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A Serious Situation

RECENT rulings of Selective Service authorities in Washington are beginning to create a situation which may prove to have serious consequences for the future flow of candidates for the Protestant ministry. For some time the government has taken the stand that this flow of present and future candidates ought to be safeguarded with a view to the spiritual needs of the nation which the ministry must supply. It is sometimes thought that the exemption from military service allowed theological students in the seminary and pre-theological students in college, was a matter of a favor which the clergy and the future clergy enjoy because of their sacred office. There are, of course, such favors which the clergy enjoy as a class, as for instance the reduction of railroad fares and the granting of clergy discounts in certain business houses. Whatever one may think of such “favors,” exemption from military service as allowed by our government is not one of them. The government takes the correct stand that the service which the clergyman renders is one that is indispensable for the welfare of the country and that weakening this group or breaking down its future supply will operate to the serious detriment of the spiritual and moral welfare of the nation. It is of paramount importance that in these days, when thousands of ministers are serving their country as chaplains, when the need of strengthening the morale of the people both at home and at the battle front is greater than ever, when the comforts and consolations of the Gospel are needed more sorely than ever before,—it is of paramount importance that the continued flow of students and candidates for the ministry shall not be broken.

For some time the government has taken serious cognizance of this need. Pre-professional students, among whom also those in medicine, dentistry, and theology, were declared exempt from military service provided they were definitely committed to a college preparatory course fitting them for entrance upon the professional school of their choice, and provided some professional school had given them advance certification that they would be admitted upon the completion of their pre-professional studies. Now, however, the authorities have suddenly issued a new directive requiring all such pre-professional students to be in the professional school of their choice on or before July 1, 1944, withdrawing the privilege of occupational deferment from all who have not advanced sufficiently in their college studies to be ready for entrance upon the professional school of their choice. Limiting ourselves to students for the ministry, this means that, unless the present rules are changed, the flow of pre-theological students entering the Seminary will be completely stopped after July 1, 1944, except for those who have been physically disqualified from military service. Even such persons may be taken by the government into defense work at home.

This creates a very serious situation. Let no one interpret this as a plea for a favor to be given to future men of the cloth. No one is too good to be drafted by the government into such service as the welfare of the nation may require in days of national peril. But the need which the ministry is expected to meet is precisely one of the greatest, and it is a need which must be supplied if the nation is not to perish. It is gratifying that our government has ever recognized this, but it may well be questioned whether the most recent orders on this score are in harmony with this policy. If one were certain that the war would be over in a twelvemonth, all this might not be so serious, although even then the interruption of the flow of future ministers would be seriously felt. With the prospect that this war may last for some years to come, the present regulations are nothing short of alarming. With acceleration of the theological course in effect in many (if not most) seminaries, it will only be a little over two years before the number of available seminarians and pre-seminarians will be exhausted, except possibly for a small trickle of those who are rejected from military service on physical grounds.

The problem is complicated by the fact that the situation involves serious discrimination against the Protestant and in favor of the Roman Catholic clergy. Not that this is so intended. It is all in the system of education. While a Protestant student is not “in the seminary” until after he has finished college, the Roman Catholic student for the priesthood is “in the seminary” as soon as he has finished his high school training. The Roman Catholic system of minor and major seminary training places the youthful student for the priesthood under the care of the Church and actually in the seminary at a very early age. Consequently though without intending any discrimination, the ruling of the government is designed to favor the Roman Catholics and to place the Protestants at a disadvantage. Heavy pressure is being brought to bear upon the proper authorities in Washington to remedy this.
The N.A.E. Goes Forward

REPORTS coming in from the Second Annual Convention of the National Association of Evangelicals, held in Columbus, Ohio, this past month are gratifying to those who pray for united action on the part of all who stand upon the basis of the authority of the Word of God and the great verities which that Word teaches. The N.A.E. presents a strong testimony over against the Modernism of our day and its organization is the most powerful single protest against the principles of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. How unfounded the accusation is that the N.A.E. in any way compromises its testimony over against this modernist "super-church" organization which pretends to speak for all American Protestantism, anyone who reads the literature and hears the addresses delivered under the auspices of the N.A.E. can know. There is need of a united testimony for the truth as we know it from the Word of God. And there is a special need of action, united action on the part of all who name themselves after the Christ of the Scriptures.

One or two voices have been heard of late expressing surprise that those who take a strong stand for the Reformed Faith can join this National Association of Evangelicals. The objection urged was that there are many Arminians in the N.A.E. and it was assumed that this means those who are Reformed in their Faith are compromising with such Arminianism. One writer even spoke of the Christian Reformed Church, which had enough vision to join the N.A.E., as flying the flag of Reformed truth "half mast" since this action had taken place. How anyone knowing the facts and the situation can make that kind of statement with its implied accusation is difficult to understand. Joining the N.A.E. has nothing to do with church union. Neither has such joint action anything in common with an attempt to move in the direction of doctrinal indifferentism among those who are evangelical. We believe we may say without fear of contradiction that the editorial stand of THE CALVIN FORUM has been one of outspoken and enthusiastic espousal and propagation of the Reformed Faith. We believe with all our heart that the richest and fullest formulation of the faith of the Scriptures is given us in the Reformed Faith. But it would be a sad commentary upon our Christianity in its Reformed expression if it had no room for standing shoulder to shoulder with other Christians that cling to the Word of God and the great verities of the historic, supernatural faith of the Bible, even though there are many differences of doctrinal understanding. When our espousal of the Reformed Faith has made it impossible to cooperate with those who have an orthodox creed but not of the Reformed type, we have substituted the worst kind of exclusivism and narrowism for the depth and the breadth of the Faith of our fathers.

In these days of the perversion of the supernatural, biblical, revealed truth at the hands of Modernism, there is great need for all who name themselves after Christ to stand together against every form of unbelief that comes under the garb of a higher interpretation of the Christian Faith, as Modernism does. Without in any way relaxing on the distinctive things of our own creed, we can join hands with all those who believe in and profess the Christ of the Scriptures. "Hereby," says the Apostle John, "know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not Jesus is not of God." Fellow-Christians who hold the Arminian view of sin and redemption will not be welcomed in the pulpits of those who prize the Reformed Faith, but it would be a sad situation if there were no common ground in any large scale gospel and radio work on which Calvinists and Arminians, who both believe in salvation through Jesus Christ from sin, could send out a joint testimony into this sin-sick and sin-ridden world.

The N.A.E. is doing a great work and those of the Reformed Faith will do well to join it. They can exert a wholesome influence upon others and add their testimony to that of others who wish to be loyal to the biblical Faith, from which the organized Church in our land has departed so seriously today. Both the evangelical Arminians and the Calvinists believe in the Christ and in the atonement through the Christ of Calvary. It will be a beautiful opportunity for Calvinists to show the superiority of their faith over that of the evangelical Arminians while both address themselves with the Word of the living God to a perishing world with its denial of the heinousness of sin, the power of the blood of Calvary, and the supremacy of the Christ.

C. B.

A War-Time Confession

WITH the invasion of Western Europe on the horizon, and an earnest prayer in the hearts of us all for God's blessing upon this gigantic effort to crush the enemy and bring this horrible war to a close, it is well to remind ourselves of the intimate connection between the unconquerable will to resist manifest in the countries of the occupation and the revival of the powerful verities of the Reformed Faith apparent in some of these countries. We have had occasion to point to this connection before.
Now comes a statement entitled “A War-Time Confession” which has been circulated throughout the membership of the “Hervormde Kerk” (i.e., the established Reformed Church) of the Netherlands under the title: What We Believe, and What We Do Not Believe.

In this statement of thirteen points clear and unequivocal testimony is given to the great truths of the Faith of the Scriptures both in its doctrinal and in its ethical implications. The Christ as the Way, the Truth, and the Life, without whom no one can come unto the Father, is placed over against the false teaching of Nazism that God can truly be known in the history of the race apart from the supernatural Christ. In each case a great truth is first affirmed and then the repudiation of the current error is solemnly and clearly stated. Here is clear-cut testimony. We affirm, and we reject. Here glorious truth is placed over against “fatal error.” Anti-Semitism, the deification of the State, the denial of the supernatural character and eschatological outlook of the Kingdom of God, all come in for scrutiny and repudiation. Everyone ought to read this statement, which may be had free of charge upon writing to: Central Bureau for Inter-Church Aid, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N.Y.

A remarkable fact in connection with this statement is that it comes from authorities of the Established (“Hervormde”) Church. Although there have been days when that church was honey-combed with Modernism, ever since the influence of Abraham Kuyper, who established a free Church movement in 1886, there has taken place a remarkable counter-Reformation in the Established Church. While at one time Modernists held the prominent pulpits in the large cities, for some time past many of the outstanding leaders and preachers in that Church have been of the distinctly orthodox and even Reformed type. Today, while the church is in the shadows, only the language of the unwarried Reformed Faith can meet the test. This statement is a glorious vindication of that Faith and it is proof positive that clear-cut, anti-theoretically stated formulations of the great truths of the historic Reformed Faith are a living power in days of suffering and persecution.

When the day of liberation shall come for the “Church of the Occupation,” it will be apparent to the whole world how God has purified, strengthened, and enriched his people while suffering in the crucible of affliction. May God speed the day!

C. B.

**Sovereign Grace**

In the religious vocabulary of the Christian there are certain key words which gather in themselves the distilled wisdom and truth of the ages in concentrated form. Such a term is: Sovereign Grace. It is only by sovereign grace that we can become children of God. Sovereign grace is the true perspective into the highest conception of God, the God of transcendence and glory, of holiness and sovereignty, of unfathomable mercy and of free compassion. Sovereign Grace—not Fate—is the solution of the problems and enigmas of this poor, benighted, blundering world. It will be sovereign grace when you enter through the pearly gates into the celestial city. Sovereign grace is the glory and the boast of the most educated as well as the most illiterate child of God. Sovereign grace is the heart and core of the Bible, the essence of the teaching of the New Testament, the secret of Paul, the boast of Augustine, the master thought of Calvin, the dynamic of the life of Kuyper. Sovereign grace is the keystone in the arch of Christian truth.

To be sure there are corruptions and distortions of this precious truth. Then it becomes a caricature. But this only proves that the finest can be debased and corrupted and it confirms the saying that the corruption of the highest produces the lowest. But you do not think less of gold because this precious metal has been debased in some cases and imitated by a worthless metal in another. You do not think less of the priceless precious stones because there are those who would palm off for them base substitutes. Today there are new yearnings in the heart of many for a truth that meets the exigencies of the hour and can lift man’s seared soul above these into the realm of the abiding realities. In these days when all that man built seems to have collapsed, there are outreaching after the deeper truth that saves. Such a truth is that of Sovereign Grace. The Calvin Forum has written this pregnant truth in its banner from the day of its first issue, nine years ago this month. Far from being out of date, he who has caught the secret of Sovereign Grace, is in the very front line of the battle for the soul of humanity and in the very van of all human thought. The Calvinist is in principle the most up-to-date thinker. He who with all his soul knows and believes in the Sovereign God is always a step ahead—not by his own achievement but by the grace of that same God—ahead of those who know Him not or who may only know Him by “the hearing of the ear.”

C. B.
Why Not Two Universities?
A Plea For Regional Research Libraries

H. J. Van Andel
Professor of Dutch Culture, Calvin College

W HAT is a University? According to our Encyclopedias there are two types of Universities in our United States. There are regional Universities, with big campuses on which we find besides a college with some graduate courses a number of professional schools for business administration, engineering, law, medicine, education, theology, etc. And there are group supported Universities which often have only a small campus, few professors, comparatively few students, but always graduate work and a research library in at least one department. There are big colleges in our country which are in reality universities. And there are colleges which call themselves universities, but should not do so, for the consensus of opinion according to Encyclopedia authorities is that a University should at least consist of a college of the humanities (that is, the spiritual courses) and the natural sciences, and some graduate work in one or more of these college subjects. Henry Van Dyke says somewhere that according to American tradition a University must do graduate work in at least one department. If the present writer is not mistaken he means in one department of the “arts and sciences,” i.e. in college subjects. That explains perhaps why such a big institution as Johns Hopkins, famous for its medical school, has one graduate department in the humanities, namely philosophy. The graduate work need not necessarily lead to a Ph.D., for there are reputable Universities like Tulane and Texas State University which at least up to recent times only granted Master’s degrees. Of course, the library must be adequate for the graduate work offered, and the professors should be equipped for their task of guiding research work, which task does not mean an A.M. or a Ph.D., for such degrees simply indicate a definite number of courses with a satisfactory grade but not that one is able to do independent research work without professional assistance. To conclude: The minimum connotation of the term university seems to be: a college plus at least one graduate department in the arts with an efficient library, and an efficient staff of well trained professors to make free research possible for regions or groups that feel the need of such research. Let us examine what this means for a Calvinistic University.

