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Third American Calvinistic Conference
An Editorial

The Third American Calvinistic Conference, which took place at Calvin College and Seminary on August 12 and 13, has been a most rewarding experience for all who attended and goes down into history as a lasting inspiration and a continuous challenge to all lovers of the Reformed Faith.

First indications were not favorable for a successful conference. Time allowed for preparation was comparatively brief. Foreign speakers could, from the nature of the case, only be given short notice. August, being vacation month, seemed an inauspicious time at least for this type of conference. Till the last it was uncertain whether the South African speakers would arrive in time. But despite these handicaps, this third conference has proved a greater success than its predecessors and augurs well for the future.

Special circumstances surrounded this conference and these circumstances in turn have lent it a special character. The occasion for holding this conference at this time arose from the anticipated presence of a number of representative Calvinist scholars from abroad who were scheduled to be delegated to the First Reformed Ecumenical Synod that was to be held in Grand Rapids in August. Although this Synod has been confused with the Conference in the minds of some, the two are quite distinct. The Synod, at this writing still in session, is an ecclesiastical assembly consisting of properly appointed delegates from three Reformed church bodies in three different continents, whereas the Conference consisted of public meetings with addresses sponsored by the Calvinistic Action Committee, which is a continuation of the former Calvinistic Conference Committee. By availing itself of the presence of these speakers from abroad necessitated by attendance upon this Synod, the Calvinistic Action Committee was in a position to offer the American public a treat of addresses by a group of men who may never be in our country again.

These special circumstances of an international character also have lent the Third American Calvinistic Conference a unique, international character. From beginning to end this Conference bore the stamp of the ecumenicity—that is the global or world character—of Calvinism. Not that the subject of International Calvinism was on the program, but the entire conference from beginning to end was the most beautiful demonstration of International Calvinism in action. If at earlier conferences only an occasional speaker was from abroad, the rest being all Americans, this time every speaker came from a Calvinist group in some country from beyond the seas. The only American speaker originally appointed suggested that instead of his address the evening be devoted to a special popular meeting of greetings by various speakers from abroad, thus giving an unusual practical demonstration of the world scope of the faith we hold dear, and of that faith in action. In this way everyone of the five sessions of the Conference was offered to Calvinists from abroad while the Americans played the part of hosts and listeners.

Whatever there might be new and strange about the speakers, about their background and their use of the American language, there was a most remarkable oneness in faith, outlook, and conviction. All were enthusiastically devoted to the God-centered Faith of the Scriptures as interpreted most clearly and truly in Calvinism. The foundations laid and the standards set in the earlier American Calvinistic Conferences were unequivocally maintained and reasserted by these voices from abroad. Our oneness in the faith with them came to clear and repeated expression. Differences of opinion there were, differences of outlook, of background, and in some cases even distinct differences in the proffered solution of a problem. But there was beautiful unity and harmony in the devotion to the God-centered Faith as historically interpreted by Calvin, in the determination to maintain and defend this faith in the modern world, and in the conviction that an aggressive and progressive application of these principles to the problems of thought and life in our day is the only hope for the future and constitutes the challenging task of the present.

Calvinistic conferences should strive to combine the scholarly with the popular. Their prime purpose is scholarly, rather than popular. But the objective sought will not be reached unless a happy union of the two is achieved. We believe this was done in the present Conference. As in 1942 at the Second Conference, the day meetings were devoted to more scholarly papers and their discussion, whereas the evening sessions had a wider, more popular appeal. In 1942 there were two such evenings available, the one offering a popular address and the other being devoted to a banquet with its after-dinner speeches. This year’s conference, which had to be held on the very eve of the opening of the Ecumenical Synod, had only one evening available for such a meeting with a popular appeal.

Each one of the main speakers at the day sessions delivered a solid address of about an hour, which
in each case was followed by opportunity for questions and discussion. Professor Aalders of the Free University of Amsterdam spoke on Spiritual Freedom, the first subject of the series which had been announced as dealing with Calvinism in the Post-War World.

After having given a brief description of the idea of freedom in contrast to compulsion and physical necessity, the speaker pointed out that spiritual freedom in particular deals with the freedom of the human spirit. Holy Scripture clearly teaches that God created man with such a freedom. This is involved in the divine command to have dominion over the animals (Gen. 1:26, 28), and even more in the probationary command not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Gen. 2:16, 17).

Man, however, wantonly despised this true spiritual freedom and became chained in the bonds of sin. But Scripture preaches Jesus Christ, who has come to abolish the works of the devil, and through Him real spiritual freedom is regained (John 8:36). This freedom is not absolute as long as man abides on this earth, for the believer finds in his members the law of sin which brings him into captivity (Rom. 7:21ff). On the other hand, the lack of real spiritual freedom of the unbeliever is partly restrained by common grace, and so to a certain extent we can speak of a relative spiritual freedom with respect to the unbeliever, i.e., insofar as his human spirit is not compelled to commit sin or to accept a wrong representation of God, or a wrong view of life. This, of course, presents us with the difficult problem how freedom of the human spirit can be compatible with captivity to sin. This problem cannot be solved, but we must acknowledge that there is at least a relative spiritual freedom; and this is according to the will of God, who gives His revelation in the Bible in such a form that no man is compelled to accept its truth. God did not give to His people of Israel an infallible touchstone to put to test true and false prophets. Jesus Christ did not after His resurrection show Himself to His enemies with many infallible proofs. In the light of Scripture it cannot therefore be doubted that the freedom of the human spirit is a great boon which we must maintain, in particular because it opens the way for the preaching of the Gospel, though such freedom may be abused by many people. Calvinism has always been a champion of spiritual freedom and must remain faithful to its history in this respect in this post-war world.

The second of the four main addresses of the Conference was delivered by Professor Stephanus DuToit of the Theological School of die Gereformeerde Kerk in Suid-Afrika at Potchefstroom, Transvaal. The subject which he had chosen under the general theme of the Conference was: Calvinism versus Communism in the Post-War World. Whatever our sympathies during the war, we must, said the speaker, face the new situation, viz., that Communist Russia has come out of the war as a world power and today plays a dominant role in world politics. There is no world and life view which is more diametrically opposed to Communism than is Calvinism. Both are religious in their inner essence; both are comprehensive world and life views; and both promise paradise. These are, however, only apparent similarities. In every sphere of life—in church, state, and society—deep-rooted differences between them are apparent. It is the contrast of light and darkness, and neither of the systems can yield an inch in the struggle. In recent years there have been some changes of policy in Russia, but these may be of a purely tactical nature and Calvinism should keep watchful. Our task is to carry the banner of Christ fearlessly as prophets and as priests to alleviate the sufferings of humanity wherever possible.

The third major address was by another South African speaker, Dr. H. G. Stoker, Professor of Philosophy at the Potchefstroom University College, the collegiate institution of the same Reformed group which owns and operates the Theological School with which Dr. DuToit is associated. Dr. Stoker's address may be briefly summarized as follows. In the 19th century the conception of science was narrowed down to that of natural science. This scientific outlook was predominantly positivistic, mechanistic, and deterministic. Philosophy was ignored and skepticism and agnosticism dominated the view of religion. The present scientific outlook is a reaction against this view and at the same time a reaction against the thinking of the entire modern epoch of the last six centuries. This new outlook is indeterministic, holistic, and activistic. It has a determinative influence on every sphere of life and assigns significance, value, and purpose to the world and to human life, allowing all to be controlled by the principle of creative evolution, of which man is considered the highest form of expression. Calvinism recognizes elements of value in this view but rejects its glorification of change, progress, and power; its humanism, its holism, and its false optimism. However, Calvinism should not assume a merely negative attitude, but must offer a constructive criticism of this present-day scientific outlook. To accomplish this task what is required is the self-criticism and the cooperation of Calvinistic theologians, philosophers, and specialists in other fields of science.

The last of these solid papers was read by Professor G. C. Berkouwer, recently appointed to teach Modern Theological Currents at the Free University of Amsterdam. Speaking on Calvinism and Humanism, his address may be summarized as follows. In spite of pessimistic tendencies after the first world war, Humanism continued to fascinate the mind of man and came to expression in a titanic finitism. We have witnessed a remarkable coexistence of a theoretical revival of humanism on the one hand with definitely anti-humanistic tendencies in practice on the other, coupled with a devaluation of human personality. The problem which engaged the attention was to search after the mean-
ing of history. Especially in Germany this problem was alive when National Socialism with its notion of fate ascribed new values to history in its attempt to escape chaos. This produced certain tensions which became apparent in the field of theology. New developments in the Dialectic Theology showed that this reaction offered no solution and that the new eschatological emphasis simply created new reactions. Anti-humanistic tendencies in Theology only emphasize the importance of the mode of attack upon Humanism. Sons of the Reformation, especially Calvinists, must carry forward this battle not by threatening the bond between nature and grace (compare Barth’s sharp attack upon infant baptism) but by maintaining it, and at the same time—as over against Rome, Humanism, and other modern movements—by maintaining the depravity of human nature and the sovereign grace of God. The doctrine of common grace is not a weakening of these—on the contrary, in harmony with Kuyper, Bavinck and Calvin, it is an accentuation of the deadly character of sin. In this connection mention must be made of the widespread rejection of the Scriptural data of paradise and the fall, in consequence of which the modern theodicy can speak of sin only as an irrational moment in history. It may seem strange that in our age anti-humanistic tendencies go hand in hand with a renewal of humanism, but this is to be explained from the fact that a secularized humanitarianism is not able to check the impulses of the human heart once they have been called forth. Here Calvinism has a task to fulfill. In all humility it must ever be prepared to serve. We seem to be few in number, but this should only remind us of Samuel in those bitter days of silence and prayer, listening to the voice of God. That became the beginning of a renewal, which was a blessing for many. And then we read the word: And the Lord let none of His words fall to the earth. This is sufficient for us in this confused world to be kept from a superficial optimism on the one hand and pessimism on the other, and to perform the task before us until the true humanity shall have been achieved and the problem of humanism shall have found its solution.

