came Chancellor Hitler's speech over the radio, on the eve of the church elections already referred to. Acquaintance with the methods used in these elections forces the impartial observer to the conviction that the main body of Christian forces in the Church had been stampeded and overrun by extra-ecclesiastical political forces. As the result of the elections the *German Christians* took possession of every important administrative office, from the office of Reich Bishop down to the membership of the individual parish boards. The large body of the Protestant clergy felt that by acts of political pressure and violence the church had been betrayed into the hands of a political movement.

(This article is the second in a series in which Dr. De Moor gives us an insight into the intellectual and political forces of Nazi Germany which have precipitated the German Church crisis. The first article appeared in the April issue under the title, "Rosenberg's Myth and Nazi Paganism." The concluding article, due to appear next month, will deal chiefly with the anti-Semitic fury and with Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, the "bible" of the National-Socialist creed.—EDITOR.)

TOWARD UNDERSTANDING

Henry J. Ryskamp, Ph.D.

Professor of Economics and Sociology, Calvin College

ONE who follows the news carefully is well aware of the fact that the Government, Business Management, and Labor all have their own Press, their own means of keeping the public informed as to their attitude toward present day problems and as to their aims for the future. The statements issuing from these groups during the last few months have carried with them less of the bitterness that had characterized them for some time. The owners of business especially have been making an attempt to inform the public as to their position on the day's problems and as to the worthwhile but often little understood aims and methods of business. Representatives of the American Federation of Labor have sought to counteract the militant attitude of the Committee for Industrial Organization by statements similar to those of Management, one of these having been sent out recently under one cover with one representing one of our largest corporations. The President in his recent fire-side chats has apparently endeavored to tone down the attitude toward business formerly expressed by him with such positiveness. There is a noticeable trend toward imparting information, and

this, it is to be hoped, may contribute toward better understanding.

In spite of this observable trend there is, however, much fault-finding still. With the deepening of the recession charges against business leaders still emanate from government offices; business leaders persist in laying the business reaction at the door of the government; and A. F. of L. leaders, it would seem, are, at least in part, carrying on their struggle against the C. I. O. in their *rapprochement* with Business. And the C. I. O. seems for the present simply to be "lying low."

It is a recognized fact, as the magazine *Business Week* for March 5, 1938, reminds us, that the business situation in 1937 "needed correction, which duly occurred in a natural way, beginning a half year ago." The reaction was perfectly justified and, in its beginning, had salutary effects." Dun and Bradstreet in a recent pamphlet, *Signs of the Times*, point out that, "With the impetus given by the receipt of large orders for raw materials to be used in the rearmament programs of Europe and Asia, and the forward buying as a result of higher wages, strikes, and anticipated higher prices, business was

on one great buying bender." After emphasizing and proving statistically the fact that inventories were abnormally high at the end of 1936, this pamphlet makes the point, "that managements decline to learn even from bitter experience that it is not a sound, healthy business policy to purchase more merchandise than is legitimately needed, and that the current 'recession' in business was brought about at least in part by this buying spree which can only be worked off by the liquidation of heavy inventories purchased at prices which prevail in the current spot markets."

Many leading economists have similarly interpreted the present recession, and several have pointed with confidence to improvement after liquidation of inventories has been completed and the uncertainties incidental to consideration of legislation now before Congress have passed. This Fall is regarded as the time when the improvement may begin to manifest itself.

It is true that the explanation of the recession just given is only partial, that the reaction took place within a framework provided by government action. It must be remembered, however, that the signs of the coming reaction were evident before the squabble concerning the Surplus Profits Tax arose, and it is also true that the period of recovery and prosperity had continued so long that a reaction could have been expected. Government policies and the attitude of Business toward them undoubtedly hastened and deepened the decline. The relations between the two have thus far not contributed much to the expected recovery.

Government agencies and individuals serving in important governmental positions have their goals, their ideals. While not always clearly presented, these are manifest in such legislation as that involved in the recent farm bills and in the proposed industrial expansion bill. The latter, if adopted, would attempt to expand industry, raise wages, and lower prices. This would be accomplished by permitting the owners and managers of enterprise to receive as much and perhaps just a bit more in profits than they now receive, but it would involve preventing the great increase in profits that usually accompanies business expansion. These goals, while undoubtedly idealistic and intended to make individual liberty a reality for the masses, are so obviously more collectivistic than anything we have attempted heretofore, that they are considered as being unrealizable and fraught with grave dangers both for the individual and for society.

The attitude of Business, while one of acceptance of the principle of social insurance and of sympathy toward well-considered relief, is still too frequently expressed as one of "leaving well enough alone." Now, in spite of the hazards involved in attempting

reforms, this attitude is hardly constructive. In fact, encouraged by government excesses and overstatements it tends to degenerate into mere negativism. It has meant bitter opposition to such well-considered and necessary legislation as that concerning the control of monopoly, the reorganization of the far-flung and confused governmental departments and agencies, and the reduction of tariffs. The government proposals with reference to these and other matters certainly called for some revisions but scarcely deserved the attitude aroused toward them by the opposition.

There is much that is fine in our two party system, particularly now that the two parties seem to be dividing and taking stands on real issues. It is not going to be particularly helpful, however, so long as the one party insists on pushing toward goals which are not made clear, by means of methods not only untried but full of uncertainties, and the other party insists upon a return to tried methods in the expectation that this will, under changed conditions, lead to the old recovery. A measure of recovery is likely to occur in any case and in spite of current charges and counter charges. But there is a real likelihood that both parties will be tempted to rely on what appears to be of political advantage rather than meet the issues of the day realistically. If so, our new problems, instead of being met in the light of experience as well as of a high and enduring idealism, will be pushed aside only to confront us, perhaps more seriously, at some later time.

We need today less emphasis on one-sided and almost jealously protected positions and more willingness to understand and co-operate.

LIGHT IN DARKNESS

Affliction's rod pressed sore
And buffeted my frame;
Broken, I could no more,
But sank in galling pain.

Rebellion's cry rang loud
And rancor filled my soul;
Self-pity wrapped me in its shroud,
Despair deep o'er me stole.