I. FIRST REQUIREMENT: A COLLEGE
Are there Universities without colleges? There were some in our United States, but the trend of the times, and tradition forced them to introduce a college. There were four universities in the latter part of the nineteenth century which were established without undergraduate work. But in about a quarter of a century they all had to add a college, an undergraduate department. It is a mistaken notion that European Universities have no equivalent of our colleges. The English Universities of which our American ones are copies are complexes of many “colleges” each consisting of an undergraduate department and one or more graduate departments, and professional schools. The Dutch Universities recognize since 1931 an American A.M. as a candidate’s diploma which means three years of study, so that our Junior or third college year is recognized by the Dutch government to be equivalent to the first Dutch University year. The other continental universities must have a similar arrangement for the Dutch are too careful and too slow to set a different pace from France and Germany. And in America the very effort of President Hutchins of Chicago to organize the first two college years as a separate institution granting an “A.B.” and his further effort to combine the first two college years with the Senior High School (grades 10, 11 and 12) into a Junior college shows that he recognizes at least the Junior and Senior years in college as essential for University study.

From the foregoing it must be plain that a Calvinistic University would hardly succeed without a college. Tradition and experiment would condemn such an effort. But also practical considerations. After all, the great majority of students in our universities are undergraduates. Independent research work is done by comparatively few, especially in the humanities. In an exclusive graduate school the professors in those branches would hardly have a chance to teach, and to prepare students properly for research work. Further, it is of the utmost importance that the scientific curiosity of students be aroused in the Junior and Senior years, and that the basic principles in the spiritual sciences be in accord with the Scriptures to bear any fruit for the coming of the Kingdom. Even
now students in Christian colleges have to some extent been spoiled by an evolutionistic high school training or by modern texts. For professors and students both, therefore, it is necessary to have a Christian college as a foundation for Christian research. Even then it will be hard enough for the professors to convince their students to stay with a small institution. This problem can partly be solved by having assistants and instructors for the first two college years. But, if the students have no respect for their own principles, it will be impossible to interest them in research work in a small graduate school. And conversely, no graduate school can flourish without a basic college. A college is needed to prepare students, and to stimulate their interest in principles and in research. In the college courses the research problems can be pointed out. In the Seminars (or roundtable classes) of the graduate school these problems are thoroughly discussed. For the sake of professors and students, and for the sake of principles and problems, it is unavoidable to have two college years, and if two, why not four? Even the survey courses and the introductory courses are of the greatest value, both from the point of view of content and tenor. And this goes back even to the elementary and high schools. No Calvinistic graduate study is fully possible without Calvinistic training in the grades and in the college. It is one great chain of causes and effects, of select principles and select facts. There is no future for Christian Research without the Christian School. Christ must be not only in the church, in salvation, and in Christian conduct, but Christ must be the Alpha and the Omega of education and philosophy. Christ must be king also of the undergraduate college which is the most important link in the whole chain. For in the College years it is determined what our future leaders are going to think and to do.

II. RESEARCH LIBRARIES

A second requirement for a University is a research library. There must be students who are interested and well trained both in regard to principles and scientific technique. There must be professors who understand the Christian philosophy of life which presupposes the foundations of theology and ethics and the foundations of a Biblical theory of knowledge and culture. But, before all these, there must be books, books, books. Even if we cannot have one graduate school, let us at least have research libraries.* Some of the smaller though reputable, graduate schools have only about a hundred thousand books. These books can be roughly divided into Encyclopedias, Primary sources, General works, Monographs, and Magazines. For philosophy, history, and literature a great number of primary sources are needed, some of which are rare and many of which are very expensive. For education, the social sciences, psychology and psychiatry a considerable number of works on recent research are necessary. To buy a hundred thousand volumes costing an average of three dollars a piece, three hundred thousand dollars are required. To house these books adequately in a building which has lecture rooms, seminar rooms, meeting halls, stacks and alcoves for books, tables and nooks (or "corrals") for laymen, graduate students, doctors, and professors, another two hundred thousand dollars could easily be used. That makes a half million together. To establish a research library, then, of only a hundred thousand books it would be necessary to have for instance 2,500 people contribute twenty dollars per year for ten years. And this would only be a beginning, especially in a city like Grand Rapids where there are no other research libraries. But with faith and energy such libraries could be founded all over our country. They would be arsenals of Calvinism, if the books were chosen with an eye toward the cultural value of Christianity. For here is the weak spot in our American education. The students have been taught from their youth that Christianity has no cultural and philosophical values. And here is the arena where all the great Christian heroes—not only Reformers, but also Christian statesmen, scholars, artists, inventors, leaders—have been slain and where Christ has been crucified again. Research we need. Not any and every kind. But Research in topics in which our Christian honor is involved. Catholicism, Liberalism, and even Evangelical Liberalism and Arminianism have slandered the great orthodox Christian believers of the past and credited their achievements to the Humanism of the Italian Renaissance, to the French Revolution, to the rise of the Natural Sciences, to the triumph of Biblical Criticism, and to the application of humanitarian ideas. It will take dozens of years before the pseudo-scholarly work of unbelievers and semi-pagan historians and philosophers has been undone. But this should be done. And with the fear of God it can be done.

Here are some examples of misguided modern scholarship. Calvin has been called a primitivist, though in reality he laid more foundations than Augustine and Aquinas ever did. Erasmus and Sebastian Brandt get the honor of having exposed Catholic superstition, but in reality these men only ridiculed the ignorance of the priests and professors, whereas the superstition of the Catholic church was not fully exposed until Calvin wrote his Institutes and the Dutch Calvinist, Philips van Marnix of St. Aldegonde, wrote his famous work, The Beehive of the Catholic Church. Erasmus and Reuchlin are praised for their work in textual criticism of the New and of the Old Testament, but according to Dakin's Calvinism (London, 1941) Calvin is recognized even by modern scholars as

*There are such Research Libraries for the Mennonites and the Jews in Philadelphia. But no graduate school can do without one.
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the father of scientific exegesis which goes far beyond primitive textual criticism and puts the latter in its right place. Calvinistic Research will straighten history out in many of its aspects, religious as well as cultural, and inspire us with new courage.

Should a Calvinistic University not include the Natural Sciences, Medicine, and Law then? Let us forget about these big matters for at least a quarter of a century. We need first of all Research in the Humanities to correct liberalistic scholarship. And moreover, the question is whether we should ever try to build laboratories and hospitals which will devour millions of dollars and open the door to a number of students and teachers who are only lukewarm in regard to the principles of God's Word. For technical equipment cannot dispense with a great number of technicians, and they are the ones who may drag us down again to the level of liberalism. No, let us carefully select our students, our librarians, and our professors for the natural sciences, but especially for the humanities, and possibly also for astronomy and psychiatry, and let us work night and day to break the yoke of liberalistic tyranny.

But how about Theology? the reader asks. Strange as it may seem, the present writer believes that graduate work in the Humanities is in a way more important than in theology. For it is in the Humanities that Orthodoxy was defeated first of all. The seminaries have not spoiled the colleges, but the colleges have spoiled the seminaries. And, moreover, the college graduates go out to teach in our schools, and for education the high schools and colleges are more important than the seminaries. But if there is ambition among the young ministers to carry on graduate work and to attack the products and the views of Liberals, Arminians, Barthians, Occamists, and Thomists, who will deny that this will not be of incalculable advantage for the Kingdom of God? Bavinck has said: Theology is not the Queen of the Sciences, but Christ is our King. Christ is King of all scientific disciplines, and our relation to Him determines all our thoughts and doings. Certainly, let there be a Research Library for Theology in all its branches. And let every Reformed seminary strive to complete its program so that Th.D's may be awarded to worthy students and that the mouths of unbelievers and halfbelievers in the truths of religion and ethics may be stopped. But the humanities should precede.

A university as we described may be small, but what of it? Calvin started his Academy with five professors in 1559. The Free University of Amsterdam began with five professors and five students in 1880 and up till recently had only 25 professors in theology, the humanities, mathematics, law and psychiatry, and about 800 students. Both institutions have been powerful instruments to call the world of education, theology, politics, social relations back to Christ. Let us not forget the day of small things!

III. FREE RESEARCH

A third requirement for a Calvinistic University is that it should be free, at least in its graduate studies. First of all, it is not the task of the church to take care of education, even though it is vitally interested in the college training of its preachers and teachers. It might be better, if for instance the Christian Reformed Church in the future would be consistent and make its college free, which does not mean that this denomination would have no financial obligations to a college where its strength or weakness lies. Moreover, the church would then still have the privilege and the duty to keep a watchful eye on her foster child in matters of religion.

Secondly the supervision or control of the church is no guarantee at all that the teaching in college and seminary will remain sound. In the past almost all Christian colleges which were denominational, or even church controlled, left the path of orthodoxy because the departments of philosophy, history, literature, psychology, pedagogy, and the social and natural sciences had become unsound. Here again the great importance of a Christian philosophy, or view of life, comes to the foregound. The Catholic dualism of nature and grace, reason and faith, culture and religion has done a world of harm to Christian education. The Occamistic separation of religion and culture made things worse. It was the beginning of the end: a school without Christ became a school against Christ. No, we need a Christian basis for education as Calvin taught. But the church as an institution cannot control this. Philosophy is too subtle a subject for the church.

Thirdly, the supervision of the institutional church is apt to do an injustice to real research. The church as an organization is naturally a conservative body. It is apt to fall into conservative ruts, and to confuse tradition with principle. It is apt to become legalistic, dogmatic, and puritanic, and to frown upon any idea or conclusion that does not agree with her present status. Research work may make the church feel uneasy and jirtery, even if it is of a sound kind. The present Dutch revolt against the Thomistic element in the views of Kuyper and Bavinck has caused Prof. Hepp to write a series of pamphlets against the so-called Philosophia Deformata (which means worse than un-Reformed) whereas the purpose of Vollenhoven and Dooyeweerd is apparently to return to Calvin, and to make the Bible the infallible rule also for philosophy without falling into the error of Biblicism. A research school will be hampered if it is denominational. History teaches that at first it will be scared and fight for puritanism and legalism. Later it will seek to escape the church's supervision in a subtle way, and under the flag of progressivism, harbor the foes of Arminianism, Bar-
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thianism and Modernism. A Research School ought to be free from church control, therefore, but kept in line by enthusiastic conferences. No whispering campaign can save a church. There must be real life, real enthusiasm, and open discussion of all issues without immediate heresy hunting. The profounder issues of culture cannot be solved by quoting a few Bible texts, or a few Reformed authorities. The issues and the inferences must be subjected to keen debates. The truth can stand on its own feet, but it must be challenged in conferences, regularly, and amicably.

IV. REGIONALITY

A fourth requirement for a Calvinistic University or Research School is that it should be a spontaneous act of faith of a homogeneous group in a certain region. How can a University or Research School be really free, and at the same time a compromise of heterogeneous groups, or churches, or even of individuals? The very compromise condemns it. It must be rooted in enthusiasm, not in sheer duty. Those who support it must believe in its mission as individuals who are interested in Christian higher education, not as church officers. Culture, that is science and art, cannot flourish in any atmosphere of compulsion, or official duty. It is born aloft by the spirit of free enterprise. And history is there to prove that neither church nor state is that which was laid for our regional Calvinistic conferences. Liberty, enthusiasm, and regional enterprise will make Calvinism again a force in American life.

Sphere sovereignty is also the fundamental principle of the new Calvinistic philosophy of the Law Idea. It is this idea that makes for enthusiasm, for whole-hearted love, for Kingdom work in the realm of culture. It is this idea which is indispensable for a Free Calvinistic University. History has proved this beyond a doubt.

The Keyword of a truly Reformed life and world view means also that any effort to found just one graduate school is bound to be a failure. Sphere sovereignty recognizes regional and collective needs. Every locality, district, state, or group of states and churches has its own needs. It is vain to dream of one standardized or totalitarian United States. It is also vain to dream of one all-embracing Calvinistic University for such a huge country as ours. Naturally our land is divided into two regions, North and South of Mason and Dixon’s line. And again, at least the Northern half is conscious of the Eastern States, of the Great Lakes Region, of the Plains of the West, and of the Pacific coastline. Then there is Canada, and there also the needs are different in East and West. Even on a smaller scale the words of Kipling are true:

East is East, and West is West,
And never the twain shall meet.