* * *

Such was the solid food which the major addresses served to the conferees. It is no wonder that many expressed the desire soon to see these ideas in print, so that they might be pondered and re-digested. Meanwhile many an interesting question was asked and supplementary replies and elucidations were made by the respective speakers.

However, this Calvinistic Conference made its appeal not only to the mind, but also to the heart, and to the hand—to action. Calvinists are sometimes accused of being only thinkers, speculators, debaters, men of cold reason. But this Conference proved that Calvinism is practical as well as theo-

retical, that it stands for feeling and action as well as for logic and thinking. If the glory and beauty of striving to think God’s thoughts after Him was the outstanding feature of the more or less scholarly day meetings, the Monday evening meeting was a beautiful demonstration of the fellowship of the saints, of hearts beating in love for all who hold the same precious faith, of Christian charity, of inspiration and uplift, of blessed Christian fellowship in spirit with all Calvinists throughout the world.

Those who at times dropped a word of complaint that the speakers during the day went beyond their depth, that the day addresses seemed to be only for "intellectuals," at this evening meeting felt at home, were inspired, and together with the most intellectual speakers of the day found their hearts strangely warmed in the fellowship of brethren whose unity of heart and purpose draws its inspiration from the common—nay, rather uncommon—faith in the great, majestic, sovereign, loving God of the Scriptures.

The evening meeting was an unusual demonstration of the international character of Calvinism—of Calvinism as it is living, striving, struggling in the world—and that Calvinism as it expresses itself—yes, also in thought and scholarship to be sure—but especially in worship and praise, in the bond of union in Christ, in love, in sacrifice, in devotion, and inspiration for the practical task that must be faced. The singing was inspiring, uplifting, worshipful. The words spoken by living representatives of various Calvinist groups scattered throughout the world went right home. And the generous offering of some five hundred fifty dollars to relieve the plight of suffering Calvinist leaders in Hungary was one of the most touching evidences of the practicality, the readiness to sacrifice, the reality of a living, vibrant, international Calvinism that the present writer has ever witnessed.

Four speakers brought home to us, by their presence as well as by their words, this living demonstration of International Calvinism in action. Holland, South Africa, Ceylon, and Hungary were represented on this American platform and were speaking to this American Calvinist audience filling the Calvin College auditorium. An instructive brief address at one of the day sessions had already given us an understanding and appreciation of the situation in which the Calvinist (Anti-Revolutionary) political party of the Netherlands finds itself today. The speaker had been Mr. Abraham Warnaar, himself active in Calvinist political action and a mayor of a Dutch town. In the evening meeting Holland was represented by Dr. Jacob Hoek, a Reformed minister at the Hague, who had been active in the distribution of relief received by the Reformed people of the Netherlands from American Calvinist sources. Gratitude and appreciation was the keynote of his brief address. Calvinists of South Africa were speaking through Dr. P. J. S. De Klerk, who briefly sketched what Afrikaans-speak-
A Physician Meditates on Human Suffering

Stuart Bergsma
Former Medical Missionary, now Practicing Physician and Surgeon

"Man is born unto trouble, as the sparks fly upward" Job was informed in his affliction. Human suffering is universal. Wherever there exists one man, one woman or one child there suffering also has taken up its abode. It is true that happiness, joy, love and peace may dwell in the same heart, so that this universe is not one great vale of tears but a mixture of sunshine and clouds and tempests. But to shut one's eyes to reality, to bury one's head in the sand like the proverbial ostrich, to deny that suffering in some measure is the portion of every soul in the universe, is to be living in a fool's paradise. "Man is born unto suffering as the sparks fly upward."

The Problem Defined

By suffering is not meant mere physical pain, such as the suffering of childbirth, the suffering from fractured bones or pain-wracked bodies. Suffering is not only physical, but also mental and spiritual. Many people most deeply scarred by suffering are wearing the scars "where they don't show," but the scars are just as real nevertheless.

To most of us suffering would present no great problem if only the obviously evil people suffered. That the rascally depraved criminal type should suffer for their misdeeds is only just and right, we say. But why must even righteous people suffer, why must even the obviously innocent be drawn into the whirlpool of human suffering, often by the misdeeds of others who are not worthy to blacken the boots of those they drag into the mire with them?

The problem of suffering is as old as the world itself. Adam, as he struggled against the forces of nature in the sweat of his brow, although still so filled with shame at his own fall, was yet so fresh with the memories of the blissful walks with God in the garden, that all nature plotting against him must have wrung from his breast in anguish the question: "God, why must this be?" Mother Eve, in the pain of bringing forth the first child ever to be born on earth, a suffering without precedent, an amazing event without parallel, with no mother to guide her, no physician or nurse or medical book to instruct her as to what she must expect, must have cried out: "My God, is this suffering unavoidable?" The first man and woman viewing with broken hearts the first human death, a violent death at the hand of a brother, both victim and culprit their sons, must have lifted tear-stained eyes to heaven and cried: "Dear God, is there any purpose, any meaning in all this?"

Our Holy Scriptures devote an entire book of forty-two chapters, the Book of Job, to the problem of human suffering, especially the suffering of the righteous. A whole Psalm, Psalm seventy-three, is devoted to the riddle of the prosperity of the wicked and the suffering of the righteous. Asaph says: "But as for me, my feet were almost gone, my steps had well-nigh slipped. For I was envious at the foolish, when I saw the prosperity of the wicked."

ing Calvinists are doing to develop a God-centered consciousness for thought and life in the southern half of the globe. Mr. Alton G. Foenander, a Burg her of Ceylon, at present a graduate student at Calvin Seminary, brought greetings from the Dutch Reformed Church of Ceylon and gave touching expression to the desire to have his group draw instruction and inspiration from those who love the Reformed Faith in America. And Dr. Charles Vincze, Archdeacon of the Free Magyar Reformed Church in this country, spoke of the ties that bind Hungary and Calvinism together and reinforced the plea of Professor Bela Vasady of Debrecen, Hungary, who had spoken briefly in one of the day sessions about the plight of his country, and especially of the Hungarian Reformed Church, its people and its leaders, in these days when the shadow of the Russian colossus has fallen across their land.

Here was international Calvinism, visible, embodied in living personalities and their pleas, demonstrated by their words and their presence.

The audience was inspired and uplifted. Those who sometimes are inclined to be discouraged because the host of the enemy is so much greater than the forces of God's people, were both humbled and heartened.

When that audience finally rose to sing "Faith of our Fathers," they seemed to sing it as never before, and one could not help sensing in these words the renewed consecration and dedication of all Calvinist groups throughout the world to the glorious task of making known the riches of the truth of the God-centered Faith of the Scriptures.

C. B.
The problem of human suffering is as old as time and as fresh as today’s dawn. It is a problem of which the full answer will only be known to us after we cross the Jordan and see Him face to face and know Him as also we are known. Now we can see the answer only darkly as in a distorted glass, out of focus. Amazing insight into the problem has been shown by saints of old—Job, David, Asaph, the Prophets, the writers of the Epistles; modern poets, prose writers, divines have shed light on the subject; but the mystery of suffering remains. No one can solve the real mystery of suffering although much can be done to help us to understand suffering better and to bear it with Christian fortitude when it falls to our lot to suffer.

Job, the Prototype of Righteous Suffering

Let us see how men of old met their suffering and try to find some answers to the problem. No one answer will explain all suffering. The answers are as numerous as the types of suffering. Let us look first at a righteous man suffering primarily physically, but with it mental anguish at the loss of seven sons and three daughters in a tornado; a suffering in which his wife shares but to which she responds by saying: ‘Curse God, and die!’ Righteous Job fell on his face upon the ground and worshipped God. ‘The Lord gave, the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.’ As we read the Book of Job we see a man dazed that God would deal so with him, questioning God with a great ‘Why, Oh Lord, Why?’ but in it all clinging to God with might and main as his most precious possession on earth or in heaven. ‘Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him,’ he cries.