Until God softly said,
"Sufficient is my grace;"
Chastising love made soft my bed,
He led me seek His face.

Submission's peace reigned sweet,
And now my faith did see
Him whom God's wrath once beat,
Who suffered now with me.

—H. P.

PROFESSOR LECERF ON RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

A REVIEW

DU FONDEMENT ET LA SPECIFICATION DE LA CONNAISSANCE RELIGIEUSE. *By Auguste Lecerf, Docteur en Théologie, Editions "Je Sers." Paris, France, 1938. 30 frs.*

THE Foundation and the Specification of the Religious Knowledge," is Dr. A. Lecerf's second volume of his Introduction in Reformed Dogmatics. The first volume (same publishing firm, 1931, 20 frs.), discussed the nature of religious knowledge. One would do well to read both books. This review of necessity will not do justice to the books in question. This we deeply regret, for Dr. Lecerf is a Frenchman's voice, trained by both French and Dutch Calvinists, speaking to his countrymen the message of Calvinism.

The first volume introduces us to the question: What is religious knowledge, and how do we come to know this knowledge? After having set forth the principles that should control a Reformed dogmatician, this book compares the Reformed answer with the answer of contemporary schools of philosophy. This introduction purports to be canonic (canonique), that is, normative (pp. 9, 268), and as such it takes precedence over methodological and historical introductions. In the question of knowledge, which is undoubtedly a special philosophical question, there are principles that are normative for anyone who wishes to be considered a Reformed dogmatician. Lecerf concludes in favor of a moderate critical realism as approaching our position the closest, which later on he calls Calvinistic Realism (p. 255).

The second volume, as the first, emphasizes the sovereignty of God and the absolute claims of faith. The author shows that a man must live by faith both for his devotional life and for his scientific pursuits. Faith is related to and compared with knowledge and reason. The Word of God is the infallible rule of faith and conduct.

What is Dogmatics?

The second volume is divided into two parts. The first section treats first of all Preliminary Questions, Christian, or Calvinistic Apologetics, and Calvinistic Philosophy. There is no religious knowledge unless it has for its object the truths concerning the glory of God and the salvation of man (7). There are principles and implications. Besides discovering implications one must also learn to differentiate. To say that we must obey God's will does not make us a Calvinist. A Mohammedan could say the very same thing. We must differentiate between the latter's capricious tyrant and our God's good pleasure. We are Christians. Some are satisfied with the gospel of Christ (only what Christ actually said). We maintain the gospel concerning the Christ (Dordt). This includes the entire Bible. To be a scientific theologian we must compare, group, present logically the truths of the gospel concerning the Christ. A Reformed theologian, to do so, must also take cognizance of the confessions or symbols of the Reformed Churches, for Reformed Dogmatics is the science of the Reformed Faith.

Preaching is the presentation of the Word of God by ambassadors of God to sinners. The needs of the congregation determine in a measure the choice of textual material. Catechism has for its objective the growth of faith sufficient for a conscious and intelligent confession of our Lord (11f.). Dogmatic theology satisfies the scientific needs. It determines scientifically what ought to be believed. It may never become a substitute for preaching. Those who confess Christ are not expected to be little dogmaticians. Faith comes from hearing, and hearing from preaching. Still, dogmatics has a value for those who have faith but have an inadequate religious training. Perhaps one cannot give a good account of the faith one has. Besides, dogmatics in clarifying truths, prevents heresies espe-

cially as a scientific knowledge of dogma. Finally, the preacher will discover by the study of dogmatics the more important truths to proclaim.

Christian Apologetics

Can there be a Christian, or, specifically, a Calvinistic Apologetics? Our apologetics will be different from the other branches of Christianity. In this chapter as well as in the one that follows, one must bear in mind the question of the relation of faith to unaided, unregenerate reason. The regenerate says, "we have the mind of the Spirit," and the unregenerate "have the mind of the flesh." Before what bar are we to defend our faith? Who will be our judge? Is the reason of the worldling the court of last appeal? These questions we must keep before us as we read Dr. Lecerf's splendid chapter on a Calvinistic Apologetics.

Karl Barth says emphatically: no! Total corruption makes an apologetics impossible. Let the natural man toy with reason. Barthianism is in some ways a good reaction. Reformed theologians, beguiled by Cartesian philosophy, took the wrong road in maintaining a preparatory natural theology. In so doing they have forsaken the domain of faith. The existence of God and the Bible as the infallibly inspired Word of God are not objects of science, but are articles of faith. We can appreciate Dr. Lecerf's observation. At the same time we feel with Dr. Lecerf that Karl Barth is also on the wrong road.

The Catholics and the Rationalists also deny the Calvinists the right to have an apologetics. This question is closely related to the question to follow—Can we have a Calvinistic Philosophy? The argumentation seems to be briefly this: Sin has affected even our reason. We cannot depend upon it. Apologetics deals with the reasons for Christianity. How then can Calvinism have an apologetics when it cannot depend upon unregenerate reason?

Faith, says Dr. Lecerf, to the contrary, makes us think normally. Sin indeed makes us think a-normally (anormaliste). When we are in contact with God we do not renounce thinking. We think normally. Faith provokes thinking instead of arresting it. Apologetics obeys a law inherent in the very nature of faith. This law is to define intellectually and dialectically from contact with God and His Word that which in its very nature is supra-rational—the gift of God. This task is not the task of the blind. The fact is that this task is scientifically legitimate. This type of Apologetics addresses itself first of all to those who search and seek because they have already found (25). In obedience to the law of faith, faith also examines the counter claims of hostile systems. This, of course, includes the claims of sovereign reason. In so doing faith shows that there is no sacrifice of the intellect. Reason cannot (vs. Scholastics) draw from its own fountain. She receives her data from without. She can suggest a legislator, a "garant," but he cannot be demonstrated by reason. Faith is never a child of discursive reason. Faith reposes upon the testimony of God. It excludes an independent, an autonomous reason. Faith always remains faith even in its scientific manifestation.