It is useless to tie any one’s hands. In the line of culture the church should not draw any boundaries. Our schools and colleges should be the free roaming ground for Calvinists of all colors. Here we should cultivate the enthusiasm, the liberty, and the unity of outlook and purpose that will make Calvinism again a force in American life. Here our young people who want a higher education should meet each other, and cultivate friendship, and love for our Reformed theology, philosophy and culture. Here the groundwork should be laid for our regional Calvinistic conferences. Liberty, enthusiasm, and regional enterprise will carry the future of Christianity and of Calvinism.

Besides the example of the Dutch Calvinists in all parts of the world, there is the inspiring example of the Catholics. They have seen the necessity of regionality long before the protestants saw it. In America alone they have 25 Universities, and 168 colleges. It is true their numbers overshadow ours. But Calvinism is stronger than many may surmise. There are ten million nominal Calvinists in the United States and two million in Canada. Of those twelve million only half a million are of Dutch descent, and the great majority of Presbyterians have English names. Their colleges and college graduates may have mostly fallen under the spell of evangelical, or even pure liberalism. But as Dr. Zwemer put it recently: the heart of the Presbyterian churches is still sound. It seems to be in America as it used to be in Europe fifty, sixty years ago. The educated have turned their backs on Calvin, but there are still the thousands among the common people who are faithful to the faith of the fathers. These are the men and women that...
ought to be organized for free Christian schools and colleges, for free graduate libraries and universities. Here is the hope of the fatherland. Not Fundamentalism will save the country, for it is based on the false dualism, that is, the hostility of faith and reason of William of Occam, or of Thomas a Kempis. But there is a future for real Calvinism, for Calvinism that believes in liberty, enthusiasm, and regionality. This Calvinism revolutionized the Netherlands after 1880. Let us give it a chance here. It is the Calvinism of the intelligent laymen.

But, some one will say, here is the difficulty. Which one of the seven groups mentioned must take the lead? The answer must be, let any group take the lead that wants to lead. If Michigan wants the lead let it take the initiative and form an association for the foundation of a Free Research Library and Graduate School on a Calvinistic basis, and let the Michiganers decide whether they want to found this Research Library in Grand Rapids, or, in Holland, Michigan, or whether they want to divide into two groups, each to work out its own salvation. If the "Easterners" want to found a graduate school in an Eastern city and call in the help of others who have confidence in them because they have shown firmness of principle and purpose, and because they have shown an immense amount of religious and scholarly enthusiasm, let them have their way. Each group has advantages of its own. The Michigan groups have the Dutch background, and history, prestige, and good-sized colleges and seminaries. The "Easterners" have the Scotch background, and energy, scientific achievement as shown in the Westminster Seminary and Westminster Theological Journal, and they have other great research libraries at their disposal. No real University or Research School can be the result of formal ecclesiastical co-operation. A real Research School must be the spontaneous act of a group of enthusiastic individuals in a certain region who are convinced that there should be Calvinistic Graduate work, and that such work should not be controlled by any denomination, but by an Association of lovers of the Reformed Truth.

It is a sad fact, that if two or more associations are formed there will be competition, division of funds, and division of loyalties. This is all true, but we have to take the consequences of our Calvinistic principles. We are not Catholics, and, therefore, we should not want a Church-controlled University; and we should not want even a University supported by an alliance of Reformed denominations. No church should take upon her shoulders to support college graduate work. A church needs Christian ministers, and Christian teachers, and therefore, if private initiative is lacking, it may and should establish a college. But no church should undertake to take on, or to regulate research work at least not in the humanities. No alliance of churches should undertake this. No alliance of churches should even try to aid one graduate school at the expense of another. This whole undertaking should be left to private initiative. And this private initiative cannot be limited by any church membership. Each individual must have a perfect right to join any group or groups that appeal to him. Liberty is the genius and the curse of the Reformation. It will be a genius, if we seize the opportunities which the Lord offers us. It will be a curse if we antagonize each other. Whether we are going to have one, or two, or a dozen Calvinistic Research Libraries or Universities in America, is not to be determined by a synod, or by church papers, or by personal opinion, but is going to be determined by the wide-awakeness and the aggressiveness of as many associations as the Lord may give grace to go forward. Vivat, crescat, floreat Universitas Calviniana Libera. And if we want a free university and a free research school, why should we not begin with two varieties, the Dutch and the Scotch?

---

**Eternal Life**

I knew him as a youth of signal promise
Preaching with zeal the Word of life and light;
My early teens were not too young to notice
His joy in serving God and doing right.

Then Time passed by and years can oft be trying—
I saw him now ascend our pulpit-stair
—My heart prayed for him—were his great hopes
dying?

How worn he was, his face much seamed with care.
Soon he announced the hymn and then his sermon
Begun quite simply, soon took hold on him:
He told about the glories of the Father
Of heavenly treasure that can never dim.

And lo, he changed, his face no longer frowning
Was young again and strong, with glory dawning.

—JOAN GEISEL GARDNER
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This subject is both timely and worthy of our consideration. There is added reason why we may profitably concern ourselves with this newly-born organization, since the action of our last held Synod relative our affiliation with this organization has already been criticised and the propriety of such affiliation questioned. This is not surprising; it quite naturally would be expected. Constructive criticism and considered appraisal of Synod’s action ought to be heartily welcomed.

The action that Synod took is in substantial agreement with the report and advice given by the delegates who were requested to attend the Constitutional Convention of the N.A.E. held in Chicago May 3-6 of last year. The report rendered by that committee was, I believe, sober and objective. It did not withhold praise where due, nor did it fail to point out apparent weaknesses and certain dangers which in the development of the N.A.E. might in the end make our co-operation and affiliation with the organization improper and impossible. However, up to the present stage of development of the N.A.E. there is nothing which hinders our hearty support and co-operation and there is everything which ought to justify the action that Synod felt free to take. Let it be said frankly that Synod was not led into a blind alley, or that the action was rushed and railroaded by some interested parties. It was action taken after due consideration was taken of objective facts; facts not only known to the entire body of Synod, but carefully deliberated upon by a committee of pre-advice.

We will be in a position to properly appraise the action of Synod only after we have clearly before our mind what that action is and then to proceed in considering the origin, membership, constitution, aims and objectives of the N.A.E. The advice of the committee anent this matter adopted by Synod with scarcely a dissenting vote, is found on page 137, Art. 202 of the Acts of Synod, 1943. For our present purpose articles one and seven will suffice. They read as follows: 1. That we as denomination become a member of the N.A.E. 2. That the Christian Reformed delegation at each convention shall submit a joint report to the following Synod and make such recommendations as it may deem necessary.

That matter is therefore clear and concise and needs no further elucidation. We will now be able to appreciate this action if we proceed to a consideration of the N.A.E. Since it is an organization so recently launched it will be profitable to trace briefly its history, the purpose for which it was called into being, and the aims and objectives it envisions and anticipates.

A Personal Reaction

Perhaps I may be permitted to give a personal reaction and characterization. My contact with the group of men sponsoring this new organization is limited to the constitutional convention held in Chicago last May. Of all the meetings I have ever attended where a large number of religious groups of protestant persuasion were assembled together, this one stands peer to them all in regard to spiritual conviction, evangelical ardor, and sober intelligence. Here were met some 600 leaders of protestant America, not the hallelujah shouting Methodists, or the rabid, rapture premillennialist, or the sentimental revivalistic fundamentalist, but leaders of various groups and churches, serious-minded men with sober judgment and unshaken religious conviction. The atmosphere was simply surcharged with what is finest in religious sentiment and intelligence. Here were men devoted and completely surrendered to Christ, who recognized the Sovereignty of God and the Lordship of Christ, men set with grim determination to recapture some of the lost radiance of protestantism; to introduce a spear head of determined opposition into the camp of modernism and liberalism. Here were men deeply conscious of the fact that our common enemy, modernism and liberalism, was firmly entrenched, well-organized, and that the only hope of regaining territory that the enemy now held lay in a well-planned and prayer-founded and spirit-led organization and strategy. It is not an overstatement to assert that the N.A.E. counts among its members and directive personnel some of the finest among American Evangelical Protestant Christianity. And this characterization may well cover the entire membership of the organiz-
tion. Proof for this assertion is amply supplied considering the statement of faith adopted at the constitutional convention held in Chicago, a statement which every individual member, church, or religious organization must unreservedly and unequivocally subscribe to, and no less the solicitous care exercised in the admittance of others who apply for membership in the organization.

Growth of the N.A.E.

The Field Secretary stated in his annual report to the convention that this organization may be destined to "change the course of Protestantism in America." Considering the progress that has already been made, this appraisal, which when spoken appeared to be presumptuous, may yet be fully vindicated. Less than a year old, that is, considering the adoption of the constitution as its birthdate—let it be said in parenthesis that some preparatory work had been done since 1941—this organization already counts more than 800,000 members, with applications for several thousand more. It should be noted in passing that whereas the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ boasts a membership of some 21 millions, facts prove this number to be highly padded, whereas the number of those now affiliated with the N.A.E. represent actual figures. It is highly gratifying that many who nominally are still members of the F.C.C.C. and many others who for the sake of religious conviction already have left that organization, are now joining the N.A.E. and are rallying to its cause. It is the earnest expectation of the N.A.E. that thousands of Evangelicals in America who at present are members of organizations repudiating the claim of Christ and are thoroughly modern and liberal in tendency and policy, will come out of that bondage and lend their support to an organization that is true to their deepest religious convictions. The N.A.E. expects a hegira from these apostate organizations and it aims to unify and make vocal the aims and desires of the thousands of evangelicals who at present have no organization and are therefore at a sore disadvantage. God has His faithful still among all Christian groups, and the N.A.E. has already proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that there is a deep-seated hunger and passionate desire for fellowship among these Christians.

Our Divided Protestantism

The N.A.E. was born for the express purpose of unifying in spirit and of giving a united voice to these scattered evangelicals throughout the land. For the leaders took cognizance of the fact that protestantism is hopelessly divided in especially two opposing camps, viz. those who have departed from the faith of our fathers, once for all delivered, and those who without equivocation or reservation adhere to that faith. It is the unspeakable tragedy of protestantism that it is so hopelessly divided. There should be some technique by which a unification in spirit of the true members of the body of Christ can be effected and realized, without encroaching upon the rights and sacred convictions of the individual religious groups which make up the body of protestantism. Though it be admitted that the principle of the Reformation fostered and seemingly countenanced the breaking up of protestantism into various denominations—and surely none would deny that this fact yielded untold spiritual blessings to countless thousands—yet this aspect in itself has not been an unmixed blessing. There are a number of mooted questions and difficult problems still to solve relative to what Abraham Kuyper called the pluriformity of the church. We have not gotten far beyond this observation at this time, namely, the distinction of the true church and the various degrees of its purity. Among protestantism there are many denominations which we would not dare to characterize as a false church, though we are entitled to the reservation of passing judgment on its purity of doctrine and life.

There are many churches we dare not denominate false, yet we differ with them relative to our interpretation of the teachings of scripture, as to church polity and rites and ordinances. For the sake of convenience we may divide this group, though all might be evangelical, into these two camps, those who have the Arminian approach and those who hold to the Calvinistic, Predestinarian point of view. One of our difficulties with the N.A.E. will, I believe, issue out of this difference, for by and large American Evangelical Christianity, the best of it, is almost thoroughly saturated and completely orientated to this Arminian approach. Let us not try to smooth over or soft pedal this deep-seated difference. However, this having been stated and frankly admitted, there is another division among Protestants that is far more radical and incisive and fundamental, and that is the division of Orthodoxy, using that term with considerable latitude now, and Modernism, or Liberalism. The difference here is fundamental, irreconcilable. Each represents a clear-cut and very definite Weltanschauung. Both claim the name Christian, both use the same terminology, but they nevertheless declare a radically different gospel.

The Federal Council and the N.A.E.