As he sits in the ash heap, with painful boils from head to foot, dirty, repulsive, despised, his three friends carry on an academic debate on the meaning of the suffering of this man they once regarded as so righteous. His horrible appearance, with putrefying sores from crown of head to soles of feet had the same effect on them that it would have on us today were we to see suddenly a ‘repulsive eruption covering almost all of his body. Most people would say in their hearts: ‘Aha, my fine hypocrite, you’ve been leading a double life, you’ve been living in sin while smugly so pious before us all, and now your sin has found you out!’ One of the diagnoses of medical science on Job’s sickness is venereal disease. And this is practically the answer his three friends give. They deny this is a suffering of the righteous.” ‘Job, you sly old rascal, you’ve preached to many people but you haven’t practiced it,” says Eliphaz the Temanite in effect. ‘Who ever perished, being innocent? Or when were the righteous cut off? Even as I have seen, they that plow iniquity and sow wickedness, reap the same. All suffering is because of sin, Job. Confess up, Job! Happy is the man whom God correcteth; therefore despise not thou the chastening of the Almighty. Know that it is for thy good.”

First Answer: Suffering Is Punishment

There we have one answer to the problem of suffering: Suffering is penal, for punishment or correction because of sin. It may fit some cases of suffering, but unless one is very sure of his ground it is a very poor approach to the sufferer. Job said to his friends: “Miserable comforters are ye all.” For Bildad adds fuel to the fire and even accuses Job of being a hypocrite. “Job,” he says in effect, “God won’t pervert justice. Your children died because they sinned against Him. Suffering is because of sin. Pray to God, Job. If thou wert pure and upright God would make the habituation of thy righteousness prosperous. So are the paths of all that forget God; and the hypocrite’s hope shall perish; he shall lean upon his house, but it shall not stand. Behold, God will not cast away a perfect man, neither will He help evil doers.”

Job in his misery replies: “My soul is weary of my life; I will speak in the bitterness of my soul. God, show me why you contend with me? Do you delight in what you are doing, God? Do you despise the work of your hands? Is your vision at fault, God, or are you also seeing as man sees? Thou knowest that I am not wicked; I can’t escape from thee. Thou hast said ‘My doctrine is pure, and I am clean in my own eyes,’ But oh! that God would speak and open His lips against thee. Know therefore that God exacteth of thee less than thine iniquity deserves. Put away iniquity, let not wickedness dwell in thy tabernacles. Repent! Repent! Repent, and all this suffering will go away.” To which his friend Eliaphaz also agrees and even mentions specific sins he thinks Job has committed, saying in effect: “You can fool some of the people all the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you can’t fool God, Job.”

His friend Zophar then adds coals to the fire and says: “Job, you are not only a sinner and a hypocrite but a liar as well. Should thy lies make men hold their peace? And when thou mockest, shall no man make thee ashamed? Thou hast said ‘My doctrine is pure, and I am clean in my own eyes.’ But oh! that God would speak and open His lips against thee. Know therefore that God exacteth of thee less than thine iniquity deserves. Put away iniquity, let not wickedness dwell in thy tabernacles. Repent! Repent! Repent, and all this suffering will go away.”

We see here a righteous man vigorously fighting against the first answer to the problem of suffering: All great suffering is evidence of great sin. Job maintains he has not sinned worthy of this suffering or else all the world would be plunged into far worse hell, for he feels he is as righteous as he could remain in a sin-filled world.
Suffering
Second Answer:
God Wills It

Elihu, a fourth friend, who has been listening throughout the whole debate in silence, can remain silent no longer. He scathingly denounces Job's friends because they find no answer for Job's misery, yet bitterly condemn him. He denounces Job for self-righteousness. "Job," he says, "You have said in my hearing: I am clean, I am innocent, neither is there iniquity in me. God just counts me for His enemy" or we might say: God is picking on me. Elihu now gives a second answer to the problem of suffering: "In the midst of suffering be still and know that God is God. God is greater than man. Bow to His will. Why strive against Him? show us why He does things or what He intends to do. We can't call God to the bar." It is a typical Mohammedan answer to the problem of suffering: "It is the will of God. Kismet! Fate! Be still!"

Third Answer:
Suffering Purifies

Eliphaz goes on to expound a third answer to the problem of suffering: "God does it for the good of our soul. God keepeth back man's soul from the pit. Man is chastened with pain upon his bed." But for Job the mystery of his suffering remains, and the voice of God speaking out of the whirlwind indicates to Job that the mystery of suffering always will remain. Job's friends have been passing judgment on Job yet not knowing what it is all about. Job has been passing judgment on the doings of God yet knew not what reason God might have for sending all these calamities. It has been thus far a one-sided discussion on the mystery of evil. God now restores the balance by pointing out the mystery of good. Suffering is a mystery. Goodness is a mystery. God's whole creation is a mystery, His omnipotence, majesty, sovereignty. Job is finally convinced that while his suffering remains a mystery it is still intended for man's discipline and God's glory.

Fourth Answer:
Suffering Tests Our Faith

And what was really the reason Job had to suffer all these woes? The opening chapters of the Book of Job clearly indicate the reason back of Job's suffering. In Job's case it was clearly to refute the devil's slander that God's people serve Him only for what they get out of it. Job stood the test. "Curse God and die," said his wife. But Job answered: "Shall we receive good at the hands of the Lord, and shall we not receive evil?" I wonder if we could stand such a test. Many a Christian has turned bitter against God through affliction, as if he had not lost enough already without losing his God with his material possessions or family.

Thus the Book of Job gives us a fourth answer to the problem of suffering: Suffering is for the testing of the Christian's faith to the glory of God. "That the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honor and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ." "Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them that are exercised thereby." In Job's case it yielded restoration of health, wealth and property in double measure. Even his children were in double measure for he was granted seven sons and three daughters again on earth, and had seven sons and three daughters living in heaven awaiting his coming.

Nor was Job an exception as a righteous man suffering. David was a man after God's own heart. How God must have loved the sweet singer of old who just had to burst into psalms telling of the greatness of God, psalms which would be sung to the glory of God for ever and ever! No other living creature has memorialized the name of God more than David, excepting our Lord Himself. Yet David's life was one in which suffering played a prominent part. In anguish he cried: "Oh my son, Absalom, my son, my son Absalom! Would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!" To have a son die in warfare may be the lot of any Christian. To have one die in rebellion, and to have fears that that son may be eternally lost, is a suffering for the righteous almost too deep for words.

Fifth Answer:
Suffering Builds Character

When David numbered the people in his pride, we see another aspect of the problem of suffering, for thousands died of pestilence, and we hear David cry in anguish: "Lord, I have sinned, and I have done wickedly; but these sheep, what have they done?" Let thine hand, I pray thee, be against me."

It is perhaps the most poignant suffering possible for the righteous to know that their pride or stupidity or false moves are the cause of suffering to the innocent. Unconsciously we say: "If God is a loving God, why doesn't he intervene when His servants with all good intentions are doing something which may be a cause of suffering to others?" Why didn't God check the foolish desire of David to number the people? And here we see a fifth answer to the problem of suffering: Suffering builds rugged Christian character.

Let us suppose that I as surgeon am performing an operation. A child has been injured by an auto, the leg is crushed, gangrene has set in, and from all appearances the child will die unless I ampu-
tate the leg. Because of the gangrenous skin I decide to sacrifice the leg. But after the operation is finished, as I examine the leg sacrificed, I find the gangrene was only superficial, there was a 50% chance that the leg might have been saved by sulfa drugs or penicillin. What a life-long suffering or handicap for this child! What a suffering for the surgeon? Why didn’t God in a sudden flash of insight just keep me from the possibility of making any mistake!

Supposing that every time my action might be the source of the slightest harm or painful consequence to anyone God Himself intervened? What would this ultimately do to me? It would reduce me to a machine, I would no longer be a free agent, able to choose for myself. The perfection of my results would soon make me arrogant and less and less cautious every day. “I can do no wrong” would be a more devastating philosophy for my character than would be the present state of possibly doing harm. Too often we must repeat the words of The Fool’s Prayer:

These clumsy feet, still in the mire,  
Go crushing blossoms without end.  
These hard, well-meaning hands we thrust  
Among the heart strings of a friend.

Let us not misunderstand the implications of this. I do not say that God never intervenes, that God is not with us, that we cannot often feel His presence, that He does not give us guidance and help. He intervenes a thousand times a day and we are unconscious of it; He upholds and strengthens. But He does this when it is conformity with His will to do so, not just because it is our will that He do so. Without God we could not live one second. But wisely He refuses to make us infallible little machines reckoning on His going wherever we lead Him instead of our going where He leads us. St. Augustine once prayed that remarkable prayer: “God forbid that I should ever seek to bend the straight to the crooked; (that is, God’s straight will to my crooked will). But may I ever seek to bend the crooked to the straight; (that is my will to His).” Thus the two wills become parallel lines stretching into eternity.

**Why Doesn’t A Loving God Stop All Suffering**

But some will say: “If God can prevent all suffering and doesn’t do it, then God is no longer a loving God.” But this is a very great error. Would you say that a physician who could prevent half an hour of suffering in a patient, yet refused to do so at once, was a fiend in disguise? Not necessarily. When I was an intern a patient was admitted with a ruptured gastric ulcer. The pain was excruciating, for acid gastric juice was pouring into the man’s peritoneal cavity. The physician in charge, himself inexperienced and unable to do surgery, immediately gave the patient an injection of morphine, for he could not bear to see him suffer. When the sur-

As the morphine effects wore off the pain recurred and it was at once evident that in the interim juices had been pouring out of the perforated stomach even though the patient had no pain. An operation was done, but it was too late; the peritonitis was now wide-spread. Would it have been cruelty to have in your power the means of relieving suffering, yet not use that means? You will say: “Only is you have a good purpose back of it.” Can we not believe that God, in refusing to intervene every time suffering may occur by our folly, or our nation’s folly, has a good purpose in it all? Is God’s great purpose with us to make us free from pain, and as happy as possible on this earth, or does He aim at building our characters through lessons in fortitude?