Calvinistic Philosophy

Can a Calvinist have a philosophy, and may he philosophize as a Calvinist? Both Catholics and Rationalists refuse to accept this possibility. The rationalist, M. L. Brunschwich, asserts that a Christian will be a Christian before he will be a philosopher. His Christianity will incapacitate him to think without a bias. After dismissing claims that faith is a preliminary stage of reason, or a prefiguration, Professor Lecerf replies that of necessity a Calvinist will philosophize differently

from Descartes, Hegel, or any other philosopher. This does not indict a Calvinist. Who has a monopoly on an unbiased mind? Who has discovered the ideal methodology? If the claims of faith are true, then the philosophy of a Calvinist must be different.

The Christian must study the laws of the Creator, his sovereign Lord. Lecerf emphasizes the "laws" of God in the study of philosophy. This reminds one of the Dutch School of Calvinistic Philosophy, a school well known to our author. A Christian is like a student who knowing the answer to a problem (in this case that God is the sovereign Law-giver), is busily engaged in working out the various steps leading to such an answer. As in Apologetics, he searches because he has already found. A Christian philosopher should not trespass upon the territory of a Christian theologian. In theology we deal specifically with such doctrines as: incarnation, sin, and the return of Christ. These we cannot deduce from the nature of man as God has created him, nor from the nature of God such as He has revealed to us. All these revealed truths are essential for a Calvinistic philosopher. The objective of a Calvinistic Philosophy, however, is "the necessary relation between the supreme Legislator and the creatures such as results in the general laws that rule in every phase of reality the entire world" (48). Christianity is therefore "anormaliste et theonomiste." Man because of sin is not normal. Reason is not autonomous. Faith has taught us our Creator in His relation to the world as well as our relation to Him. Over against the Scholastics, we maintain that metaphysics does not hereby become a useless study. It is useless to found a religion. Still it can and does glorify God. It shows how faith stirs the noble ambitions of science in believers. It is a critique upon systems impregnated with pagan philosophies. It also evinces that all things point to a supreme cause and that God, the supreme cause, is not identical with the world He has created.

In seeking to eliminate the pagan elements do we not eliminate nature? Nature is the subject-matter of philosophy. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas could not have philosophized had they not assimilated, and when necessary, rectified the ideas of Plato, Plotinus, and Aristotle, all pagans. Greeks have taught the Christians the natural sciences and the reflexions upon the conclusions of science. But, for a Reformed thinker there is nothing profane but sin. In opposition to sacred and profane we substitute particular grace and common grace. Greek philosophy is pantheistic and deistic. The worship of nature has usurped or replaced the worship of God. If there is anything good or beautiful in pagan thought we do not hesitate to adopt it. This good is not to be confused with the paganism for any good found in the work of God's common grace (Calvin). To separate the good from paganism is precisely one of the tasks of Calvinistic philosophy.

What Dogmatics Ought to Be

The second part of the book leads us step by step to a Reformed Dogmatics. Lecerf begins with a very general proposition that all Christian dogmatics ought to be theistic. He ends his book with a chapter on the necessity of the restoration of Calvinism. Although this second section comprises the major part of the book, space forbids us to write much about it. Lecerf points out that the Catholic Church has no foundation for any of its claims. If the Church is the guarantee of the Bible, why does the Church appeal to the Bible in the defense of this authority? The very appeal to Scripture for the authority that she is the infallible guardian of the Bible is already a denial of that authority. In the final analysis she must admit that the Bible is the final authority and not the Church. Practically she does so. Her claim that the apocryphal books belong to the sacred text cannot be maintained, for she has failed to establish that the Old Testament Jesus considered authoritative was that used by the Alexandrians. Jesus

quoted the Palestinian Old Testament, and that Testament we follow. Our final authority is the Word of God, and our assurance is the testimony of the Holy Spirit.

God's Word is infallibly inspired. Lecerf teaches that Biblical Criticism is the child of nineteenth century Philosophy. Karl Barth, in spite of all the deprecations of philosophy, is still under the spell of this rationalistic philosophy in his conception of the Bible and Higher Criticism. The entire Bible is the Word of God. This does not mean that everything in the first five books was written by Moses in the same sense that Augustine is the author of the *Confessions*. Lecerf quotes a contemporary Amsterdam exegete who believes that redactors have left certain traces of their work upon the original books. Still, these redactors were guided and inspired by the Holy Spirit.

Although the New Testament is a clearer revelation, it is not a more inspired book. There are no degrees of inspiration. The Old Testament and the New Testament are equally inspired. There are degrees of revelation. The New Testament shows a greater degree of revelation than the Old Testament.

Calvinism's Tomorrow

Over against both Lutheranism and Methodism Lecerf teaches that: "The Reformed thinker seeks above all to re-establish the sovereignty of God in every sphere of thought (exclusive authority of the Word), in every sphere of salvation (justifying faith, the gift of divine predestination), in the sphere of worship (validity of the second commandment condemning images), in every sphere of human activity (the law normative for the regenerate), and in the cosmic sphere (pre-ordination and efficacious providence)." (p. 248.)

In his pamphlet, *Le Calvinisme et les Causes du Renouveau Calviniste*, the author points out that Calvinism is more than "a pope in paper" (substituting the Bible for the Pope). We have besides the external authority of the Word the seal of the Holy Spirit. Our authority is ultimately God Himself. The difference between a Lutheran and a Calvinist in their conception of the Holy Supper is more fundamental than "this represents" or "this contains" the body of the Lord. Basically, there are two types of mysticism. Lutheranism teaches that the human is capable ontologically to contain the infinite, God. The incarnation is the incarnation of the divine nature. The human shares in the attributes of the divine, and the divine in the human. Calvinism teaches that we can never cross the border line between the divine and the human. The incarnation is the incarnation of the Divine Person. The human and the divine remain human and divine.