While generalizations may in individual cases be too sweeping and hence be unfair, yet it is the firm conviction of the N.A.E. that the F.C.C.C. represents the liberal and modern camp of protestantism. Since there are still millions who adhere to the fundamentals of the faith as based on an in-
fallible Bible, it is presumptuous on the part of the F.C.C.C. to claim being the authoritative voice of protestantism in America. And exactly this fact prompted evangelical leaders to organize and to unify the true evangicals, that their voice too might be heard. Allowance is made for individuals and churches who nominally are still members of the F.C.C.C. The N.A.E. believes that all of these are not "hopeless apostates" and that many are members of the F.C.C.C either due to ignorance of its liberal and modernist policy and tendency, or for the reason that there is no other organization that can act as an effective spokesman for Protestantism. It is exactly this fact that the American Council, a rival organization of the N.A.E., has failed to appreciate and recognize. And it is exactly this fact that made the N.A.E. hesitant and cautious, openly to repudiate the F.C.C.C., believing that a contentious spirit, a policy of "indiscriminate destructive criticism contributes to defeat of its own purposes."

But this policy of the N.A.E. must not be construed or interpreted to indicate that it is not whole-heartedly and unreservedly against the program and policy and principle of the F.C.C.C. The very genesis and purpose of the organization of the N.A.E. is in protest to the F.C.C.C. The N.A.E. is firmly convinced that the F.C.C.C. does not represent the wishes of all Protestants in America and that it has no right to claim such distinction. Its pronouncements are therefore not representative of Protestantism. Consequently it may be affirmed that the birth of the N.A.E., its origin, aim, and purpose, as well as its statement of faith, are not merely a protest against the F.C.C.C., but constitute virtually a repudiation of it in every particular. The approach of the N.A.E. is not one of destructive criticism, or of a contentious spirit, of negations, but a positive statement of the faith once for all delivered to the saints. And on the basis of that statement of faith there can be no good reason advanced why we cannot heartily cooperate up to the present stage of its developments. Indeed, there are reasons commanding such cooperation, for with the pure light of Reformed faith and with the strength of religious conviction based on the infallible truth, we are duty-bound to make the impact of our views effective and influential in the further shaping of the course and destiny of the N.A.E.

The Key-Note Message

The president of the organization, Dr. H. Ockenga, delivered the key-note message to the Chicago convention. This message was thought-provoking and challenging and was, I believe, indicative of the intellectual timbre, religious conviction, hopeful anticipation and vision of the N.A.E. It was more than just another message; it gave evidence of careful analysis and diagnosis, of penetrating insight, of clear and straight thinking, and of fearless statement of conviction based on that insight. It was his judgment that the church and our spiritual development are being outstripped and eclipsed by material and ideological matters. Our position, he said, is comparable to ancient Israel which had been endowed, equipped, favored, preserved, guided and used of God. Considering our rich heritage, the many blood-streams that converged into our national life, the rich traditions, the wealth of this nation, surely for all of this we are accountable to God; and in this day we are being held to an accounting.

We stand, said he, at the cross-roads; only two ways lie open to us. One road is the way of the rescue of western civilization through a revival of evangelical Christianity; the other is a return to the dark ages of heathendom. There can be no doubt that we are witnessing a revival of paganism. God has been banished from His universe; and without God men are without hope; they flounder in thought and action. Civilization is fast paganizing and an apostate church, a church whose message repudiates the fundamentals of Christian faith, is a mighty instrument hastening this tug of battle towards hell. There is a commanding urgency of a now or never to strike out boldly for the gospel and for the principles of the gospel. Our democracy cannot survive without an undergirding of Christian conviction and practice. The F.C.C.C. is not meeting this challenge of this crisis-hour in history. Magnifying our differences as evangicals will weaken our common cause and while we fritter away our energies in this pursuit the deadly foe to true Christianity, modernism and liberalism, will continue its conquest in every realm of human endeavor and will do so almost unchallenged. As evangicals we believe that we are the bearers of the true light and the carriers of a message and of a program which alone offers hope and cheer to a world fast filling with despair and confusion worse confounded. Division makes us impotent; there ought to be found some basis of unity to bring "into affiliation and fraternal co-operation some twenty-four millions of evangicals in the United States in order that they may have their own clearing house and means of functioning together in voluntary association."

Fields of Endeavor and Areas of Cooperation

It is not the aim of the N.A.E. to effect an organic union of Evangelicals, such as the F.C.C.C. is campaigning for, for this would force the various denominations into an ecclesiastical hegemony in which the conscience of the individual believer would be stultified and in which discipline would ultimately take the place of persuasion. The aim of the N.A.E. as stated by Dr. J. Bradbury at the
Chicago Convention is to gather together a great host of believers who will work together in those areas of mutual co-operation for the benefit of interests common to all. The operation of this organization shall be strictly democratic; no ex cathedra pronouncements are to be made by the governing body without constituent approval. This will preclude the danger that a few shall speak for all.

You ask, what then are some of the areas in which there can be mutual co-operation? The N.A.E. proposes several fields of endeavor. As a general criticism I fear personally that the N.A.E. will be trying to do too much; it may be necessary to retrench. It need not surprise us that hopeful anticipation and youthful enthusiasm would occasion an over-reaching at certain points. It is understood that these fields of co-operation shall be "clearly delimited." That is, there is on the part of the N.A.E. the hope that diligent care shall be given that in no case the N.A.E. would encroach upon the rights of any constituent member of the organization or to interfere with the plan or program of any individual church or denomination. Just at this point, however, the greatest danger lies, namely that the N.A.E. will undertake to do the work that belongs specifically and solely to the church.

This is especially a danger if the N.A.E. would be it said in utter frankness that these fears are need enlightenment on this score; that in consequence of such a policy they would be doing a disservice to the cause of Protestantism. Up to the present time no such program is yet launched, yet be it said in utter frankness that these fears are not vain imaginings!

One field of co-operation suggested is that of our common devotion to the great principle of separation of church and state. A special case in point is the American embassy to the Vatican which challenges and is a direct violation of that principle. I may in parenthesis add here, that in the discussion group which gave particular consideration to this problem of church and state, the Rev. G. Hoeksema very ably defended our position and as the discussion proceeded he was instrumental in shaping and almost dictating the final draft of their advice to the Convention. Once more, Dr. C. Bouma did splendid work in the study group for Christian education, ably defending and eloquently propagating our view of Christian day school education. Here were palpable evidences of making the impact of our Reformed views effective and influential. In this critical hour of world history we can ill afford a policy of mere defensive strategy. The charge leveled against us that very often we resemble a peace-time standing army, diligently and assiduously going through our drills and polishing our guns, is not wholly without justification. This day calls for action, for grim determination, for clear vision, for fearless offensive. It is our unhesitating conviction that Evangelical faith possesses the stuff that will assure us the victory. If the voice of Protestant Evangelical Christianity is to be effective and telling, if we are to strike decisive blows at the common enemy, we must pool our spiritual resources.

Another field of co-operative endeavor is that of international interests, giving advice and aid to the persecuted Christians of the world. The church must be ready for the challenge of the period of rehabilitation and reconstruction following this war. And to catalogue the others: Co-operation in a great world-wide missionary enterprise; in moral reform; in the development of a Christian laymen’s movement; in evangelism, local, community and national; in the preservation of the American Sabbath (Christian Sabbath); and in Christian education. Much emphasis was laid on this field of endeavor, viz., Christian education. It was openly stated that “it is to our everlasting disgrace that we have allowed this field to be almost wholly possessed by the proponents of modernistic conviction.”

Creedal Basis and Present Accomplishments

We cannot but sincerely rejoice in the founding of this organization. Its statement of faith adopted in Chicago is one with which all heartily agree and can be endorsed without hesitation. The following is the “Statement of Faith” of the N.A.E.:

1. We believe the Bible to be the inspired, the only infallible, authoritative word of God.
2. We believe that there is one God, eternally existent in three persons: Father, Son and Holy Spirit.
3. We believe in the deity of Christ, in His virgin birth, in His sinless life, in His miracles, in His vicarious and atoning death through His shed blood, in His bodily resurrection, in His ascension to the right hand of the Father, and in His personal return in power and glory.
4. We believe that for the salvation of lost and sinful man regeneration by the Holy Spirit is absolutely essential.
5. We believe in the present ministry of the Holy Spirit by whose indwelling the Christian is enabled to live a godly life.
6. We believe in the resurrection of both the saved and the lost; they that are saved unto the resurrection of life and they that are lost unto the resurrection of damnation.
7. We believe in the spiritual unity of believers in Christ.”

Among the accomplishments to date of the N.A.E. I quote the following from their national monthly publication:

1. Its successful efforts to protect the liberties of gospel broadcasting.
2. Its institution and maintenance of a national newspaper devoted exclusively to the interests of world evangelism.
3. Its establishment of an office in Washington which is recognized by the government as an accredited clearing house for the chaplaincy applications of its constituents; as an agency for procuring passports, visas and military permits for missionaries; as a center of information for many mission boards; and as a listening post at the seat of government for all concerned.
4. Its survey (now well on the way to completion) of religious broadcasting throughout the United States, in the course of which it has been in contact with every individual station in this country and with more than two thousand broadcasters.
5. Its organization of about two score regional committees and many local committees in every section of the country. Many of these committees are actively engaged in sponsoring evangelistic and Bible conferences, youth and child evangelism, service clubs, street services and a variety of other projects.

6. Its inauguration of several surveys in addition to that of radio broadcasting about which more news will be available in the near future."

By getting in on the ground floor of this organization we can let our light shine, make effective our position, and perhaps by the grace and favor of God help shape the course and destiny of this organization. There are folds and creases in the new cloth that will need to be ironed out; there are dangers that lurk. Prayerful guidance and appreciative understanding is necessary. The vibrant faith and clear vision of those of Reformed Calvinistic persuasion ought in this instance prove corrective and should serve as a guiding star. Be it ours not to fail in this challenge!

[NOTE: The thoughtful reader will note that this article was written before the recent 1944 Convention of the N. A. E. held in Columbus. At that convention, we are happy to report, Dr. Rutgers took an active part as a delegate of the Christian Reformed Church. The present writer, though also delegated and privileged to have been a member of the Board of Administration during the past year, found it impossible—much to his regret—by reason of press of other duties to continue in the responsible position of Board membership. It is a source of gratification to know that Dr. Rutgers has been appointed in his place on the Board of Administration. We bespeak God's blessing upon the N. A. E. and all its leaders.—Editor.]

Economic Statesmanship

WE HAVE succeeded in getting over the "hump" of our war production. Victory is a real possibility, if it is not already in sight. Although deeply aware of the fact that the war must still be won, men are beginning to look to the opportunities which the signing of the peace will bring. Many are beginning to fidget under war-time restraints. Some, even now, seem to regard these restrictions as limiting their freedom as completely as the binding compulsions of a strait jacket.

Undoubtedly the opportunities in this country after the war will be great. We know now what our production capacity is, pretty close to 180 billions in dollar value at our present peak. We know that after the war our people will have enormous sums of money to spend and our industries will have sufficient reserves or other sources of capital to supply our wants. We know that when the great backlog of unsatisfied wants has been met, many new desires will have been aroused to take their place. We can be quite certain that we are on the threshold of amazing possibilities, that we may be privileged to cross new frontiers.

We must face the post-war future with certain facts well in mind. The first is one that the political party of the opposition will no doubt exploit to the limit, the fact that the danger of regimentation in the modern world is very real. We need only look to our totalitarian enemies to be convinced of this truth. Our own excesses and mistakes furnish additional proof. We should not forget, however, that the dangers in our present controls have been difficult to conceal, whereas the excesses of a free economy are not so openly revealed.

A second consideration that we should bear in mind is the fact that the controls made necessary by the war have worked far more satisfactorily than many are disposed to think. To bring home the success of these controls we need only to be reminded that the checking of inflation, in spite of the tremendous increase in our currency during the last ten years, has been a remarkable achievement. Indeed our general price level has been kept quite stable during the last year. Labor has enjoyed high wages and Industry has received satisfactory profits. This is especially noteworthy when one remembers that we pledged ourselves to take the profit out of this war. The average profit for leading corporations reporting was 8.6% in 1943 and 8.5% in 1942, this after depreciation, interest, taxes, other charges and reserves had been deducted. The average profit in each of these two years, after all charges including taxes, was higher than the average profit for the period from 1935 through 1939. We have reduced our business failures to a minimum. In this respect our record has been excellent in spite of the great emphasis on the fact that some enterprises have had to close down. Most of those who have had to turn to new fields of activity have found the new fields profitable.