**Sixth Answer:**

**Suffering Is A Blessing**

A sixth answer to the problem of suffering is that sufferings and blessings are but facts of the same sparkling jewel, God’s love. Someone has said that all suffering is a direct result of four great blessings granted unto mankind. Take from mankind these blessings and most of the suffering in the world will also disappear. I do not know who first listed these four blessings inseparably linked with suffering, as I must delve some years back into my memory to recall even a skeleton outline of an address I once heard.

**The Blessing Of Freedom Of Choice**

The first great blessing which results in suffering is freedom. True, man cannot choose to be saved or to do positive good except God move him, yet in all every day affairs man is a free agent not bound by an iron-bound will above him that compels him to choose this and reject that.

Again, let us no misunderstand the implications of this for we tread on holy ground; we are on the edge of a greater mystery than the mystery of human suffering when we touch upon the mystery of God’s sovereignty and man’s liberty. As Reformed people we believe God decreed everything great and small, important or trivial. In fact the trivial may be important and our “important” may be very “trivial” in God’s sight. Yet, mysteriously, in foreordaining all things God has not made man a mere machine, compelled first to go at a snail’s pace, then driven like mad, now over smooth six lane highways, then suffering in every part as it is driven over rutted roads, at the whim of the one at the steering wheel. Somehow we remain free agents and therefore responsible.
But just this freedom results in suffering. A wrong choice may mean disaster. Choose one road and you may meet and be bitten by a mad dog you would have avoided by choosing the other road. Choose one life-work and you shoulder burdens you would miss in another vocation. If only God would just compel us to choose this and reject that our way would be without mishap. Yet in order to miss the suffering involved, would we be willing to give up the great blessing of freedom of choice?

The Blessing Of Law and Order

The second great blessing linked with suffering is the blessing of law and order. God has made this an orderly universe. There is a law of gravity. A stone dropped from a height will fall with a thud. So will we and our bones may break. Yet can we ask God to have the law work one way for the stone and another way for us? Fire heats objects, will boil water, will do work for us. But if we put our hand into the fire we are burned and suffer. Can we ask God in the one case to permit the fire to cook our food for us, and at the same time ask him to make fire that will not cause our hand to burn? What an unpredictable universe this would be! One day fire would cook our food, the next day it would not be hot fire, perhaps cold instead!

Let us consider, for example, the laws of this earth's crust. Inside the earth all is perhaps a fiery molten mass and we live on a quaking crust. Every now and then an earthquake occurs and thousands of people perish. Can we ask God to make the earth quake everywhere except just where His church stands or where you, His child, stand? Why does God permit earthquakes anyway? Is it really true that God loves mankind if He will permit thousands of people to perish in one instant by an earthquake? I like the answer Bishop Ingram of London gives in his book, Asking Them Questions. He says: "I do not profess to base my belief in the love of God upon anything I see in the world today. I base my belief in the love of God upon the Incarnation. Is the death of even a hundred thousand people in an earthquake much different from the death of about two hundred thousand people which occurs over the world every day in the ordinary course of events? Suppose there were no death, what would happen? How soon would life become impossible on this earth? Is death so terrible? I decline to accept the fact of thousands dying every day as any evidence against the love of God. These great things like earthquakes are allowed to happen to prevent us from being drowned in security. Let us then rush to the rescue of the sufferers, let these great calamities bring out the love and the sympathy of the world, but let them not move from our belief in the love of God."

The Blessing of Progress

The third great blessing linked with suffering is progress. Man must progress but it brings suffering. Monster-size ocean liners like the Titanic make possible a thousand deaths in one collision with an iceberg. The fast air liners make possible thousands of accidents annually. Progress in exploration, progress in Missions, the splitting of the atom and release of atomic force,—where is not progress bound up with opportunities for new forms of suffering? And yet would we, in order to be free from the suffering, be willing to give up the progress?

The Blessing of Love

The fourth great blessing to mankind, linked up with suffering, is love. Love is the cause of an incalculable amount of suffering in this world. Death would lose most of its sting if love were absent. It is because a mother loves her child that she must suffer when he is injured. Take love out of the world, make man indifferent and cold as an iceberg toward his fellow man, and suffering would be greatly reduced. And yet, would we want to live in a world like that? Would life be worth living without love, even if there is suffering added to make love all the more poignant? "Love suffereth long," said Paul; yes, lifelong.

Have you ever thought that the only way we know the immensity of the love of God for us is from the fact that God was willing to suffer for us to prove it? "God so loved the world that He gave." Rule out Divine love and the Divine suffering also becomes unnecessary. We with our feeble imaginations, our finite minds, our limited understandings, cannot grasp the infinite spiritual suffering and soul agony of our Lord on earth, but we can understand hunger, thirst, sorrow, bloody sweat, tears, crowns of thorns, forty stripes, nails through hands and feet, and the shame of a cross. Unconsciously we make Christ's human suffering a yard stick with which we measure the love of God for us, for we too have suffered, we too have loved. Rule out human love and most of the mental and spiritual suffering would vanish from the earth. But Ah, at what a cost! Suffering is cheap at the price.

Seventh Answer: "Perfected Through Suffering"

It is but natural that we human beings shrink from suffering, though it be cheap at the price we pay. Our Lord and Master shrank from the cup in the garden. In the words of Edmund Leamy:

"Breathes there a man who claimeth not
One lonely spot,
His own Gethsemane,
Whither with his inmost pain
He fain
Would weary plod."
We see but an echo of our Master's words: "The servant is not greater than his Lord."

"Unto the Prison House of Pain none willingly repair—The bravest who an entrance gain
Reluctant linger there."

writes Florence Earle Coates, and continues:

"Yet in the Prison House of Pain things
full of beauty grow—
Like Christmas roses, which attain
Perfection with the snow."

Suffering meant perfection for our Lord. The Captain of our Salvation was made perfect through suffering, the writer of Hebrews informs us. In this we must also be like our Master.

Alas, at times the accusation of Satan against Job, with which we began our meditation on suffering, is true. At times we do serve God "for what we can get out of it; because it pays to be a Christian." God forbid that we should be only "fair-weather Christians" who turn against Him at the first gust of stormy wind. Arthur John Gossip says in The Hero In Thy Soul: "I do not understand this life of ours. But still less can I understand how people in trouble and loss and bereavement can fling away peevishly from the Christian faith. In God's name, fling to what? Have we not lost enough without losing Him too? If Christ was right, and

immortality and the dear hopes of which He speaks do really lie a little way ahead, we can manage to make our way to them. But if this is not so—how dark the darkness grows. Were it not pitiful if we receive the discipline of life in vain; have all the suffering of it, pay down the price in full, yet miss what it was sent to teach! After all it is not in the day, but in the night, that star rises after star. And it is in the dark that the faith becomes biggest and bravest."

Suffering should lead us nearer to God and prepare us to face life with steady eyes, with faith in God. It should prepare us, as it did Jeremiah, for those times of "swelling of Jordan" when life's problems threaten to engulf us like a wild mountain stream suddenly rising, fed by rains on the hills, and we in the direct path of the rushing torrent! Can we face it like Job of old and say: "The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord . . . Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him." Then our feet are on the path of perfection through suffering. Then we can understand why suffering will remain until the better world is ushered in, for as the poet John Oxenham so aptly expresses the thought:

God is a zealous pruner,
For He knows,
Who falsely tender spares the vine
But spoils the rose.

V-J Year Plus One

THIS first year after the cessation of military conflict with Japan has been one of confusion and distrust, both in national and in international relations. Reports on the meetings and actions of the United Nations Organization emphasize the differences in the positions, the aims, and the ideals of the great powers which just a year ago, through united action, brought the war to a close. Strong feelings are still thinly veiled in the pronouncements made by the delegates to the international meetings, but the newspaper comments bristle with criticisms. Our newspapers report the bitter, the cynical reactions of the soviet press. Russia's newspapers very sarcastically brush aside the holier-than-thou attitude of our press and proceed to severe condemnation of what they regard as our imperialistic designs. They are quick to detect in us the feeling that we are the greatest and, of course, the noblest nation on earth. And they do not hesitate to match our conduct with our pretensions.

What is true of Russia and the United States seems to be general. Political and diplomatic relations between the nations appear to be headed for new "lows" rather than the new "highs" which successful cooperation during the war gave us some reason to anticipate. The state of economic inter-relationship is little better. The race to consolidate national economic strength and the bitter rivalry that followed in the period after World War I seem about to be repeated now. Indeed it is this conflict of economic interests that intensifies diplomatic discord in such areas as South America and the far East. And as for conditions within the great nations, (except perhaps for Russia which, as every one knows, blankets her affairs from the rest of the world) economic and political confusion is greater than ever before.