The popularity of Methodism must be understood in the light of eighteenth century humanism and nineteenth century subjectivism. These attributes created a stifling atmosphere for Calvinism. Without a doubt, John Wesley was a great Christian and an incomparable revivalist, but he was not a reformer. In being Arminian, his theology was humanistic. He also negated the sovereignty of God (cf. also Vol. II, p. 250). Humanism has shown its impotency. Still we do not follow John Calvin blindly. We follow Calvin in so far as Calvin is a Calvinist. We seek a return to the God of heaven and of earth, and not a return to John Calvin. Calvin is not the *doctor angelicus*. Calvin knows no other authority than the Word of God, no other life than the life in Christ, no other destiny than the destiny God has decreed for those who believe in Him.

We sincerely hope that God may use Dr. A. Lecerf in the University of Paris and in the struggle of French Protestantism as the champion of the absolute sovereignty of God, and as a messenger of the unconditional claims of the faith that removes mountains.

JACOB T. HOOGSTRA.

Englewood, N. J.

BOOK REVIEWS

PSYCHOLOGY AND PASTORAL CARE

AN INTRODUCTION TO PASTORAL THEOLOGY. By Henry Balmforth *e. a.* The MacMillan Company, New York, 1937. Price, \$3.50.

ONE is constantly reminded these days of the words of Jesus recorded in Luke 16:8. In more than one respect "the sons of this world are for their own generation wiser than the sons of the light." How those who deny so-called common grace can explain this predication, "wiser," (mark you, wise in the *comparative* degree) without wresting the words of our common Lord, is not my present concern.

It is passing strange that "the sons of light" who are solemnly called "to watch in behalf of the souls" of God's people and their covenant children (Heb. 13:17), should have neglected the intensive study of the soul of man for so long. Protestantism in particular must plead guilty. It has hitherto given but slight attention to the revelational psychology of Scripture, and it has made practically no study at all of the empirical soul of man. Both are necessary with a view to the efficient and fruitful discharge of the comprehensive pastoral task of the Church. Even the Reformed Churches must, sorry to say, confess failure on this significant score, in spite of their perfectly biblical belief, that "redemption is built along creation lines." Of all sons of the Reformation Calvinists should have realized long ago, that spiritual life, such as the Church seeks to nourish and direct and protect and heal pastorally, can be understood properly only if *due* account be taken of the soul as its natural substratum. In a word, Pastoral Theology can best understand what God has to say on the subject in *special* revelation, if it pays diligent heed to what God tells us about the soul in *general* revelation.

"The sons of this world" are a step ahead of "the sons of the light," as respects the study of the soul as general revelation acquaints us with it. They may not recognize the sources they are studying as *revelation*; and they may not get the right slant at the facts, owing to their rejection of *special* revelation. But they have interested themselves in the soul; they have studied its life history; they have endeavored to arrive at the laws governing its divers operations; they have earnestly attempted to turn the psychological information they collected to *practical* use in every field of life, religious life excepted, at least in the sense of the *spiritual* life of which the Holy Scriptures speak.

The authors of the volume announced above are persuaded that Pastoral Theology should benefit from the psychological studies which are the vogue of our century. The book they have written is an attempt to integrate the results of psychological research in the branch of theological study that deals with "the care of souls." The writers are Anglicans. The background of the volume, insofar as it is theological, is decidedly Anglican of the High Church type. It is positively refreshing to find that authors who set considerable store by psychology, and applied psychology in particular, nevertheless decidedly refuse to follow the style of the day and disdain to substitute psychology for religion or, to put it otherwise, to put a *psychologistic* construction upon the phenomenon of religion.

The Anglican clergymen who collaborated in the production of this book do not, as a matter of *theory*, confine pastoral work to the "cure" of *individuals*. In this book, however, they do not take up the psychological implications of pastoral work insofar as it concerns the Church in its *corporate* capacity; preaching, for instance. They have imposed still another limitation upon themselves. Dealing, as they do, with the pastoral care of individuals on a psychological basis, they conceived these individuals largely as in need of spiritual *healing*. Possibly the

present state of the world in moral respect and the deplorable conditions that prevail in the Church in our age and day, to whatever causes they may be attributable, have influenced the learned authors, four in number, in restricting their attention to the *therapeutic* aspects of pastoral work. They well know, as appears from their book, that the New Testament pastor has a *feeding* function no less than a *medical* task; that he is a *guide* of souls no less than their *guard*.

The book has *many* excellencies. Space forbids even their enumeration. Its virtues are not merely formal, the book has substantial worth. It is open to criticism, indeed. The reviewer could wish that the pastoral significance for Pastoral Theology of the Word of Christ, the great, the good, the chief Shepherd of the Father's flock, had come to its own in a larger measure. Again, certain theological views propounded and ecclesiastical practices sponsored, do not commend themselves to the present reviewer's mind. But his last word in this inadequate review of a very fine book is one of generous commendation. No one at all interested in the good of the House of our God in a pastoral capacity, should fail to read and study this notable contribution to a department of Theology as indisputably eminent as it is woefully neglected in Protestant circles.

S. VOLBEDA.

CALVINISTIC PHILOSOPHY CLUB

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE CALVINISTIC PHILOSOPHY CLUB, 1937. Secretariat Jacob T. Hoogstra, Th.D., 90 Demarest Ave., Englewood, N. J. (Mimeographed), 34 pages, 60 cents.

THIS booklet offers in mimeographed form the two addresses delivered at the first and at the second meeting of the organization which has adopted the name: Calvinistic Philosophy Club. This club has about twenty members living in and near Philadelphia and Paterson. Its meetings have so far been held at Westminster Seminary. Its officers are: Dr. C. Van Til, President; Rev. E. F. J. Van Halsema, Vice-President; and Dr. J. T. Hoogstra, Secretary. Besides the two addresses the booklet also contains the minutes of the two meetings of the Club held in 1937.

The greater part of the booklet is covered by the address of Dr. W. Burggraaff on the subject, The New Scholasticism. It is an interesting account of the current movement of Neo-Scholastic Philosophy. The account is historical and descriptive, and is to be followed on a later occasion by a discussion of the principles of this Neo-Scholasticism as compared with the fundamentals of a Calvinistic world and life view.