A third important consideration for those who are worried about the post-war period is the fact that when the war ends, our reconversion plans should be far better developed than were those for the period after World War I. Our service men will apparently not be dumped on the labor market as they were then. Industry will profit from the mature thought now being given to three well-outlined programs. To mention just one of these programs, the Baruch-Hancock post-war plans have been very carefully devised and will undoubtedly serve to a considerable extent as the guide for reconversion. Industry has ample funds to carry on without much assistance, according to latest interpretations of corporation balance sheets.
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Perhaps the most important fact that we shall have to keep in mind, however, is that the best of these plans will go awry unless they are executed with the wisest of economic statesmanship. We shall certainly need that if we are not to ride the swollen stream of post-war prosperity to the same kind of post-war depression that followed our previous wars. We must maintain a high level of production. This we must do for all classes, especially for our returning service men. This we can do with our huge volume of savings and our accumulated demand. We must safeguard the provisions of our social security act and extend them where need indicates that they are now not adequate, in the field of medical care for the lowest income classes, for example. We must prevent inflation. This we can do also if we discourage too rapid buying by means of taxation, or if individuals will continue to buy and hold government bonds instead of passing this burden to the banks. For if individuals buy and hold government bonds, the government uses the money they would otherwise spend, whereas if the banks buy the bonds they do so with their credit, which leads to the expansion of deposits and to the use of additional currency. We must, as soon as possible, reduce our debt. Our total interest charge at the end of this year will not be too heavy to carry, but it will approximate four billion dollars a year. We cannot permit the spree that some would apparently like to indulge in after the tension of the last years is over, not the hang-over that would most certainly follow. We cannot now afford the terrible cost of another great depression. Our tax burden is already heavy enough.

It is the task of wise economic statesmanship to set up our economic goals, individual and social. More particularly it is the task of such statesmanship to encourage and maintain a balanced economy providing not only for economic well-being for the largest possible number, but also for social security whenever and wherever it is needed. This is an end that all can and should accept, in spite of the obvious fact that we may not be able to realize it to the extent that we should like. In envisaging this end and in working toward it we must be guided by our experience, not only our experience with the often frustrating and wasteful economic controls of the last few years, but also our experience during the wasteful and frustrating years from 1918 to 1933. We should not forget the inflation of 1919 and 1920, the sudden and frightening reaction in 1920 and 1921, the speculative orgy of the twenties, or the terrible loss of productivity of the thirties.

It is to be hoped that the present political campaign may issue into something more productive than merely the ushering of an opposition party into power. Party platforms should give evidence of economic statesmanship, farsighted enough to set up goals worthy of achievement and specific enough to have real meaning and to present definite challenges to those who are to put them into effect. The platform writers should espouse the cause of an economic freedom that does more than to encourage an individual to act as he pleases, an economic freedom that really encourages men to act for the good of their fellow men as well as of themselves. Our economic statesman must dare to cut the wastes and to end controls that may hamper progress and bear us down with a burden of taxation and of regulation too heavy to bear. They must be wise enough to discern and courageous enough to acknowledge when controls are necessary for the good of all. They must, for example, know that proper taxation need not be a hindrance to progress, rather a control to make it flow more evenly. When there is danger of too much saving and capital investment they should tax those in the higher brackets, who do most of our saving, heavily. When it is more necessary to discourage spending than to encourage it, they should have the courage to impose taxes, especially luxury taxes, that affect all classes. They should, when necessary, have the courage to engage in such reclamation projects as the one which involved the building of the Boulder dam, or to improve backward areas as was done by means of the T.V.A. In every instance the purpose should be to increase individual opportunity and to encourage reliance upon individual initiative rather than to provide a substitute for it.

We must realize that we can reconvert to peacetime economic activities successfully and quickly if we plan carefully and then act with the dispatch recommended in the Baruch-Hancock plan. We must not forget that our potential production is so great that our most optimistic estimates before the war were understaments. We must be confidently aware of the fact that our potential demand and our available purchasing power is sufficient to put all our manpower to work for a long time after conversion is effected. But we must not overlook the fact that impatience or lack of control during the period of conversion can get us into a "peck of trouble" before we get started. And we must be reminded that there must be adequate guides, rules, and controls if our tremendous economic machine is not to get out of order. We have behind us the period from 1918 to 1929 to indicate the values and dangers of lack of governmental controls, and the period from 1929 to 1944 to point out the need of such control as well as the threat of too much of it. Have we the wisdom, the courage, and the patience to profit from both?
The Need and Place of The Church

A Parable

There was once a valley that would have been a parched desert were it not for a river that had its headwaters far up in the tops of the high mountains and flowed down into the valley and gave the valley its water. But the valley was only fruitful where the river flowed and the rest of the valley was wilderness. And the dwellers in the valley had great difficulty with the river. They crowded along its banks and they dipped the water from it, but it was very hard. The mountains from which the river flowed were very high and the water ran swiftly and there were treacherous currents and eddies that very quickly swept men who waded into it to dip the life-giving water, off their feet.

One day there came a man down from the mountains. He was a wiser man than any of those who lived in the valley and he understood that river and had explored it far back to its very sources. He said, "I will build, here at the river's bank, a pump. And by means of that pump you can pipe water into your homes, into the very mouths of your little children with safety."

And so a beautiful pumping station was built. It was simple and beautiful in its design and capable of swift and efficient action. But the wise man left again and the pumping station had to be manned by men of the valley whom he had trained. And these men were not always wise. Sometimes they misunderstood the instructions he had given. Sometimes they wilfully cast them aside. But, for the most part, the pumping station worked faithfully and the homes of the valley were happier and the children were healthier and the whole valley became clothed with verdure.

But there were two kinds of very foolish people in the valley. Some of them said, "Our pump is so wonderful, let us move it closer to our homes and away from the river." And they did, with the result that the intake pipe left the river's stream and began sucking mud up from the river bank and that muddy water went into many a home and brought sickness and death.

Other foolish people, seeing that the pump was not bringing life-giving water, and seeing its many failures, due to the unwise handling of the valley workmen, said "The pump is an evil thing, we must go and dip our water directly from the river."

And they did, but the swift currents of the river swept them away and they were washed ashore in strange valleys far from home.

But there were wise people who realized that unless the pump drew its water from the river, and unless it were allowed freely to pump that clear water into the valley, the valley was doomed. And so they moved the pumping station back upon the river-bank and the water flowed again, bringing health and happiness to their homes and fruitfulness to their valley.

The valley is the world. The river is the Revelation of God. That Revelation comes from the lofty headwaters of God's own mind. But in the days of the Old Dispensation, the life-giving properties of that Revelation were limited to the nation of Israel. And there were difficult doctrines that men could not interpret alone and so men had great difficulty with that Revelation.

Then there came One from the throne of God, the Word incarnate, who understood that Revelation as no one else could. He said, "Here on this rock, I will build my church. And by that church ye shall be able to give water to your children, and disciple all nations, and make every area of earthly life fruitful to the glory of God."

And He built the church and left this world and left the church in the hands of those whom He had instructed. But those men were not as wise as He. They misunderstood His teachings or cast them aside. But the Church went on and piped the water of life into home by Christian ethics, into the mouths of children by religious education, and over the various fields of life by Christian doctrines as to political, social and economic life.

But there are foolish people in the valley of earth. They are of two kinds:

One says, "The Church is the channel of grace, the Word itself is relatively unimportant." And they have moved the church away from the Word and the muddy waters of Papal injunction or human rationalism are brought into the preaching of the church, bringing death and sickness of soul.

The other foolish people see that this has happened or they realize that human weakness has always made the Church less effective than it should be, and they say, "The Church is of very little importance. We must go, and dip from the Word itself. 'No creeds, but Christ!'" And they do, with the result that the swift eddying mysteries of Revelation sweep them away and they land in strange waters among strange, strange errors.

But there are still wise people in the valley who recognize that the Church is a gift of God in Christ, and that with all its failings, it is God's ordained means of mediating His truth to the homes and hearts of His people and their children and their daily life. Such people move the church back to the Word of God and they allow it to function according to the skill it has gained through its history, and the Water of Life flows again, bringing life and fruitfulness to the Glory of God.

Ala Bandon
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CHRISTIANITY AND LABOR

Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

ENCLOSED herewith find the price for renewal of subscription to THE CALVIN FORUM.

I am "holding the fort" in the Chicago area, for the Christian Labor Association and that, for the main reason, makes it imperative that I read this publication; for on every page of it the need cries out for Christian social action, and every article hammers home the need and the command to continue.

This afternoon I spent as a visitor at classics, and when the virtues of Christian education were highly extolled, the question occurred to me, after school, what then?

A small percentage of our high school graduates is privileged to go on to higher education. For them there is provision at Calvin and Western Academy, and heroic efforts are being made toward the establishment of a University.

But what of the young folks who go from high school into a job? From the cradle on, they have been taught to view life in the light of Divine revelation. An ordered, organized world has protected them, and provided for them the things that are tested and sure, and which point through Calvary to God. Even the job or the profession to which they aspire, has been held up to them as a gift of God's grace. Often with the job comes the problem of labor relations. This field, too, is organized, even as the home, the church, and the school in which they have been reared. With one exception. This field is as the home, the church, and the school in which they have been reared. With one exception. This field is not dedicated to the service of God, but definitely and only to the service of man. "I am the master of my fate," is the watchword, the very principle of so-called "neutral" organized labor. Would God that it was a problem in the Christocentric sense. Alas, too often it is taken in stride and considered inevitable, affiliation is established and . . . a gap is created in the full-orbed Calvinistic life. This is the sore spot in which decay sets in and which tends to corrupt the whole of life. All of our efforts in the pulpit and in school will ultimately be in vain, if this gap is not eliminated.

The Christian Labor movement has demonstrated beyond a doubt that the gap can be closed. Neither the splendid work THE CALVIN FORUM is doing, nor all our preaching and teaching will do any good, if something is not done about it. Confessing our views is great, but it not enough. We must also live them and apply them in every sphere of life.

Let us never forget to have the emphasis on action.

Yours for a greater CALVIN FORUM,
R. TEMPELMAN.

352 W. 106th Place, Chicago 28, Illinois.

APPRECIATION OF ROOSEVELT

1321 Grandville Ave., SW.,
Grand Rapids, Michigan.
April 1, 1944.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

With keen interest and hearty approval I read the fine letter of Mr. Edward Rodenhouse in the April issue of THE CALVIN FORUM, vindicating your vindication of Roosevelt as a real leader. It is especially gratifying inasmuch as so many of our church leaders have hesitated or refused to ever express their acknowledgment, still less their thankfulness, for what God through him has done for America. They have been so bitter against the "dictatorial, un-American idea of a third term for a president", but would do anything in their power to arrange, if possible, for a seventh or an eleventh term for some senator or representative of the old conservative school. Anything to oppose our Chief Executive. The war has changed it a little, as the attention of the people is focused upon the great military struggle now.

Our president has made mistakes and will make them. Of course he will. But he had to face crises no other president had to. Then he was told what should NOT be done, but his opponents never suggested what SHOULD be done. His international outlook has surely been vindicated by facts now. Too bad many of our ministers are publicly endorsing about every Roosevelt-hater that comes along running for some public office. That's not very ideal, to be sure.

Thanking you, Dr. Bouma and Mr. Rodenhouse.

Yours sincerely,
ALBERT PIERSMA.

THE DUTCH THEOLOGICAL SOURCES

3909 Swiss Ave.,
Dallas 4, Texas.
March 22, 1944.

Dear Doctor:

Having read THE CALVIN FORUM for some time and being blessed and edified by the various articles contained in it, I have always wished to express my appreciation and admiration for it. The progressive outlook of the paper combined with loyal evangelicalism has been a source of stimulating thought to me as I suppose it has been to others. I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to you.