We are Disgruntled

People tend, of course, to magnify their losses and to minimize their gains. They readily forget all that they already have in their pre-occupation to get something more. The things we do not have or enjoy are the ones that cause us concern. It may be well, therefore, to remind ourselves that we
We Fear the Atom Bomb

We fear the very weapon which we used to bring the war to an end. In reply to those who condemn us for using it first we should, no doubt, remember that we had good reason to fear that others might have beaten us in the race to manufacture and to use the atom bomb. But the fact remains that one of our greatest worries is the use to which men may put this great scientific achievement in the future. We must find a way of turning it to constructive use. Perhaps the best method of insuring this is to set up a control organization such as was proposed by Bernard Baruch recently. Such a body will not long achieve its purpose, however, unless as Baruch indicated, its members and the nations which they represent, are willing to be guided by the “principles of human duty” rather than by narrow insistence upon individual and national “rights.”

We Fear Russia

Any one who can hear or read knows that we distrust and fear Russia. We cannot imagine that Russia should have reason to distrust and fear us. That she does distrust us, and that she believes she has good reason to do so, should be obvious to any one who attempts to understand the positions of other nations as well as that of our own. Russian leaders, and the Russian people apparently, believe in their type of organization and in their political and social aims. When these come into conflict with ours we cannot hope that resort to pressure or to force alone will bring the Russians around to our point of view. People will long fight for what they regard to be the truth. And as Mr. Dulles pointed out in Life recently, in this connection too “Truth crushed to earth will rise again.” We must seek to convince Russia of our strength, to be sure, but it is even more necessary that we seek to convince her of the rightness of our position. We do well, therefore, to remind Russia that there are fundamentals of truth and of justice which must be binding upon all men and all nations. The Russian government, which in its conduct of national and international affairs seems to us to have been opportunistic and arbitrary, willing to use any means that will lead to the accomplishment of desired ends, must recognize that there is a higher law than that of any man or any nation. It is our duty to point this out and to insist on such a higher law which men and nations must recognize. We cannot do this by using the threat of force. And we cannot do so if we profess adherence to such higher law in word but deny it in our practice. Russia as well as the rest of the world must recognize the law of God. It is not our insistence upon our might that will enable us to influence Russia in the long run but our insistence on and practicing what is right.

We Lament the State of Our Economy

We lament the conflict and the confusion which at present prevents the smooth operation of our economic order. Our patience has been worn thin by the demands of some of the large unions. We are shocked by their apparent indifference to the need of full production. On the other hand we cannot understand the stubborn adherence of some industrialists to economic tenets that do not fit this rapidly changing age. We fear that as a consequence of labor disputes we may not even reach full production and full employment before another depression is upon us. Inflation has been slowly creeping up and we have been in constant fear of runaway prices. We do not want higher prices on the rents we pay and the foods we eat, but we are eager to get higher prices for the goods and services which we sell. We know that we needed government controls of prices and of consumption during the war. We are certain that we do not want or need such controls in the long run, but we do not know how to conduct our economy in the meanwhile. Individuals and groups are intent upon fighting for their rights and they will brook no controls. In the meantime production and stability in the economic order are threatened. On every hand we see that men are trying to get as much as possible for little or no work. That is the criticism which is generally and very openly made of union labor. It applies to many others who today are trying to make money quickly by means of one scheme or another. It certainly applies to those who would get rich quick by speculation or by gambling. Monetary gains received without work done in exchange for them are returns received without due service rendered. This is true no matter what the manner is in which the reward is gained without work. To get without giving in exchange is, generally speaking, wrong. Laborers today want higher wages, they want them throughout the entire year and they want equivalents for them in periods when they are injured, sick, or too old to work. No one will deny that in this age of mechanized production and of the economic interdependence of all men, some provision must be made for social insurance. To call
each advance along the road of such insurance another step toward socialism is but to repeat the criticism made already in 1910 when workmen’s compensation, long overdue, was finally introduced in this country. When laborers apparently forget, however, that all efforts at providing security for them depend upon the productivity of industry, it is time to call a halt. This employers are, of course, only too ready to do. Some do so at the very time that they themselves should be condemned because of their own practices. Obviously laborers are not the only ones who have withheld services or goods from the market during this last very hectic year.

The president of the Proctor and Gamble company recently informed the members of the American Management Association that he believed that the manufacturers of 85% of the goods consumed in this country could so organize their production as to provide regular employment for their employees. His contention was based upon the belief that 85% of our goods and services are consumed regularly and rather evenly throughout the year. But, as he pointed out, we produce not to this regular “consuming line” but to a very irregular “buying line.” This producing and selling of goods in spurts causes sharp ups and downs in employment. Management must, he insists, regularize employment, for if management does not, the government will be forced by pressure groups to try to do so. And he is convinced that the government cannot do it.

There is a point in this contribution of the President of this great soap company that deserves emphasis. Neither Labor nor Management is going to win out in the present conflict for any length of time simply because it is stronger than the other party. Labor will not long have high wages and full employment simply because its unions are strong enough to dictate to employers. Management is not going to get full production by putting the burden of responsibility for such production upon the cooperation of Labor alone. In addition to making certain of their own rights and firmly insisting upon them, each side must have vision enough to see what it can do constructively to satisfy both sides to the conflict. There is much pioneering still to be done in this kind of endeavor. And it holds more promise of good for all concerned than the bickering over “rights” that we have witnessed in the last year.

We Should Be Concerned About Character and Culture

We are an impatient people. We want many things. We want peace, we want employment, we want high wages, we want wealth, we want security, we want luxuries of all kinds,—and we want them all at once. We do not want to take the time required to obtain all these ends; we are forever attempting short-cuts. The fact of the matter is that we are unwilling to pay the price in money, time, and effort that is required to gain these ends. Worse still in attempting these short-cuts we close our eyes to the moral trespassing of which we became guilty. We become callous to the wrongs which we commit.

Not only does seeking for short-cuts threaten to upset our economy; the same tendency and practice threatens the very basis of our culture. Young men and women are so impatient to get into occupations and professions and thus to make money that they have no time for subjects or courses which do not directly contribute to the gaining of their ends. Why, as a writer of one of our recent books has put it, “should a liberal education be contrary to a useful education; why should theoretical knowledge be opposed to applied knowledge; and why should abstract and concrete thinking exclude each other?” As many an educator is emphasizing today the school of the future should give to all students instruction in “subjects of common human value.” In a democratic society, in which each individual at times shares in the function of ruling, each individual should understand the culture in which he is living and each should develop a character worthy of the role of citizen which he is permitted to fill. Men yearn for freedom and all the good things which freedom is expected to bring. But we shall not attain to economic or political freedom, and certainly not to spiritual freedom until we attain to an objectivity which none of us has demonstrated thus far. Today as ever the world needs to be reminded of the truth that there is no other freedom than that which we have in Christ Jesus. Any freedom, spiritual or otherwise, that is not based upon a recognition of a law higher than man’s cannot be anything else than a sham.
Modern China and Her New Independence

In this post-war world in which we are living, we are vitally concerned with what takes place in other parts of the world. We can no longer isolate ourselves and remain indifferent to the problems other peoples are facing. Our world is indeed a “one world.”

One of the sore spots of the world at present is the Orient, where peoples who have long been dominated by the white race are struggling for national independence. The rising tide of Nationalism is threatening to do away with the dominant position held by Europeans in the Orient for decades. Planters, traders and big business concerns that have always been closely tied up with cheap native labor are now in danger of losing their special privileges. However, it is evident that the Europeans are reluctant to relinquish their special position, and they are trying hard to re-establish themselves on the old basis.

When first the Atlantic Charter with its four freedoms was announced we were all thrilled, for it seemed to promise a new deal for all the oppressed peoples of the world. However, it soon became evident that it was meant only for those who had recently lost their independence to our enemies and did not at all apply to the peoples of the Orient. Mr. Churchill’s statement, that he had not become prime minister to liquidate the British empire, made this very clear. During the war we admired the people of France and Holland for their heroic struggle against German oppression. Oh, how they suffered under the German yoke and what a relief when finally the Allies brought deliverance. But then what happened? When the peoples of the East asked that they also be given their independence on the basis of the Atlantic Charter, their request was flatly refused. The governments of France and Holland, which had just recently been re-established with the aid of the Allies, insisted that the subject peoples of the Orient continue in their old colonial position, and they ruthlessly put down all opposition. One can hardly understand how people who have just passed through such a terrible experience themselves fail to sympathize with other peoples in their national aspirations. A former Dutch official of Java now residing in Shanghai, expressed the typical attitude of this class when he said: “Wij zullen ze wel klein maken.” The same policy is, of course, being followed by Great Britain in Burma and in the Malay States. This does not make for permanent peace. We claim to be the champion of the small nations like Iran, but how about these peoples in the Orient who are also struggling for freedom? Does this not concern us, or are we afraid of offending our former Allies? And, of course, this policy of trying to re-establish the rule of the white man will make missionary work very difficult, if not impossible, in those lands.