The other address—which is really the first—is entitled, A Society for Calvinistic Philosophy. It is from the pen of Dr. Van Til, who delivered it as the opening and introductory address for the program and activities of the Club. It is very much worth reading for anyone interested in a fundamental approach to the problems of our faith. The author touches upon a number of fundamental questions and makes some pertinent observations. He rightly insists upon the difference between Christian Theism and Idealism. He emphasizes the need of viewing the universe and all its phenomena under the determinate aspect of divine creation. He stresses the need of a sound Calvinistic epistemology and methodology, and the need of making these consciously basic to all teaching. He suggests the value and importance of studying also the Natural Sciences from the point of view of a Christian theistic philosophy. And he raises the question whether there is such a thing as a truly Christian, a Calvinistic, philosophy.

I can imagine that the reader who takes up this pamphlet introducing a Calvinistic Philosophy Club and its activities with some degree of interest, might give expression to the wish that

this last question (which, by the way, is proposed first in the paper) might have been dealt with a little more fully. It would, no doubt, have been very helpful if Dr. Van Til could have enlarged upon that very subject at this time. What is a Calvinistic philosophy? Is there such a thing? And, if so, what is its standpoint, task, and method? And, further, how do these in the case of philosophy differ from those of a Calvinistic theology? Dr. Van Til, in dwelling on the benefits that might accrue to theology from the Calvinistic study of philosophy (or, should I say the study of Calvinistic Philosophy?), shows that for the critical understanding and evaluation of modern theology a knowledge of philosophical movements is quite important. On that, I trust, there is no doubt. But here again the question as to whether there is, ideally speaking, such a magnitude as a Calvinistic Philosophy is not touched. It sounds very hopeful when on the very first page of the address this question is raised. But at once, after the question is proposed, the writer goes on to make remarks about the way in which the teaching of philosophy and of religion are related in a Christian college; and also about the need of having a definite world and life view underlying all of our teaching. Dr. Van Til is eternally right when in this connection he insists upon the great importance of having the Calvinistic world and life view consciously underlie and permeate all teaching in Calvinistic colleges. But neither of these two points is an answer to the question whether there is such a thing as a Calvinistic Philosophy.

It has for some time seemed to the present reviewer that this subject should have received more attention than it has received so far from the Society for Calvinistic Philosophy in the Netherlands. With the organization of an American group under the almost identical name, "Calvinistic Philosophy Club," it might have been appropriate and helpful if some attempt at an answer to the question whether there is such a thing as a Calvinistic Philosophy (which—it need hardly be said—is something quite different from holding that there is such a thing as a Calvinistic attitude toward the study of philosophy) had been attempted. Possibly this will be done some time in the near future.

Meanwhile we heartily recommend this pamphlet to all Calvinists who are interested in the deeper issues of their faith. It will be helpful if, also in the future, this new Club can keep up making its papers available in mimeographed form to the general public.

C. B.

ON INSPIRATION

INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF INSPIRATION. By Harry Rimmer, D.D., Sc.D., Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. pp. 244; price \$2.00.

THE author has undertaken to write a six-volume series of apologetical works, to be known as the *John Laurance Frost Memorial Library*. The book now under consideration is the third volume of the series. The two that preceded it are *The Harmony of Science and Scripture*, and *Modern Science and the Genesis Record*. They are all works in defense of the Bible as the Word of God. Written in the author's well known popular style, this volume on inspiration is pleasant reading. It bears unmistakable evidence of the writer's belief in the plenary inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible, and is well calculated to strengthen the faith of believers, though it would probably make little impression on those who make human reason the ultimate standard of truth, and would be branded by them as unscientific. In harmony with the standpoint of faith, it directs the attention of the readers to the testimony of Scripture itself to its divine inspiration, the very testimony which the unbeliever would not be ready to accept. There are the claims of the prophets and of the apostles, the testimony of Jesus Christ, and the voice of prophecy. While on the whole the arguments themselves are not new—which they could hardly be after so much has been written on the subject—, they are sometimes put in a new and arresting way. The present reviewer endorses prac-

tically everything contained in this volume, though he finds the author's assertion that we have two separate, though closely connected, books in the Bible, namely, the Old Testament and the New, is rather dubious, especially in view of what he says on page 131: "The word 'testament' really means 'covenant' or 'contract.' When a contract is fulfilled, its authority ends. The Lord Jesus Christ in His earthly ministry and by His vicarious death on Calvary, fulfilled all of the conditions of the old contract. So from the time of the Crucifixion until the Age of Grace shall end, men deal with God under the terms of a new contract. The conditions of that new contract which replaced the old covenant, upon the fulfillment of the latter, are all set forth in the revelation which we call the New Testament." This is a denial of the unity of the covenant in the old and new dispensations, and of the authority of the Old Testament for those living in the "Age of Grace," that is the present age. It bears evidence to the undesirable leaven of dispensationalism.

L. BERKHOF.

AN EXPOSE OF LIBERALISM

MODERN RELIGIOUS LIBERALISM. By John Horsch. *The Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago.* 320 pages. Price \$1.50.

WHEN a demand for new editions of a book encourages the publishers to reissue it, there must be something about it that makes it deserving of such appreciation. And when that appreciation is thus expressed by the family of God's people, the volume deserves to be looked into and recommended, if possible. So it is with this volume, the third edition, which is now before us.

The book has been considerably revised. A chapter on Communism has been added. And those on the Social Gospel and on the Modernistic View of Missions have been enlarged.

It will be impossible to do justice to the rich contents of this work in a brief review. Suffice it to say that its determinative position is that the Christianity of Fundamentalism is sharply distinguished from, indeed is antithetical to, the Christianity of Modernism. Horsch attempts to show the tremendous difference between the two, and to refute the modernists by their own words and by the use of the Bible. This is done at numerous points of cardinal importance. Various movements associated in spirit with the "ism" which he opposes are also mercilessly exposed. The dangers from the side of modernism through the various educational agencies are indicated. After perusing this work, it doesn't surprise us at all that it has been, and perhaps is today, used as a textbook in The Moody Bible Institute. The author is apparently committed to the position of the Fundamentalists.

The volume ought to be in the hands of every Christian who makes contact with Modernism. And who doesn't? H. S.