During my reading of THE CALVIN FORUM I have noted time and again references to the writings of the Dutch theologians such as Kuyper, Havinck, Vos, Maastricht, etc., etc. I am deeply interested in theology, intending to make it my major down here in Dallas Seminary. Despite the fact that this seminary may not conform to the standards of the standard Reformed beliefs, it has nevertheless stimulated my love for Reformed theology. So setting aside differences that may exist between us, I wish to enquire more thoroughly of the writings of these above men. For some time I have been wanting to get their works, but have been dismayed to find that most of their works are in the Dutch tongue, except for a few which are in English. I have most of Dr. Kuyper's works that have been translated by Dr. De Vries. What I would like to find out is whether there are any Dutch Reformed (outside of Berklof which I have) theologies that have been translated into English, e.g., Bavinck's Gereef. Dogm., Kuyper's Dict. Dog., or Vos' Gereef. Dogm., etc. If not, someone ought to. I believe someone has well said that a translator of these standard volumes must by necessity have command of both the English and Dutch languages to an exceptional degree beside being well-versed in theology himself; I suppose the thought being that there is no such man today. Being undaunted and audacious, I have decided that if an English translation is not to be had, I would like to attempt to learn the Dutch language if only to be able to read these men. So, with that thought in mind, will you recommend some standard Dutch grammar book with which one may learn to read the Dutch language by self-study? I would greatly appreciate it if you can supply the above information.
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Thanking you kindly, and wishing you once again all God-speed in your efforts to propagate Calvinism during these crucial times, I remain, 
A grateful and admiring reader,
GEORGE Y. UOMOTO.

[NOTE OF EDITOR: In a personal reply we expressed admiration for the ambition of our Japanese reader to learn the Dutch language in order to have direct access to the great Dutch Systematic Theologies and suggested the Dutch Grammar of Prof. Van Andel (Berdouw, Grand Rapids, Mich.), and that of Prof. Leidwyck (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, Australia). Both are recent works.]

From Our Correspondents

THE CALVINISTIC STUDY CLUB

At the home of Professor Welmers in Holland, Mich., the Calvinistic Study Club met April 21. Not all members were present. The Rev. John Weidenaar is still sojourning in the land of the East in quest of wisdom. Dr. H. J. Stob is also in the East. But he went thither in answer to the summons of Uncle Sam. H. J. has donned the Navy uniform.

According to schedule, Dr. Bouma having given the invocation, Dr. J. T. Hoogstra delivered a paper on the subject, "Ecumenicity and Denominationalism". The speaker had planned to treat the subject under three heads: The Church United, The Church Disunited, and The Church Re-united. Since this would extend the compass of the paper considerably beyond the time allowed (we have a rule that no speaker may consume more than one hour in reading a paper) part one was the main dish. Problems such as Unity, Diversity, etc., from the point of view of 'critics', and from the point of view of Scriptures were dealt with.

A very profitable discussion followed the reading of the paper. The president, Dr. C. Bouma, set the pace with a question as to the quality and the motive of the desire for unity. Dr. A. Persenaire sought to direct attention to the Apostolate and close adherence to the Scriptures. "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you also that ye also may have fellowship with us; yea and our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ".

Ecumenicity (oikoumenitos) signifies fellowship that is world-wide (oikumene gee). It is based upon acceptance of the inspired Record. But the heart of it is found in the Christ, of whom the Record speaks. Said Jesus to Peter (after Peter confessed that Christ is the Son of the Living God) "thou art Peter and upon this PETRA I will build my church". Hence, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God, and whosoever loveth him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of him." The reciprocal action of the Son and the believer in love is the rock of unity, and the work of the Spirit the tie that binds.

However, every believer has still an old sinful nature. That nature gives rise to denominationalism. It also, altogether too often, destroys fellowship. Many a church conflict led to a 'break' because hard words and expressions were exchanged. Therefore, denominations are mechanical units, which permit of breaking up into small mechanical units. This is in keeping with sinful nature, since sin always divides. Grace always unites. It unites to God and to one another. Jesus the Son of God who became flesh and tabernacles among us full of grace and truth is the real and eternally abiding ONEness of the ecumenical Church. We do believe in one holy ecumenical Church, because we believe in the Christ who suffered, died, arose, and lives forever more. And we belong to Him, and are in Him, and He in us.

Our gracious hostess, Mrs. Wolmers, remembered the somatic aspect of the members and served delightful refreshments. Rev. J. Griffioen led us in closing prayers.

Our next meeting, D. V., will be held September 15, 1944, at the home of Professor D. H. Kromminga, who will at that time speak on "The Significance, Place and Function of the Book of Revelation in the Organism of the New Testament Canon."

JOHN G. VAN DYKE.

MICHIGAN CALVINISTIC PHILOSOPHY CLUB

A MEETING of the Michigan Calvinistic Philosophy Club was held in the Calvin College Faculty room at 8:00 p.m. on Friday, February 4, 1944. The meeting was opened by the Rev. J. Gritter. Present were eight members and five visitors. The Rev. J. T. Hoogstra presided.

The Rev. John F. Schuurmann read a paper on John Duns Scotus. The following is an outline prepared by the speaker:

THE PHILOSOPHY OF DUNS SCOTUS

Introduction:

Every thinker, and especially the Christian thinker, faces the questions: Is knowledge valid and true? Is that which I perceive true? Is there an independent, objective world? What is reality? Is there a reality beyond the conscious states themselves?

I. LIFE AND WORKS OF SCOTUS.

A. Life. We know next to nothing about this man. Even the date and place of his birth is uncertain. Most likely he was born in 1265. We are sure that he died in 1308 as a member of the Franciscan order.

B. His Writings. There is hardly a trace of emotion in the thousands of pages of his writings. He was a severe critic, and did not earn the title Subtle Doctor for nothing. His writings are concise, yet lack clarity. The arrangement of material, although following a definite order, is very intricate. His was a splendidly acute and critical talent in examining and attacking the writings of others fearlessly. The works attributed to him are exceedingly voluminous and cover a very wide range of subjects. An edition of his works printed in 1891-95 consists of 26 quarto volumes, averaging about 750 pages each. But the genuineness of many of these is doubted today. A large part is open to suspicion, and others, if they are genuine, have been extensively re-edited. Because of this lack of agreement as to which works are genuine, the critics of Duns Scotus are divergent.

II. HIS EPistemology.

A. The Nature of Knowledge.

1. Object and Way of Knowledge. Left to itself, sense does not suffice for knowledge. It is devoid of actual knowledge, and needs an external stimulus. Simple knowing is not the seeing of the various elements as such, nor the comprehension of the various meanings for the whole of the object, nor a comprehension of the essence, but a simple acceptance of the object of knowledge. There is a knowing of the object in its totality, a concrete knowing before we know abstractly.

2. Universals. In discussing the question of the relation between thought and things, Scotus introduces his Distinctio Formalis. It is more than logical, for it exists a parte rei, independently of mind; and is less
than real, for it is a distinction not of things, but merely of formalities, which may exist in the same thing, as rationality and animality in man. The concept Formal to Scotus is the opposite of reality. It seems that he introduced this concept because his will to know ever seeks experienced reality, which therefore also seeks concepts which are bound to reality, and are not mere abstractions which seek the object only per similitudinem. Here it seems difficult, if not impossible, to understand Scotus. If there is this formal distinction, what is it? That it is neither real nor logical seems a contradiction. Is there some kind of a third reality?

3. The will to know. There is no knowledge without the will. The intellect does not determine what I know. It is indifferent to the object. The will can interrupt, divert, suspend the act of the intellect. The will is free, not in the sense of inherent determination, but of the act. The will is actively free, but not blind activity. It is reasonable freedom, ever moved by the ego, and has its own determining principle. The will alone is rational in man, for to Scotus rationality means that which has the ability to act freely. The object of the will is first of all being, and then goodness. The whole being is the object of the will, but formally the good is also the object of the will, as truth is the object of the intellect.

The act of the will is also determined by the object, will alone is not determined by the object alone. The will and the object work together to cause the act of the will, but the will always remains the primary cause of all the acts. But how do the will and the intellect cooperate? Both work according to their own nature, and the one cannot get along without the other. The object must be known first, yet the will as the principal cause does not become necessary through the object.

Scotus does not answer the questions: How is knowledge possible? What is truth? But even though he does not answer them, he has performed a distinct service in calling attention to the importance of the will. However, in his emphasis upon the will Scotus does come dangerously near to setting the will next to, and independent of God. Instead of one focal point, namely God, he seems to have two determining foci in the universe, God and the human will.

III. PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

A. The distinction of the two.

Theology is a science which is not subordinate to any other science, for although it shares in some measure its subject-matter with metaphysics, it accepts no principle from metaphysics. Nor is any science subordinate to it, for no other science derives its principle from theology. Theology therefore is a unique science.

It is also unique in that it is a practical science. It is a form of knowledge which is regulative for the will. Theology is a form of knowledge which does teach facts about the nature of reality. And theology is a practical science because it carries with it an imperative, and is essentially related to the will in a way in which the speculative sciences such as metaphysics are not. And since the will is higher than the intellect, theology is superior to the other sciences.

B. Philosophy inferior to Theology. Scotus makes a separation between revealed and natural theology. Revealed theology is superior to philosophy in both origin and content. Many propositions are inaccessible to us through the medium of natural cognitive faculties. Divine revelation, both because of its origin and object, is above the natural, is necessary. The first object of our theology is God, and here theology differs from metaphysics, for the latter has as its province being as such, and God is its object in so far as He falls under the notion of being. Philosophical reason utterly fails to prove the attributes of God. They come only by revelation.

Scotus has often been misunderstood in the matter of setting forth the distinction between theology and philosophy. Scotus is not a pragmatist, not anti-intellectual. He does not belittle the reasoning faculties. Nor is he the first to introduce a critique of reason, for he expressly asserts the validity of the a posteriori proofs of the existence of God, and he is a realist who insists upon the objectivity of the categories of thought. To Scotus the arguments which do not amount to demonstrations in support of the articles of faith are useful if they avail to show the possibility of the dogma we believe. We find in him the common error of separating nature and grace, and therefore the failure to recognize the gravity of sin. To him sin has not resulted in the ruin of reason, in the perversion of thought. The real service Scotus has rendered in this connection is to point out that theology is not a mere indicative, but also an imperative.

The following questions were answered by the speaker:

1. What is the influence of Scotus on modern thought, e.g. on Kant?

Ans. Scotus has had no greater nor more direct influence upon Kant than Thomas Aquinas, for he asserts the validity of the a posteriori proofs for the existence of God, while Kant rejects all metaphysical proofs for the existence of God. And while Kant insists on the impossibility of knowing the things in themselves, Scotus is a conventional realist, and insists on the objectivity of the categories of thought.

2. What is the main difference between Thomas Aquinas and Scotus?

Ans. The main difference between the two is in their approach to reality. Thomas seeks to explain and understand the world through the universal essence, and the relationships and laws of the universals. Scotus, on the other hand, seeks to comprehend and understand the individual phenomenon. Furthermore, Thomas Aquinas approaches reality with a view to comparing and establishing relationships, as also to see the individual in its universal framework, while Scotus approaches the objects of thought to observe their behavior. To Thomas Aquinas the approach to objects is not satisfactory until the relationships and laws have been determined, but Scotus approaches the events as facts and givens. Both are rationalists and realists, and their main difference is in their approach.

3. Was Calvin a pupil of Scotus? Did Scotus influence Calvin with his idea of the will?

Ans. No, Scotus comes dangerously near to making the human will a determinant in life next to God, while to Calvin God in His eternal decree has determined "in Himself what would have to become of every individual of mankind."

4. Do Kierkegaard, Heidegger and the Existentialists have anything to do with Scotus' emphasis on the will?

Ans. According to Emil Brunner, existential thinking marks a contrast with theoretical, contemplative, merely objective thinking, in which the thinker assumes and persists in the role of a disinterested spectator. Existential thinking, on the other hand, is a mode of thinking which recognizes the claim of the subject of man's thought upon him. In thinking we face obligations and duties. Thinking here, too, there is an emphasis upon the imperative as an essential part of thought, and a kindred approach we find in Scotus.

5. Are we not still being influenced by Aristotle through Duns Scotus?

Ans. By Aristotle through Aquinas, and by Scotus in so far as he did not break with Aquinas, for Scotus as a Franciscan sought to integrate the new learning of the rediscovered Aristole with traditional Augustanism as the true interpretation of reality.

6. Is theology a science, or the science according to Scotus?

Ans. To him it is a science. The other sciences do not determine it, nor is it determinative of other sciences.
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7. Would Scotus exclude experience from real knowledge?

Ans. No, to the contrary, experience to him would play a very important part in knowledge. Since to him the object of knowledge is the individual phenomenon, experience, of necessity, must play a large role.

8. What does Scotus think of the authority of the Church?

Ans. To him, as to every good Roman Catholic, the authority of the church is absolute.

9. What is his view of the influence of sin on knowledge?

Ans. To him sin did not result in the total depravity of man, and therefore reason has not been perverted, and man can know without revelation. Natural reason is dependable.