China’s Long Struggle

China, although a part of the Orient, has never really been a colony. She has never been conquered and controlled by a western nation. Still she has not been completely independent for decades. Dr. Sun yat-sen, the father of modern China, has described her position as being that of a semi-colony. She has been independent politically but she has long been dominated economically by other powers. Modern China is therefore the result of a long struggle. In using the term “modern” in speaking of present day China, I do not, of course, mean to say that China is now a modern country in the sense that she has changed her institutions in harmony with the standards of our day and that she can compete with a country like our own. No, in comparison with America, China is very backward, and she is still facing age-old problems like poverty, famine, illiteracy, injustice, graft, etc. And yet in using this term modern I do not mean merely that China is existing in our modern world. I think we can rightly speak of a modern China when we compare present China with the past and consider the tremendous changes that have taken place especially in regard to China’s position among the nations of the world. To appreciate this we must briefly touch on the past.

China has long been a country which had things done to her and not a country which did things. For a hundred years or more she has been a weak and helpless country, an immense nation of four hundred million people without any modern weapons of defense. She therefore became the prey of greedy western nations who sought to exploit her people. Through various ways and by different means other powers took advantage of China and demanded all sorts of special concessions, rights and spheres of influence. China, helpless as she was, was unable to resist and had to agree to every demand made upon her. Of course, her people resented this aggression and finally in the year 1900 one desperate
attempt was made to drive out or kill all the foreigners. But although many westerners, especially missionaries, were killed, it resulted only in more demands being made on China. This brought about great dissatisfaction and the people lost confidence in the government so that the Manchu dynasty was overthrown in 1911 and China became a republic. But officials of the old regime succeeded in getting control of the young republic so that the revolutionaries withdrew to the South and another revolution was necessary. Dr. Sun yat-sen then appealed to Russia for help. That aid was given and in 1927 the revolutionary armies were driving north. When they reached Nanking there was a split between the Communists and the more conservative wing under General Chiang kal-shek. The latter sought and received the support of Britain and America and thereupon succeeded in conquering all of China and becoming the recognized government. Since that time young China has been struggling to throw off the foreign economic yoke and to break the treaties which were imposed upon her. It has been a long struggle and was accomplished only gradually. At the outset each step was strongly opposed by foreign interests. They insisted that law and order were threatened and often foreign troops would be brought in for protection. But gradually the Chinese government became stronger and the Chinese people objected more and more strenuously against extraterritoriality and all that went with it.

Let me explain briefly what these special privileges were which foreigners enjoyed under the old treaties. Under the unequal treaties China had no control over other nationals residing within her borders. Her police could not arrest them for crimes committed and her courts were not permitted to try them. China was not permitted to tax foreign property and therefore foreign business concerns who made big profits doing business in China were free of all Chinese taxes. China's tariff was imposed by treaty. That is, other powers decided just what import China was permitted to charge on goods coming into her country, and the import duty was so low that Chinese industry was unable to compete. This was at a time when we insisted on having high tariff walls to protect our industry from cheap foreign labor. The British and Japanese cotton mills in Shanghai were in such an advantageous position that infant Chinese mills were choked to death. Sovereign states do not permit coastal trade under foreign flags. In China treaty power ships could go wherever they pleased, even up the Yangtze river into the heart of China. Many foreign companies had monopolies in the treaty ports, and others pushed into the interior although this was contrary to treaty rights. Just before the "China Incident," Japanese merchants brought Japanese goods in through north China without paying any import at all.

It can readily be understood that all this was resented, especially by the more educated Chinese. And to add insult to injury most of the westerners took a very superior attitude towards the Chinese. The Chinese were regarded as mere Chinks, Orientals who stood far below the white man. When I first came to China in 1924 I remember seeing a sign at an entrance to one of the city parks in Shanghai reading: "Dogs and Chinese not allowed."

Now we must realize what influence all this must have had on Christian Missions. I marvel that it was possible to carry on any missionary work at all. Patriotic groups resented the presence of foreign missionaries in China and insisted that the conduct of foreigners was not at all in harmony with the gospel of love missionaries were preaching, and they mistrusted the whole missionary movement.

China's New International Position

If we bear all the above in mind we will see immediately the importance of the Declaration of Cairo of 1943. This declaration was issued by the representatives of Great Britain, America and China. Here China for the first time took her place as an equal of the western nations. This marked an epochal change in China's international position. Today China is recognized as the leading nation of the Orient. The time of unequal treaties is gone forever. In 1943 America, and also Great Britain, relinquished her extraterritorial rights in China and made a new treaty on the basis of equality with China. Now it is true that America has always been more or less friendly to China, but in regard to these special rights, she has always insisted that her citizens should enjoy all privileges that were given to other nationals. So the renouncing of the old treaties was not done first of all because of sympathy with China, but because it was forced upon us. Japan had renounced her special position in China in order to strengthen the hands of her puppets in Nanking. And then we had to follow suit. We did not want the Chungking government to make peace with Japan and we needed bases on the Asiatic continent. As a result China achieved what she had long been struggling for. But let us not kid ourselves; it was not because we were so magnanimous, but because we couldn't help ourselves. But at any rate, the Chinese obtained what should have been granted them long ago. Since that time the exclusion act in so far as it concerns the Chinese has also been repealed. (For other Orientals it still holds.) So now the Chinese can hold up their heads and be truly proud of their newly found freedom and equality.

Now the question is, what is the attitude of our people towards this new position of China? I think the average American citizen at home feels that it is only fair that China should be given equality with other nations. However, many of those who are directly affected by it, namely consular officials, business men, and even a few missionaries, feel quite different about it. They are the die-hards
who dislike losing the privileges they formerly enjoyed and they find it hard to fit into the new situation. This accounts partly for the clash between Ambassador Hurley and some of the career men of our State department. The latter have always been in a position of authority so that they could dictate to the Chinese and they resent being required now to treat the Chinese as equals. This, of course, does not apply to all, for I have also met many consular officials who took a very fine attitude towards the Chinese. Of the second group, there are many old China hands in the business world who realize they will not be able to make the big profits they did formerly and they resent being under Chinese jurisdiction and being obliged to comply with Chinese laws. The result has been criticism of China and the Chinese way of handling affairs. And then there are a few missionaries of the old school who are so convinced of the superiority of the white man that they treat the Chinese condescendingly and are imperialistic even in their religious work. And the sad part is that they consider it an important part of their work to expose all the faults and the weaknesses of China to the world.

China's Internal Problems

Now, of course, there are many things wrong with China and there is ample room for constructive criticism. There is the ignorance of the masses, the inefficiency and often corruption of the officials. I heard of two generals in West China during the war, who instead of fighting the Japanese were said to have become rich by transporting Japanese made goods to the rear. But how about corruption at home and the dealing in black market goods on the part of many of our own forces? Why do we need a special congressional committee to investigate war contracts? Yes, we know there is corruption at home also, and we are a Christian nation. Let's never forget that. That should make a difference if Christianity means anything at all. Again many manufacturers in China found they could make big money by simply holding on to raw materials and waiting for prices to go up and they ignored the crying needs of the masses. But how about the manufacturers at home? Why is there such a shortage of white shirts and nylon hose? Can it be that manufacturers are waiting, hoping for the OPA to be abolished by Congress so that they can make a kill? Let us not therefore take a self-righteous attitude. China has many faults, and she must come a long way before she is up to our standard but let's remember the tremendous problems the leaders of China are facing. China's ills are of long standing and cannot be cured in a short time, and the war has brought on many additional problems. The problem of reconstruction alone is immense. Whole cities have been wiped out and the whole economy of many districts has been disrupted. This problem of rebuilding war-torn areas is staggering. People have asked me, why is it that China does not recover more quickly? We must think of what China went through and what she is facing now. We did not suffer much from the war. Our cities were not bombed and our land was not occupied by an alien army and yet we are facing great difficulties as a nation. When a few days ago the Railway strike was on, many felt that our country was going to pieces because our communication system was disrupted. But then think of China, the best part of her country was for eight years under enemy rule. Her machinery of government in those districts was destroyed. Her communication system, which always was backward, has almost completely been destroyed. And so we must appreciate what the Chinese are facing.

And then the Chinese leaders are not satisfied to merely rebuild on the old foundation. They are determined to develop their country and to raise the standard of living of the masses. They wish to build power plants, railways, waterways; they want to open up the country's resources and build a modern system of communications. To accomplish all this China will, of course, need help. She welcomes foreign capital if there are no strings attached to it. According to reports American capital is ready to enter into China. A number of U.S. cement companies are building plants in China. American experts are helping China to standardize her production of silk, tea, and porcelain. U.S. oil companies have formed a syndicate to operate in China and an American council of commerce and industry representing some three hundred and fifty companies plans to trade in China. This shows that American business men realize the possibilities of trade in China even though special privileges have been abolished.

Of course, if China is to develop she must have internal peace. The different factions in China will have to come to an understanding. To many of our people at home the present civil war in China seems very confusing, and they have asked the question whether perhaps democracy is not suited for China. Now we must remember that China has always been more or less democratic. I have often marvelled at the free and easy way in which Chinese of all classes laugh and talk together. The son of a Chinese coolie can, not only in theory, but also in practice, become a scholar and an official. Also China has always had local self-government. It is true there are no popular elections, but appointments are through guilds and other groups, but nevertheless it is democracy in action.