ORGANIZER OF AMERICAN PRESBYTERIANISM

THE LIFE STORY OF REV. FRANCIS MAKEMIE. By Rev. I. Marshall Page. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1938. 256 pages. Price \$2.50.

FOR American Presbyterianism Francis Makemie has the same significance as Michael Schlatter has for the German Reformed Church and Henry Melchior Muehlenberg for American Lutheranism. He organized it. The phenomenal growth of American Presbyterianism adds to the significance of his achievement. It is in grateful appreciation of Makemie's services to his Church, that Rev. Page has devoted years of patient and trying research to the preparation of this biography. Historians have frequent occasion to deplore the fact that the future significance of a great man is often hid from the eyes of his contemporaries and that rarely are the records of such a man's life and labors preserved in such fulness as the biographer would wish. In the case of Makemie, what has been preserved is extraordinarily fragmentary. Makemie spent his childhood in Ireland, studied in Glasgow, and labored in the

Middle Colonies, but not one of these regions has thus far yielded much information concerning him. It was, therefore, under the compulsion of necessity, that Rev. Page had large recourse to conjecture and imagination in order to give us a tolerably complete biography of Makemie. The incorporation in the book of exact reproductions of a large proportion of the original sources greatly adds to the scholarly value of the biography. The author's warm reverence for the subject of his biography makes it attractive reading even for such as do not quite share his Presbyterian enthusiasm for Makemie. At times the book impresses one as if the special aim of the author is to capture the hearts of Presbyterian youths for his hero. The combination of this trait with its display of the results of original research constitutes perhaps the most characteristic trait of the volume. Its picture of Makemie is comprehensive. He is set before us not merely as the organizer of Presbyterian churches and the Presbyterian Church and the defender of the rights of dissenters from the tyranny of a Lord Cornbury, but also as a man of warm friendships, unselfish interest in the welfare of others, very diverse accomplishments and talents, and extensive business interests and large temporal possessions. His spiritual greatness comes out in his unflinching subordination of all these other interests to the cause of Christ and His Gospel.

D. H. KROMMINGA.

A LENSKI COMMENTARY

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS AND OF THE EPISTLE OF JAMES. *By R. C. H. Lenski. Lutheran Book Concern. 685 pages. Price \$3.50.*

LENSKI has done a colossal amount of work in interpreting the N. T. He has covered the entire N. T. with the exception of the Epistles of Peter, John, and Jude. His work in this field is highly commendatory. I know of no commentary in which there is so much N. T. scholarship put in such a form as to be available for those who are not trained in the technique of exegesis. The author does not weary the reader with a detailed discussion of the reasons that led to his conclusions, but the conclusions are clearly stated. There is little ambiguity in the work. The latest volume is now before us. It has maintained the standard set by its predecessors. It is not a book of meditations which one can sit down and read, but it is a volume to which students can refer with great profit. The author is a Lutheran, and as one can expect from every loyal Lutheran, the bias is made to be felt here and there.

H. S.

A NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION

A CONSERVATIVE INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. *By S. A. Cartledge. Zondervan Publishing House. 196 pages. Price \$1.50.*

THE author is Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Columbia Theological Seminary at Decatur, Georgia. The volume has been prepared with the conviction of the author in the inspiration of the Bible, in the deity of Jesus, and in the actuality of supernaturalism.

The volume is not put in technical form. Any intelligent layman can and will, if he secures it, use it with profit. Though it is in popular form it is nevertheless up-to-date. Indeed, that is the chief reason for giving it a warm reception. The conclusions are similar to those that have already been expressed in print before. But this volume brings the readers in touch with the most recent contributions in the field of N. T. scholarship. New developments have been studied, weighed, and incorporated. They have in no case made any great difference to the conservative position of the past.

H. S.

MONKEY MILEAGE

MONKEY MILEAGE FROM AMOEBA TO MAN. *By J. L. Martin. Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co. 162 pages. Price \$1.00.*

IT IS regrettable that popular presentations of the objections to evolution are often couched in ridicule. As its title indicates, Mr. Martin's book is not free from this weakness, which is especially apparent in the first chapter on "My Evolutionary Record." Scientific facts are not always accurately given. These two weaknesses detract greatly from the value of an otherwise useful book. The author's stress of God as the source of all living things and his emphasis on the spiritual destiny of man will, no doubt, please all of his Christian readers.

EDWIN Y. MONSMA.

PAUL

A BRIEF LIFE OF PAUL. *By Benj. L. Olmstead. Light and Life Press, Winona Lake, Ind. 80 pages. Price 35c.*

THE book was prepared to serve as a reference and study book for S. S. teachers and others interested in Service Training courses. It is a handy, well-arranged, conservative compendium covering the life of Paul in six chapters. Each chapter concludes with a series of suggestive questions. Well suited to any group study of the life of Paul and true to the Scriptures.

H. S.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

NETHERLANDS CHURCH NEWS

• The last General Synod of the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands adjourned October 2, 1936, met again April 5, 1938. The purpose of this long delayed session was the appointment of a Professor of Missions at the School at Kampen. Synod's choice was Dr. J. H. Bavinck, teacher at the Djokja (Dutch East Indies) School for Theological Training.

In the event that Dr. Bavinck accepts the position at the Theological School at Kampen, he will also teach Missions at the Free University in Amsterdam. The latter institution has already executed the necessary formalities to acquire the services of the new Professor. The appointment of a professor in the science of Missions is evidence of the interest in, and enthusiasm for, Missions among our Reformed brethren in the Netherlands. The words of the Lord, "Ye are my witnesses," they seek to apply in a systematic fashion.

Dr. J. H. Bavinck is well equipped for his task. Born in Rotterdam, 1895, he studied Theology at the Free University, finishing his academic work at Erlangen University. In 1921 he became minister of the Bandoeng (East Indies) church, returning to Holland in 1926. In 1930 he went back to the East Indies serving in Solo and later at the Training School at Djokja. Hence we may conclude that the Synod's choice was a good one.