The meeting was closed with prayer by Prof. E. Y. Monsma.

At the next meeting Prof. H. Van Zyl is to speak on William of Occam.

H. J. VAN ANDEL, Secretary.

CONVENTION NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS

THE second annual convention of the National Association of Evangelicals closed on April 17 with a banquet at the Deshler Wallck Hotel with Dr. Walter A. Maier, of the “Lutheran Hour,” as speaker. Following a stirring message in which Dr. Maier urged the evangelicals to be willing to suffer if needed in order to forward the gospel, the entire body knelt in a closing period of prayer. Kneeling together, the group sang “Revive Us Again,” and after a period of spontaneous prayer, united in singing “The Living God, Fall Fresh on Me.”

Dr. H. J. Ockenga presided at the banquet and installed the following officers who will serve throughout the year: President, Bishop Leslie R. Marston, of the Free Methodist Church; First Vice-President, Dr. R. L. Decker, pastor of Temple Baptist Church of Kansas City, Missouri; Second Vice-President, Dr. J. Alvin Orr, professor at Erskine College in Due West, South Carolina, of the Reformed Presbyterian Church; Secretary, J. Willison Smith, Jr., prominent lawyer of Philadelphia; Treasurer, Herbert J. Taylor, president of the Club Aluminum Company of Chicago.

The program each day commenced with a prayer service at 7:00 and an inspirational devotional service at Memorial Hall at 8:45, opening the sessions of the day in the convention hall. Preliminary conferences on the Sunday School movement and on radio brought about two hundred national leaders together two or three days before the convention opened. Interest ran high over plans for aggressive work during the year.

The highest point of interest during the convention centered around evangelism. For two days there were sessions on all phases of this program. Dr. Dan Iverson, of the Shenandoah Presbyterian Church of Miami, opened the congress with an address as chairman of the Evangelism Committee. Rev. Archer Anderson of Duluth, Minnesota, spoke on the possibilities of greatly increased week-day religious education work throughout the nation. Rev. Don Householder of Los Angeles, gave a “call to action,” that stirred everyone in the convention. Mr. Charles E. Gremmels, a leading Christian business man of the nation, and president of the Durham Navigation Company of New York, gave a practical message on personal soulwinning and tract distribution.

In the evening of Thursday, Dr. Richard Ellsworth Day, of Sunnyvale, California, author of Bush Aoglow, and other religious “best-sellers”, brought an inimitable message on “Barak in Joshua,” the life and service of Dr. Charles G. Finney. This was followed by a strong appeal for evangelism by Dr. Bob Jones, Sr., of Cleveland, Tenn., known for almost half a century in the evangelistic field.

On Friday, Chaplain Charles J. Anderson, of the Arma Corporation of New York, told of the wonderful possibilities for the future in industrial chaplaincies. Mr. Clyde Dennis of Chicago, Illinois gave concrete suggestions on the preparation and distribution of attractive and helpful tracts for all types of work. Mr. Alfred Kunz of New York, has been most successful in his work of distribution of Testaments and tracts among all service men who ask for literature. He is permitted access to the camps and has assisted in the distribution of millions of Testaments. Five million have been distributed by the Gideons also.

Mr. C. O. Baptiste of Toccoa, Georgia, who has unique sermons in moving picture films for meetings for boys and girls, as well as on various topics of interest to adults, gave several practical demonstrations of this art and its possibilities during the convention.

Mr. C. Stacey Woods, of Chicago, Illinois, leader of the Inter­Varsity Christian Fellowship, at work on hundreds of campuses of our colleges and universities, spoke most helpfully on Youth Evangelism. The subject of child evangelism in our cities, particularly among boys and girls not especially churched, was presented by Mr. D. E. Wright of Kansas City, Missouri.

Dr. A. A. Forrest, president of Toccoa Falls Institute and pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Toccoa, Georgia, gave a most inspiring message.

Concurrently with the evangelism group meetings and discussions, were six work-study groups on education. Three were relative to Christian Institutions and were under the direction of Dr. Stephen W. Paine, president of Houghton College. Other speakers were Dr. Robert C. McQuilken of Columbia Bible College, and Dr. William H. Rutgers, of Calvin Seminary. Accrediting, credentials, methods of engaging highly trained teachers and other important matters relating to seminaries and Christian colleges were discussed. Three group meetings on church school activities were under the general direction of Dr. Clarence S. Benson of Chicago. The chairman led the study group on the training of teachers for church school work. Rev. Harold Garner, of Chicago, had charge of the discussion of week-day religious education, promotion and curriculum. Dr. Clarence Van Der Veen led the discussion of vacation school possibilities, and Rev. C. V. Egermeier, chairman of Sunday School work in the Chicago area, led a highly satisfactory conference on that field.

On Friday evening, Mr. R. T. Harbo, Inspector under the Federal Bureau of Investigation, told a large audience at Memorial Hall of conditions at the present time in our country and of the reasons for the crime wave now exercising religious and educational leaders of the country. He traced it to a lack of real home life, discipline in the home, church attendance and proper playground and other recreational facilities. He urged church leaders to assume responsibility for an actual investigation of law enforcement agencies, recreational and social service facilities, truancy in school due to shifts in population, but most of all, for developing a consciousness among adults of the need for respect for law and moral standards.

Following Mr. Harbo’s address, Dr. Harold John Ockenga of Boston, gave a most graphic presentation of actual conditions in the Boston area, and of efforts made by Park Street Church to win the service men for Christ. There followed reports from all sections of the country where regional leaders of the National Association are carrying forward highly satisfactory programs of evangelism, conferences, and setting up regional offices. It is highly probable that within the next year there will be regional offices throughout the country, with full-time secretaries and an aggressive program carried on in all of them.

A budget of $75,000 for the national work was presented and $32,000 was raised within a few minutes, in the form of pledges toward a budget of $75,000 for the national work.

Several radio conferences were climaxed in the interest shown in a panel discussion of a world survey of radio looking forward to gospel broadcasting throughout the world after the war. Sixty delegates met for a 7:00 o’clock breakfast and followed the discussion with keenest interest.

Plans for post-war rehabilitation along the lines of spiritual, as well as physical ministrations were introduced by Rev. J. Elwin Wright of Boston, in his address as Field Secretary of the National Association, and were discussed and plans formulated at later meetings. Dr. Ockenga will take an active part in preparation for a great missionary relief program im-
Immediately after the war, plans are already being made by affiliated denominations and missionary societies. Three important measures were adopted in relation to the Sunday School movement. First, that a new uniform series of evangelistic lessons be established and that the National Association favor the establishment of such a series. Secondly, that the independent publishers invite official representatives of the National Association of Evangelicals and of the American Council, the Southern Baptist denomination and others, to meet them on June 1st for the purpose of initiating such a series. Thirdly, that the National Association shall initiate a new Sunday school movement in this country, reviving the Sunday school convention, teacher training and other features.

Dr. Walter Kallenbach, the blind evangelist from Philadelphia, and Mr. Howard W. Ferrin, president of the Providence Bible Institute, gave addresses that were highly appreciated.

The closing Sunday address was given by Dr. Paul Rees, of the Covenant Tabernacle Church of Minneapolis, and was a masterpiece on the Claims of the Lord Jesus Christ and of His ability to fulfill these claims in peace of heart and power for service for all who accept His claims and His invitation.

Business sessions on Monday, April 17, completed the roster of officers, the Board of Administration, and the findings of the various committees. The missionary program of the nation received careful attention; a gospel broadcasters' association is in the process of formation, to be affiliated with the National Association. Recommendations for the protection of our national principle of separation of church and state were adopted, and social and moral reforms were urged. Among other measures taken, it was urged that army and navy authorities should not require chaplains to perform any acts which are contrary to the dictates of their conscience in the pursuit of duty.

After a stirring address by Dr. Walter Maier, the convention at Columbus was closed, as it began, with a period of earnest prayer for wisdom, for the aid and protection of God in our national emergency, and for a great spiritual revival throughout the world.

--Official News Release.

NEWS AND VIEWS

Oleomargarine.

Iowa State College has lost 20 teachers since last fall. First one to go was Professor Theodore Schultz, head of the college's Department of Economics and Sociology. Nineteen others followed, either on leave, or permanently. They found new positions at Chicago U (Schultz did!), Vassar, Wisconsin, Harvard, Government Bureaus. The reason for their leaving the Department of Economics and Sociology was simply this: the Department last year issued a pamphlet in which oleomargarine was praised as an excellent butter substitute. Evidence and proof for it was submitted. But the Iowa Farm Bureau in unholly ire descended upon the State College authorities and compelled them to suppress the pamphlet. And that was demoralizing to Faculty morale. Hence the professorial exodus from the bondage of butter to the realities of oleomargarine.

Suppressing the truth for economic reasons is wrong. The professors are right.

Anno Domini 1944.

"In the name of God, Amen. We whose names are underwritten, loyal members of Church of _______ do solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together to work for a just and cooperative world order. We pray that our nation shall help to establish an international organization for the better ordering of the independent life of nations, the preservation of peace with justice, and the furtherance of the general good of all peoples. Unto this great task we commit our wills and our ways. In witness whereof have hereunder subscribed our names. Anno Domini 1944." This Compact will be signed by some 4000 Congregational Churches after a special service on May 21, 1944. They will be sent to Grand Rapids, to the biennial General Council to be held June 25. The Compact follows closely the famous Mayflower Compact of 1620. Why not?

Paul the Crusader.

Paul Mallon is a columnist whose views are read by millions of newspaper readers. That he is a crusader against so-called "progressive education" is no longer spot-news. But what is newsworthy just now is his analysis of "progressive education" and its effect upon American youth. He discovered, as many others did, that forty per cent of the service men discharged by military authorities are classified as P-N's. Every month from 10,000 to 12,000 men are sent home by the Army and Navy as Psychoneurotics. This in spite of the fact that large numbers are rejected by Selective Service for the same reason. These men "can't take it." They are "jittery," they "go-to-pieces".

Columnist Mallon links up this fact with the results of "progressive education", on the basis of answers he received from many competent authorities. His question posed to these authorities: What is the reason for this peculiarly American phenomenon? (The Russian Army has no P-N's.) The best answer received is that of Dr. Frederic H. Land of Temple University. Said he, writing about child education, "Our present system retards emotional maturity by prolonging childish habits of self-indulgence (self-expression), of following the crowd and of identification with army and navy as Psychoneurotics. This in spite of the fact that large numbers are rejected by Selective Service for the same reason. These men "can't take it." They are "jittery," they "go-to-pieces".

Columnist Mallon links up this fact with the results of "progressive education", on the basis of answers he received from many competent authorities. His question posed to these authorities: What is the reason for this peculiarly American phenomenon? (The Russian Army has no P-N's.) The best answer received is that of Dr. Frederic H. Land of Temple University. Said he, writing about child education, "Our present system retards emotional maturity by prolonging childish habits of self-indulgence (self-expression), of following the crowd and of identification with army and navy as Psychoneurotics. This in spite of the fact that large numbers are rejected by Selective Service for the same reason. These men "can't take it." They are "jittery," they "go-to-pieces".

Paul Mallon is a columnist whose views are read by millions of newspaper readers. That he is a crusader against so-called "progressive education" is no longer spot-news. But what is newsworthy just now is his analysis of "progressive education" and its effect upon American youth. He discovered, as many others did, that forty per cent of the service men discharged by military authorities are classified as P-N's. Every month from 10,000 to 12,000 men are sent home by the Army and Navy as Psychoneurotics. This in spite of the fact that large numbers are rejected by Selective Service for the same reason. These men "can't take it." They are "jittery," they "go-to-pieces".

Columnist Mallon links up this fact with the results of "progressive education", on the basis of answers he received from many competent authorities. His question posed to these authorities: What is the reason for this peculiarly American phenomenon? (The Russian Army has no P-N's.) The best answer received is that of Dr. Frederic H. Land of Temple University. Said he, writing about child education, "Our present system retards emotional maturity by prolonging childish habits of self-indulgence (self-expression), of following the crowd and of identification with army and navy as Psychoneurotics. This in spite of the fact that large numbers are rejected by Selective Service for the same reason. These men "can't take it." They are "jittery," they "go-to-pieces".