Now regarding the present government and its difficulties with the communists, let me state first of all that Generalissimo Chiang is not a dictator, as sometimes has been said. He was elected by his party to the offices he holds. Nor is his party unwilling to give the people of China a true democracy. China has at present a one party government, because the founder of the new republic, Dr. Sun yat-sen, in his last will advised that the nation re-
main under the tutelage of the Nationalist party until it be ready for real self-government. Generalissimo Chiang seems to be eager to turn the responsibility of government over to truly elected representatives of the people. Plans are now in the making for a national election, although this will very likely be conducted along lines a trifle different from what we are accustomed to at home.

The communists are now demanding that the government be immediately broadened to include all classes, which seems to be a fair demand. But they are also insisting that they be permitted to keep their own army and that they be given control of a certain part of the country. Now it seems hard to see how any government can grant this. During the war the communists co-operated with the government in resisting the Japanese, but they also entrenched themselves behind the Japanese lines in all of north China, territory which formerly was under central government control. They organized the local guerrillas and as soon as the Japanese surrendered they insisted on taking over. Only the leaders are communists, the troops have little or no knowledge of communist doctrines but they have been taught to be anti-central government, and the common people in the areas which the communists control know nothing of communism and on the whole are eagerly awaiting the coming of the central government troops.

No doubt both groups are sincere. The Kuomintang is perhaps somewhat reactionary since the big landowners hold a dominant position in the party at present, although recently, through pressure from the Generalissimo and to facilitate dealings with the communists, the more liberal element has come to the foreground. The communists at first dealt very severely with landlords in the territory they occupied and confiscated all their land. But now they are said to be eager to have these landlords co-operate with them and they permit them to keep their land. This no doubt is a temporary measure so as to win the favor of the local people.

The communists are committed to essential landreforms but that is true not only of the communists. At a recent congress of representatives of all parties it was decided that those who work the land should also own it. This means that all the political parties in China are now committed to land reforms, which is very promising for the future. Now, of course, it would be desirable that the present government be liberalized and the communists given a share in the government. Yet some of the demands of the communists are very unreasonable. The Central government cannot be blamed for insisting that its authority be recognized throughout China. China wants and needs unity, but not at the price the communists demand. If it should come to open warfare, the communists will not be able to put up any real resistance, but they will very likely scatter and carry on guerilla warfare. That, of course, would mean unsettled conditions for some long time, and so it is to be hoped that some compromise can be worked out.

However, no matter how things are settled with the communists I am confident that China will develop and will present great possibilities. While in west China this last term, I have come in touch with many of the officials there and I am convinced that by far the majority of these men are sincere and honest. They are in dead earnest and are determined to build a better China. And they are deserving of our help and of our support. These men are almost all sympathetic to the cause of Missions and welcome missionaries back if they are willing to recognize the new conditions in China. And so the problem that the church is facing at present is to see that her missionaries that go to China are alive to the challenge that this new China presents today. Modern China is more open to the gospel than ever before, but missionaries in order to do effective work must be sympathetic to the aspirations of the people of China, and they must be willing to treat the Chinese on the basis of true equality in harmony with China's new position.
The Doctrinal Significance of the New Revision

Richard C. Oudersluys  
Professor of the New Testament  
Western Theological Seminary  
Holland, Mich.

ALREADY in its fourth printing, the new Revision of the New Testament continues to interest a growing reading public. Serious readers are busy subjecting the version to favorite tests and seeking to come to an evaluation of the work as a whole. Generally speaking, the consensus of judgment seems to be favorable to the new work and rightly so. It possesses qualities that fully deserve the high commendation being accorded it from many quarters. Initial impressions, however, must eventually give way to more careful scrutiny and study. In this more serious examination, one of the inevitable questions is bound to be: What is the doctrinal bearing of the new version? How does it affect the commonly accepted body of evangelical doctrine?

In a version designed to supplant all preceding versions of the English Bible and to serve as the official version of American Protestantism, one would naturally anticipate no change in the substance of commonly accepted evangelical doctrine. Obviously such a version would have no right to represent any particular dogmatic interest or movement, although in this case honesty compels the admission that the Revision Committee was not as theologically representative as might be desired. While the latter fact is regrettable (and another instance of lamentable strategy from the viewpoint of over-all Protestantism), it would be obtus­ant to seek to discredit the work on that ground alone. A careful study of the version reveals that the Committee achieved a commendable measure of critical objectivity in their work, and most readers will agree in the main when Dr. F. C. Grant says, “It will be obvious to the careful reader that still in 1946, as in 1881 and in 1901, no doctrine of Christian faith has been affected by the revision, for the simple reason that, out of the thousands of variant readings in the manuscripts, none has turned up thus far that requires a revision of Christian doctrine.”

The Committee’s statement, however, does not entirely settle the matter, and from certain points of view needs to be qualified. It is common knowl­edge that translation is inseparable from interpretation and brings with it certain changes in the contour, if not in the substance, of Christian doctrine. This was patiently true of the two previous English versions. While neither effected drastic changes in any single article of the Christian faith, both most certainly contributed unique changes in doctrinal emphasis and perspective. Both made the doctrinal coloring of some passages more prominent than before, and others less so. Both displayed clear doctrinal bias at certain points. This is the inevitable concomitant of all translation work, and it is hardly conceivable that the new Revision should not have some measure of doctrinal consequence. Examination reveals that the new work exhibits several new shifts in doctrinal stress, and this point is deserving of attention inasmuch as some students evidently believe the version is what no other version has ever been, doctrinally innocuous. It is the aim here only to make a brief introductory survey of some of the more important changes of the Revision Committee, to indicate the presence of the factor of doctrinal consequence and the need for studies which will undertake the investigation and evaluation of the version from the doctrinal viewpoint.

I

On the whole the RSV enunciates somewhat less firmly than the ARV the several aspects of the doctrine of the Sovereignty of God. This was almost to be anticipated and is due largely to the new understanding of Greek constructions formerly interpreted with strong telic force. For example, the weakened sense of kina in the Koine has long been...

---

3 Well over a century ago Thomas Fuller made several discerning remarks about translations in connection with his discussion of the King James Version, and among them one to the effect that “a good translation is an excellent comment on the Bible.” Church History, Oxford, 1845, V, iii, 51.
4 In some of the current criticism of the new Revision, there is to be observed a complete ignoring of this factor of doctrinal bias in the versions of 1611, 1881, and 1901. Charges of an unfair Calvinistic bias were made against the Authorized Version in its renderings of Matt. 20:23; Acts 2:47; Heb. 6:4; 10: 35, and in some cases not without ground. When the American Revision of 1901 appeared it was with a flatly Arminian translation of Heb. 6:4; and with several renderings which weakened the force of the doctrine of the deity of Christ. See Canon Farrar’s “Fidelity and Bias in Versions of the Bible,” The Expositor (2nd Series), London, 1882, 280f.
5 See the editorial book review by Kenneth Wuest in the Moody Monthly, XLVI (June 1946), p. 92f.
6 The customary abbreviations will be used throughout: RSV (The Revised Standard Version, 1946), ARV (The American Standard Version, 1901), AV (The Authorized Version, 1911).
recognized, but utilized here in a large way for the first time in official Bible translation work. Again, the interpretation of the infinitive construction in Romans 1:20 as expressing result is undoubtedly correct, but its theological bearing deserves notice. Lest a wrong impression be given, let it be said that the telic force of many ARV passages is retained without change in the RSV. In fact in two instances (Rom. 4:16 and 8:29), the divine purpose is made even more emphatic in the new version. What is of serious consequence is the strangely inconsistent rendering of the verb proorizo (to predestine). In Ephesians 1:5 and 11, the verbal forms are translated by the word “destine” which elsewhere (1 Pet. 1:2, 20) is used to translate the verb progynosko (to foreknow). This may be a mere inconsistency or an instance of interpretative bias. When summarized, the force of the changes are on the side of a reduced emphasis upon the divine sovereignty.

II

Passing on to Christology, the attention of CALVIN FORUM readers has already been drawn by Prof. Hendriksen to the improved testimony to the deity of Christ in the more accurate handling of the Greek article in 2 Peter 1:1 and Titus 2:13. The doctrinal bias of the ARV was offensive at these points, and the correction will be well received. Welcome too is the wise omission of the offensive margin in the ARV to John 9:38. Unfortunately new offense is given, however, by the adoption in Romans 9:5 of a punctuation which has never commended itself to the majority of expositors. In Colossians 1:19 the new Revision is slightly stronger than the ARV, but weaker than the suggested margin of the ARV where Christ is distinguished as one in whom not merely “all fulness” but the “whole fulness of God dwells.” For the ARV of John 8:58 “Before Abraham was born, I am,” we have in the RSV the weaker translation “Before Abraham was, I am.” One must also regret the adoption of the weaker reading in John 1:18 “only Son” for “only God.” While both readings are intrinsically possible, the latter was taken up into the Greek text by Westcott and Hort on grounds just as defensible today as then. The reading while abrupt and startling is no more than a compression of predicates previously attributed to the Logos (Theos in v. 1, and monogenes in v. 14). The translation of the latter by “only” rather than “only begotten” is another matter entirely and has good lexical support. In the key passage of Philippians 2:5, the new version follows essentially its predecessor and stresses well the great concepts of deity, incarnation and humiliation; although one may question the intrusive interpretation included in verse 5, and the slightly Romanist tinge in verse 10. (Did the early Christians already genuflect at the name of Jesus?) The data here then is confusing. The Christological strengths and weaknesses of the new version rather effectively cancel one another. While the glaring offenses of the ARV have been wisely corrected, new occasions of offense stand in their place, and we must deal with new shifts of emphasis and stress in the doctrine of Christ’s deity. We had theological intrusions in the ARV, and we have them once again. In addition, one must include in the version’s evaluation the delicate matter of the decision to use the informal pronoun “you” in all address to Jesus. Despite its infelicity at certain points, perhaps no questioning would be in order except for the strangely cryptic statement of the Committee that they made this decision to follow modern usage “except in language addressed to God.” Perhaps the Revision Committee has an explanation that will harmonize these facts, but if not, the inference to be drawn here is theologically serious.