• A very peculiar problem came up at the April, 1938, adjourned session of the above mentioned 1936 Synod. Some of the elder-delegates were no longer elder, since their term of office had expired. Were they still members of Synod or not? That was the problem. After some illuminating remarks by Dr. Grosheide, and after having heard the advice of Dr. H. H. Kuyper, it was decided to declare that they were.

- The April sessions of Synod were in one respect unique.

Whereas sessions of Synods are usually public, the April sessions were practically all executive sessions. No one was permitted to "listen-in." Naturally, this mysterious atmosphere whetted the appetite for news. What could it be that kept Synod so most privately busy? Was it perhaps the matter of differences between a few Professors at the Free University? Was it perhaps about the pending report of the Committee of Eight? (This committee must report in 1939 at the next General Synod to be held in Sneek). What was the secret? Well, a reporter of *De Standaard* did get some news. A "well-informed source" conveyed to him the information that regarding a much discussed and very important matter Synod had come to the greatest possible unanimity. And that the president of Synod had expressed his joy about it.

It was also discovered that the closing psalm of Synod had been Psalm 79:4. This psalm speaks of "Recall no more the sins we have committed, but may they all in pity be remitted"

And now the excluded public is putting two and two together. If they figure rightly, the secret is out. If they are not correct, it will be accepted as truth because the synodical delegates are still bound to maintain silence.

- The Committee of Eight appointed by Synod to report in 1939 regarding the trend in Philosophy notably in Amsterdam, lost one of its members. Prof. S. Greydanus of Kampen, a cautious, scholarly and withal gentlemanly theologian, sent his resignation to Synod. He finds it impossible to work on a committee one of whose members is allowed to issue brochures which deal with the matters entrusted to the committee. Nor does he approve of the method this member employs. Well, things are beginning to develop in the Netherlands.

- Economists of today are incessantly toiling to solve the problem of unemployment. Churches are dealing with the same problem. But there is this difference; the economists struggle with an industrial problem and the churches with a vineyard problem. The Reformed Churches of the Netherlands are trying this expedient: a synodically appointed Work and Workers Committee seeks to place candidates to the Ministry in places where work abounds. To date the committee has placed 45 candidates as assistant pastors and 7 as regular pastors. But there are many more workers waiting. So the committee has a correspondent in practically every one of the 48 classes who takes it upon himself to enlist in his classis regular contributors to the fund necessary to carry on the work. Church offerings and donations are also received. After a candidate is placed, the committee decreases the financial report year by year according to a stipulated ratio.

- The Dutch churches, Reformed and Dutch Reformed, are making a brave attempt to evangelize the masses. Open-air meetings are held in many cities and towns. The work is done in splendid fashion. Personally we attended meetings last year in which large choruses sang under the direction of very able leaders. We have seen chapels that were more pretentious than the building in which the congregation worshipped on Sunday. This is a Mission spirit worthy of emulation everywhere.

J. G. VAN DYKE.

RELIGIOUS NEWS ITEMS

- In the state of Washington the Council of Churches plans to approach the state authorities with the request to have the children excused one or more hours per week for weekday religious instruction. This is already allowed in forty states of the Union. The consciousness of the inadequacy of the Sunday School to meet the problem of religious instruction is there. But this will not do. Only a system that will permeate the entire instruction of the child with the realization that God is

the great Provider as well as the Creator of the universe, and that man cannot hope unaided to cope with the problems that he faces, and that redemption comes through the blood of the Lamb, can prove adequate to meet the rising tide of ungodliness.

- Gene Tunney, formerly heavy-weight boxing champion, is chairman of the Board of the American Distilling Industry. He plans to reform the distilling industries. He declared that the manufacturing of liquor was ordered by the vast majority of the people and that it has wonderful possibilities but also tremendous social responsibilities. He knows that the leaders of the industry are in the business by the sufferance of the people. He believes that they should not encourage spirits consumption by the youth and should exercise closer control of the stuff as it is transported from the distiller to the ultimate consumer. Well, that's a fine gesture. But it is motivated not by the love of youth but by "the love of money." He would save the business. Had he been deeply interested in the youth, he would have used his influence to cut off the source of liquor entirely.

- The Parliament in India has decided to abandon prayers in the legislature on the ground that such practice may lead to interreligious complications and that it may encroach on the time available for transacting business. The prayer was usually in the form of the national song known as *Vande Mataram*, which is an invocation to and in behalf of Mother India. That such a prayer is abolished will strike most Christians as good riddance. But the grounds adduced for such abolition will hold for the surrender of prayer in any group of lawmakers. We can in this country frankly face the question of our prayers at the opening of Congress and Senate. If it is but a piece of outmoded custom that is still being tolerated for the sake of tradition, let us be done with it. If it is regarded as an encroachment upon time, it is a bit of formality that is abominable to God. If it must be kept in such general vague and abstract forms in order to avoid interreligious complications that no personal contact with God is sensed, let us be done with it. Prayer must be prayer. And let us hope that real prayer may be found in halls of legislation and be continued.

- A unique trial took place recently in Omaha sponsored by the Nebraska Youth Council. Three members of the Supreme Court presided, and prominent attorneys of Omaha and Lincoln conducted the trial. Here are the charges brought against adult society by the youth: 1. Failure to provide opportunity for employment (found guilty with recommendation of clemency). 2. Failure to provide for constructive use of leisure time (guilty). 3. Failure to provide preparation for marriage and home life (guilty). 4. Frustration of opportunity by imposing on youth militaristic nationalism (not guilty). 5. Denial of spiritual and religious heritages through secularizing of life (not guilty). One wonders what benefit such gatherings held by the youth and consisting of high school and college students can possibly have. Such questions belong properly in an adult society. Let them find out if they are guilty and then do something about it. But when the youth begins to discuss the situation from these angles it smacks of an attempt to justify what ails them and to take an attitude of non-responsibility in the entire situation. It is the same old story. The other fellow is always to blame for our deficiencies.