Of Books and Reading

THREE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS


This book sets forth a "revolutionary re-interpretation" of Paul's teachings. The author proceeds upon the assumption that the real, historical Paul taught a Gospel of salvation through a kind of mystical identification with a dying and rising Christ, a genuinely Hellenistic idea. Hence, all those passages in Paul's epistles which, according to the author's interpretation, favor this view, are accepted as genuine. On the contrary, all those which seem to deviate from it are thrown out as so many "interpolations." Rejected, accordingly, is especially whatever could be quoted in support of the idea that a sinner is saved by trusting in Christ as his substitute, whose righteousness is by grace imputed to him. Thus,
when in Gal. 1:4 we read: "our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins," the author immediately points out that "the true Pauline conception of the meaning of the death of Christ is mystic, not substitutionary." He ascribes these substitutionary ideas to a later age, to which he also refers the Pastoral Epistles.

We regard the argumentation carried on in this book as being unconvincing:

1. It is hardly necessary to point out that nothing is left of the doctrine of divine inspiration.

2. The idea of "substitution" is ingrained in the entire structure of O. T. sacrificial legislation and ritual. See, e.g., Lev. 1:4; 17:11; cf. Is. 53, John 1:29. Paul, being a Hebrew of the Hebrews, versed in the Jewish law, was thoroughly familiar with it.

3. The attempt to make a separation between the substitution-and-imputation passages on the one hand, and the spiritual-union-with-Christ passages on the other—an attempt, by the way, which is not at all new in the history of the interpretation of Paul’s epistles; think of Schweitzer!—is confronted with an insurmountable obstacle. It so happens that in these very epistles there are ever so many passages in which the two ideas (the substitution and the spiritual union idea) are expressed in one breath. See e.g., Rom. 5:1, 2; Phil. 2:6, 8; I Cor. 6:19, 20. To say that one of these two ideas must be genuine while the other is an interpolation is an attempt to get around a difficulty. One finds a Gordian knot and decides to cut it! By eliminating from Paul’s epistles whatever refers to Christ as our substitute who died for us, and by his death obtained for us a righteousness which we can never achieve, one has cut the heart out of the body of Paul’s teachings.

4. How does the author know that these passages are interpolations? What rules of textual criticism does he apply? As long as he is unable to show us that the passages in question lack manuscript support, he has failed to establish his case. His entire reasoning is seen to be established upon a purely subjective basis.

William Hendriksen.
Calvin Seminary.


This is a book which the scholar cannot afford to ignore. As I see it, the book is up-to-date. It is up-to-date in the sense that it presents a Life of Jesus that is in harmony with the conclusions of recent liberal scholarship. Students who do not accept these conclusions should, nevertheless, be acquainted with them. They should become familiar with the arguments upon which they are based. For myself I can state with all candor that my own faith has not been disturbed in the least by the reading of books of this character. Their line of argumentation furnishes little that is new. Nevertheless, reflection upon it causes one to review his own positions with respect to various questions. The net result? One becomes more firmly convinced of the truth of the traditional and orthodox position.

I have just finished reading this book of 58 pages. The author's style is very clear. He has, moreover, given conclusive evidence of wide reading on his subject. He is thoroughly acquainted with the various schools of thought. He sees problems and dwells on them at length.

Again and again he arrives at conclusions with which we can agree. He holds, e.g., that the writing of a detailed Life of Jesus is an impossibility. We agree, though we have reasons which would mean nothing to this author. Again, he contends that it is impossible to arrive at a date for the writing of Mark's Gospel on the basis of certain passages found in the thirteenth chapter. Here, too, we agree, and have always felt that Torrey’s arguments to the contrary were very weak (see C. C. Torrey, Documents of the Primitive Church, Chapter 1). And so I could continue.

We, nevertheless, do not hesitate to declare with all emphasis that we are in thorough disagreement with certain basic ideas of the author. In fact, it almost seems to us as if he has spent more time studying the radical theories regarding the Life of Jesus than the Gospels themselves. It’s the old story over again: the Messianic-secret idea of Wrede, pp. 146, 147, the eschatological conception of the kingdom (cf. E. T. Schweitzer, etc.), p. 565; the fundamental presupposition of the Form-Criticism School (namely, that the plans of the four Gospels are artificial creations), pp. 235-237, all these are accepted with little or no attempt at justification. The author, evidently, has read these works, and—baring certain restrictions on minor points with respect to which he expresses his disagreement—has accepted their conclusions. He does not reveal familiarity with the scholarly arguments on the other side.

The believer finds in the study of such works as G. Vos, The Self-Disclosure of Jesus, C. Greijdanus, Het Heliy Evangele naar de Beschrijving van Lukas, many pertinent articles in Christelijke Encyclopedie an adequate answer to the line of argumentation upon which the conclusions of Goguel and others are based. Of course, in the final analysis this whole matter is not one of argumentation. It is a matter of faith versus unbelief. Nevertheless, the position of the believer is not contrary to reason. It is consistent, coherent, and bears upon its very surface the hallmarks of the truth.

In addition to this general criticism we wish to express our objection to the following conclusions of the author:

1. On p. 42 he tells us that all preconceived dogmatic ideas of the person and work of Christ must be entirely ruled out of court. This, of course, is impossible. Goguel’s book establishes the impossibility of this thesis.

2. On p. 150 we are treated to the usual dictum: "It is impossible that the apostle (John) could have composed the fourth Gospel." The few reasons that are given are wholly unsatisfactory, and have been adequately refuted again and again. Higher critics of Goguel’s school evidently do not read conservative books.


4. He uncritically accepts the usual liberal interpretation of the four beasts of Dan. 7, p. 565. Aalders and others have shown that this interpretation is wholly contrary to the express teachings of the book of Daniel.

5. He is in line with the long list of critics who accept with respect to Christ, "a growth of messianic consciousness," p. 578. As we see it no one has given a more able refutation of this theory than G. Vos, in his Self-Disclosure of Jesus.

To the average reader, who does not have the time to make a special study of Bible History, I would say: instead of reading Goguel’s book, read Fahlberg’s Life of Christ.

To the man or woman who has made this branch of study his particular domain, I would say: read Goguel’s book. Read it with the discretion of faith.

William Hendriksen.
Calvin Seminary.


This is a study of "the evangelical tradition at a stage when it first took literary form," an attempt to get at the oral tradition sources that antedate the Gospel of Mark. Prof. Grant, who occupies the chair of Biblical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York City, endeavors to show what elements in this Gospel rest upon the very earliest oral tradition of the teachings of Jesus, and what modifications were introduced by Mark. Among American scholars
Dr. Grant is known as one of the leaders of form-criticism, a term for which he would like to substitute the word "tradition-criticism." He himself describes this type of investigation as the attempt "to get back behind the written Gospels and their sources to the oral tradition as it circulated prior to the writing down of any account of the 'mighty works,' the sayings, the parables, or the discourses of Jesus."

The description immediately "lets the cat out of the bag," for any attempt to determine what happened to oral tradition from the time it was deposited in the earliest writings which we possess must, of necessity, furnish abundant opportunity for subjective speculation. In fact, the proponents of this type of investigation are not even able to prove one of their basic presuppositions; namely, that the earliest tradition consisted of ever so many single units (this parable, that saying, this miracle-story, and that proverb) all separately circulated. And when the question is raised: just how do these men determine what, in Mark's Gospel let us say, is in conformity with a true report of the preaching of Jesus, and what, in distinction from it, was added by Mark himself in the interest of a certain theological theory, no satisfactory answer is given.

Now, in answer to this serious objection which I raise it may be urged that there are, in the Gospel of Mark, two irreconcilable currents of thought; according to one Jesus intends to be the Jewish Messiah of popular hopes, and to be publicly proclaimed as such; according to another He guards his knowledge of being the Messiah as a very close secret, not to be disclosed until after his resurrection. Hence, so it is argued, one of these strains of thought must rest upon the original and true state of affairs, while the other was added by Mark in the interest of a theory.

What always arrests my attention in this kind of argumentation is the readiness of the critics to assume conflicts in the Gospels. We read on p. 160: "Mark did not go through his Gospel and erase everything that conflicted with the interpretation set forth in the central section, and especially in the passion announcements." But the author does not prove that there was really a conflict at all. The triumphal entry into Jerusalem can be readily explained as being in thorough harmony with Christ's program of suffering. In fact, the former contributed to the realization of the latter.

Again, the author creates a conflict between Paul, Rom. 1:2-4 and Mark, p. 164. According to Paul Jesus became Son of God, Messiah of Israel, after his resurrection from the dead. But Mark goes beyond this: Jesus was already Son of God before his death and resurrection, in fact from the day of his baptism..." On the basis of this discovered "conflict" form-criticism now argues that, therefore, those statements in which Mark teaches the proclamation of Jesus as Messiah even before the resurrection represent Mark's theology. But is this fair? Does Rom. 1:2-4 really say what Grant interprets it to say? And if it says this, then is not Paul in conflict with his own statements made elsewhere, e.g., Phil. 2:5 ff? Again, why are we treated to a virtual reaffirmation of Wrede's messianic-secret theory? In a mere book-review it is not possible to describe this theory. I do hope, however, that anyone who reads what Grant has to say in favor of this theory will immediately afterward study carefully chapter IV of The Self-Disclosure of Jesus, by G. Vos. What Vos says with respect to it disposes of the theory in a very adequate manner.

There is much in this work by Grant with which we cannot agree. Nevertheless, this is not a book to be brushed aside lightly. Grant proves himself to be a scholar of great erudition. As we see it, one of the best chapters of his book is chapter V: Was Mark written in Aramaic? On the whole Grant reaches the same conclusion which we too have reached after serious study. May this book be read and studied with all the necessary discretion!

WILLIAM HENDRIKSEN.

Calvin Seminary.

KEEP UP YOUR READING

A Book a Month.

I N RESPONSE to last month's recommendation of Calvin's Institutes in this column, one of our readers commented: "I wish there were a popular readable publication of Calvin's Institutes. I was reading your review of the one you advocate, and right then and there intended to send for it until I saw the price—perhaps negligible to some, but not to us."

One appreciates that not everyone interested in the Institutes has seven dollars and a half to spend for it. The next best thing to having a copy of the complete Institutes is to own an abbreviated edition, a sort of condensation of the work. Also that is available in a fine American edition of only 228 pages. It has been furnished by Dr. Hugh Thomason Kerr, Jr. Of course, no scholar ought to take an abbreviated edition of the Institutes in preference to the complete work. But this abbreviation, or "Compend," as it is called, can serve a fine purpose. In fact, more than one. Whoever wishes a brief review of the gist of the whole work, can turn to this Compend. Also those who cannot afford the price of the entire work. Then, also, this condensed edition will keep up the interest of the average reader, which cannot be said of many parts of the complete work.

Dr. Kerr has left out a good deal of the polemic material on controversies which loomed up large in Calvin's days. He has reduced the 60 chapter headings of the complete work to 25, and has also adopted terms for these chapter headings which are a bit more modern. The general set-up of the four books of the original has, of course, been retained. Some very serviceable and new features have also been introduced. For instance, the index to this work is a better one than that to the complete edition of Allen. Also, the index refers each entry not only to the proper page of this condensed edition, but it also locates such a passage in the Book, Chapter, and Paragraph of the complete work. In addition this little volume indicates where the expanded material may be found in the complete work by giving the references to Book, Chapter, and Paragraph in the margin. We strongly recommend that everyone interested in Calvin's thought buy himself this book, and close with a paragraph from our review published at the time of the appearance of this work in THE CALVIN FORUM.

This compend is "for those who have long been wanting to read this classic of Calvinistic thinking but have found no time to do so. It is for those who feel rather sheepish when someone asks them whether they have read the Institutes. It is for the man who wishes to get the feel of the total structure and thrust of this classic in the time which a 20th century reader can give to it. It is for you, my good friend, so that you may be able to master in limited compass the master-thoughts of the greatest theologian-statesman-moralist of the age of the Reformation. Dr. Kerr has made it forever impossible for you to retain your self-respect if you must answer the query, Have you read Calvin's Institutes? in the negative. Go thou, who namest thyself after John Calvin, spend two bucks and fifty cents for this book, and after reading it through once, take it down from the shelf right often."

And wouldn't it be a fine thing if some societies, study clubs, or other groups could work through this book some winter season?

Title: A COMPEND OF THE INSTITUTES OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION BY JOHN CALVIN, Edited by Hugh Thomason Kerr, Jr.

Publisher: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, Philadelphia. (Or get it from your religious book dealer: Baker, or Eerdmans, or Kregel.)

Price: $2.50.
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