- The Interchurch group in Florida have been called upon to lead in a movement to restore public respect for law and to reduce crime through organized propaganda. They aim "to rid the state of all gambling, to reduce taxes by abolishing crime, and to make Florida prosperous." Now, as laudable as these objectives may be, it is rather disappointing that an ecclesiastical group have no religious objectives in their campaign. Why not do these things for the honor and glory of God, in the interest of the development of His Kingdom and to develop respect for the law of God? The Churches are too

inclined to be the servants of civic-minded citizens. Let them function as servants of the Most High. No better and no more effective service can they render to any state.

- Bishop Sheil, who is the founder and director of the Catholic Youth Organization, defended his organization before the Protestant Union Ministers' meeting a few weeks ago in Chicago. The organization had become known for its boxing teams. The bishop justified the prominent place of boxing in his program from two points of view. First, as a help to reduce juvenile delinquency and crime. "Youth needed new heroes to take the place of the big shots in gangster land, and these new heroes the C. Y. O. has learned are the boys who can win their way in the squared circle." Secondly, they served as a means to secure entrance in many an underprivileged home. That a religious organization would deliberately present to the boys of this country that boxers are exemplary heroes is little short of astounding. Christ the only perfect example has none of the squared circle spirit. Try to think of him arrayed in boxing paraphernalia attempting by physical dexterity and strength to dispose of his opponent. It is impossible. In such a picture one has lost the Christ. And any form of exercise or entertainment that beclouds the finer virtues of the Lover of the Youth should not be encouraged by organizations that bear his name.

- The tremendous consciousness of labor troubles in this land has been drilled into the minds of the students of the Chicago Theological Seminary. The members of the Kimbark House, a theological students' co-operative eating place, were called upon to decide whether they should buy their milk from the Farmers' Cooperative or from the Milk Drivers' Union. They decided for the former because it was the more democratic organization. Picketeers are now parading before the Kimbark House with signs reading, "Unfair to Organized Labor." These socially sensitive and labor conscious group of students are now wondering what to do. They have found that problems in abstracto are quite different from problems in concreto, and that theory and practice are not always the best of friends.

- Among the many conferences held at London during Easter one dealt with the subject "New Ideals in Education." Of all the professions in which man is engaged none seem to be so uncertain and so futile as that of education. There seems to be a consciousness that education has failed. And the consciousness of failure usually occasions another conference. The ideals presented were not new but old. Here are some of them. The whole man is the proper objective of education. Quite correct. Not merely the physical man, nor merely the mental man, but also the moral and specifically the religious man. Secondly, education is the business of the Church. If the Church has the truth as it claims to have, it is worth while to consider the justice of the contention. Education should keep the final and not the immediate objective determinative. Citizens should be prepared for citizenship in the Kingdom of Heaven, and not primarily for citizenship in the United Kingdom. It is at least encouraging to realize that education is not bothered a great deal with a smug assurance of having attained, but is still feeling its way. But one can't make gains by going about in a circle.

- We are living in an age of experimentation. But experimentation without some guiding and controlling principle is liable to go beyond the proper bounds and to run amuck. Dr. Reisner, pastor of the Broadway Temple in New York City, urges "a spirit of personal evangelism to win people to Christ." Dr. Gates, Pastor of the Calvary Church, called upon Reisner to explain the type of personal evangelism used in the Broadway Temple. He declares that when a group of his Church visited the Temple, they found the altar moved back, and then

four radio stars came out to sing and dance in a number called "The Girl in the Police Gazette." Dr. Reisner responded that he deplored personal criticism of his methods of modern evangelism and admitted that the case in question was a mistake. But surely it would not be necessary to experiment to conclude that that method would be a mistake.

- One may seriously question in just how far it is justifiable for a Christian Church to take active part in the World's Fair Project for 1939 in New York City. The spirit of Christianity would seem so out of place in an atmosphere which will undoubtedly be one of worldly entertainment on the one hand and of the glorification of the achievements of man on the other. But independent of this question, it does seem strange that the authorities have taken a peculiar inconsistent attitude toward religion and its part in the fair. Said G. A. Whalen, president of the Fair Corporation, "provision has been made for a tribute to the principle of the freedom of worship and an unusual opportunity for the expression of the pervading influence of religion in every phase of American life. . . . A keystone of liberty is freedom of worship, the right of each individual to entertain and practice religious beliefs according to the dictates of his conscience. . . . Denial of freedom of worship destroys true civic liberty and its support is the immediate personal concern of all American citizens." Not a bad declaration of the principle of religious freedom. But the facts are that no religious services except that of the Roman Catholics will be permitted on the grounds. No religious exhibits of any denomination will be allowed, though it has been petitioned for again and again. That is not religious liberty. It is the suppressing of religion. We shall hear plenty of oratory about religious freedom, but the actuality of religious liberty is liable to become more and more denied.

- City Jailer Harper Chandler in Danville, Va., declares "Usually murderers are the most industrious readers of the Bible, and they do some heavy reading as the time for their trial draws near. Most prisoners charged with serious crimes call for a copy of the Bible after they have been in jail a week." The trouble is that they start to read the Bible too late, when the damage is done. Prayerful Bible reading might have given them an impetus away from the road of crime. But they are in jails now, and when the dark hours of life draw near, they turn to the light of the Word hoping to secure something that may enable them to bear the humiliation and the agony of it all.

- The question of sex education has not yet come to a conclusion. There is some agreement that the young people know far more about it than the youth of the days gone by. But it is just that that makes a proper education more imperative. It was thought that parents should take care of it. But parents have shown a reluctance and an evasiveness about it that they have failed. The schools were then regarded as the proper channel of sex knowledge, but here again the most intimate aspects of the subject was regarded as too delicate to be plain and blunt about. Rev. Park in Toronto feels that the Churches should assume this responsibility and his Church is offering twice a year short courses on this delicate subject. I am not so sure that the Church is the proper educating agency in this matter, but I am sure that this matter should be treated in the light of God's will. The origination of sex must be found in God's creation. It is to serve the purposes of God's creative and perhaps even the redemptive activities. That will help to remove the prudery and the delicacy and the evasiveness that so often is associated with the subject. And if the Church is the only educational agency that can do it, very well let it take care of it. *Christian* physicians can and have served excellently in this capacity.

H. S.