III

Perhaps the most obvious doctrinal change in the new version is in the area of Soteriology. The substitution of “expiation” for “propitiation” in all its New Testament occurrences is bound both to please and displease. The translators, of course, look for their warrant to recent biblical and lexical studies emphasizing the Septuagintal background of the term. The limits of this study forbid an adequate discussion of the point, but this can be said: If properly interpreted “Expiation” can convey the essential content of the word “propitiation,” and with the added advantage of furnishing a parallel between the death of Christ and the expiatory cultus of the Old Testament very much after the fashion of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the crucial Romans passage (3:21f), the phrase “to be received by faith” is set at last in its proper syntactical relations. “Faith in the blood” is an expression of dubious piety and validity, and certainly the New Testament knows nothing of it. One of the merits of the ARV over the AV was its more effective presentation of the objective and subjective results of Christ’s atoning work through a better handling of the Greek aorist tense. Although
the new Revision is less rigid in translating the Greek aorist by our English past tense, and justifiably so, it presents the atonement clearly as a definite past act in the rendering of Romans 5:14-19; 6:2, 8; 2 Cor. 5:14; and Col. 3:13. The term “reconciliation” maintains its place in the new work. In connection with the doctrine of Justification one notes the disappearance of “impute” and the use of such substitutes as “reckon, count.” In several instances “consecration” replaces “sanctification,” and the word “sonship” replaces “adoption” in three out of five occurrences (Rom. 8:15; 9:4; Eph. 1:5). These vocabulary changes are no doubt made in the interest of the general reader and should be evaluated accordingly. In fact all the soteriological changes of the new version might be termed doctrinally interesting, deserving of further study before attempting any valid appraisal of them as a whole.

IV

Considerable criticism was voiced against the ARV for its changes in 2 Timothy 3:16, and it is interesting to observe that the new Revision presents a translation approximating more closely that of the AV. The theopneustic agency of the Holy Spirit in connection with Scripture is stressed clearly in the rendering of 2 Peter 1:19-21. Regarding the several omissions and variant readings adopted in the text, we must concur in the main with the decisions of the Committee. Let it be noted, however, that one of these omissions affects Sacramentology (Luke 22:19b-20), and poses a delicate problem both for textual criticism and exegesis. In this connection it should be noted also that Baptism is no longer “into the name” (ARV), but “in the name,” a change fully consonant with the well known Koine propensity for interchanging the prepositions eis and en, but a change that may slightly change the theological stress of the formula for some folk.

If space permitted comment could be extended to such areas as Ecclesiology, Eschatology, Pneumatology, etc. We cite without comment one or two concluding illustrations. Whereas the ARV introduced the Devil into Scripture for the first time in at least six new places, the RSV reduces the number to three (evil one appearing in the margin). A startling bit of Calvinism shows itself in the new rendering of the famous Hebrews 6:4 passage where the ARV was flatly Arminian. Again, there is the happy retention of the word “church” for ekklesia rather than “congregation” following the sound practice of the old Geneva Version. But enough has been said to indicate that the new version has definite doctrinal significance, even a perceptible bias. While the former is not unduly alarming, the latter is regrettable. Since this is the situation, what shall be our attitude in the matter? We who stand in the Reformed tradition have a unique interest in all Bible translation both by reason of theological conviction and historical inheritance. Luther’s translation and the Geneva version, together with their subsequent influence upon the history of the English Bible, as well as the stately Dutch version of 1618-19, are impressive historical expressions of our conviction regarding the centrality of the Word of God. We are interested in all serious attempts to more effectively communicate this Word to men, and thus are genuinely concerned with the new Revision. We believe it to be thoroughly consonant with our tradition of Biblical interest and the doctrinal data of the Revision to offer the following constructive suggestions:

1. That in view of the doctrinal data indicating bias, we urge upon the sponsors the high desirability of providing for some future review of the version and the correction of all such matters as occasion grave dissent and widespread dissatisfaction.

2. That in anticipation of this review or some fresh undertaking, conservative students be encouraged to make exhaustive studies of all the revisional changes in successive doctrinal areas, in order that we may have a definite basis for evaluating the total doctrinal import of the work, and full data for the review.

3. That we keep our criticism constructive and aim not to discredit the version but to openly propagandize for its needed improvement. While its defects have been highlighted in this article, we do not shut our eyes for one moment to its numerous excellencies. We object to certain interpretative intrusions in the work and urge their correction in the hope of conserving the good and improving the whole. We do not insinuate that the bias in the version was premeditated. The integrity of the translators forbids such suspicion, and besides the data indicates otherwise. The data shows that the bias resulted from the translators’ critical positions which operated at certain points where the grammar was ambiguous or where interior evidence of readings was given precedence over external testimony. Unless this is carefully demonstrated our criticism of the work may be dismissed as an attempt merely to replace one bias with another of our own.

2013 Most of the criticism was beside the point as B. B. Warfield indicated years ago in his careful discussion of “Inspiration” in the International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, Chicago, 1915, 1473-1483. Incidentally, his proposed translation is an improvement upon the renderings of all the versions, 1611, 1881, 1901, and 1946.

14 Exception must be taken to the substitution of “Lord” for “God” in Acts 20:28, and to the presence of the undesignated conjunctural emendation in Jude 5. Despite Hort’s favoring of the emendation and the further fact that the best reading is difficult, the clear duty of the Committee was to place in the text the reading supported by the best evidence, and place in the margin their proposed emendation properly explained.

15 Some question on textual grounds may be raised regarding this particular omission, although the Western character of the omission appears to settle the matter for most textual students.
What Will Our Second Mowing Be?

Colleges are crowded with students, many a little older than the average and therefore more eagerly impatient. Employers more frequently look for a familiar lapel button, and then take a more careful estimate of their "available-openings" list.

Parents less frequently cast anxious eyes up toward the service-flags in the church.

Mothers, faces beaming, look up again certain favorite "special" recipes. Or a mother dusts a picture and adjusts it a little more carefully on the mantel, while a tear brims up and a breath catches in a sob. That picture will have to be there permanently!

Ministers with a sense of relief, file away service-men mailing lists and plans for possible military memorial services, and turn more eagerly to new youth programs and happy weddings.

Because this summer virtually the last of our drafted military personnel is returning home and reconverting to civilian ways.

Such thoughts bring a word to mind—a word that has been belabored until it is utterly tired out. We shall use it once more and then grant it a well-deserved retirement. The word is "aftermath." Ad nauseam we have heard of "the aftermath of the war."

"Aftermath," says Webster's Collegiate, "A second mowing; the crop of grass cut from the same soil after the first crop of the season."

The first mowing of the war years has brought us the lush harvest of victory, and world dominion, and a measure of comparative peace. We have gladly picked up our sheaves of victory and carried them triumphantly home. But in some of those sheaves thorns lay hidden, and as we pressed our sheaf to our breasts, the thorns thrust deep, and near our hearts. Our first mowing brought us a harvest at once bitter and sweet.

What will our aftermath, our second mowing bring?

Will we learn to know war and its deep, its unseen causes, that lie camouflaged in the thickets of human nature, covered by the externalities of civilization?

Will we learn to know all the iniquitous, deceptive potentialities that lurk in human nature? Will we learn also the unseen potentialities of good that a rich and far-reaching Grace has wrought in natures where we least expected to find them?

Will we learn to estimate and understand the subtleties of propaganda that come, disguised in the trappings of "information" and propagated even in the name of Him who said, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free and ye shall be free indeed"?

Will we learn that the real need of men and women and their children is not met by the incidentals of physical supply, but is met only when the yawning lack of the soul has been filled and the awful heart-hunger is satisfied by the Bread that lives, and not the bread that sustains life?

Or, will our second mowing bring in the same lackadaisical type of citizenship that allows itself, slack-handedly, to be led slowly, but oh, so surely, down the road of totalitarianism that leads unto national destruction?

Or, will our second mowing bring us only the same old sins, individual sins, domestic sins, ecclesiastical sins, national sins?

Or will that second harvest bring in the same old indifference to the great cause of God's Kingdom, the daily sacrifice and glory of Christian living, the constant struggle of the Gospel ministry in an inhospitable world?

Tell me, Brother, what will your aftermath bring?

Ala Bandon

Tread Not On These

(A Requiem)

Tread not on these;
Do them no violence;
Do as the trees, . . .
Watch them in silence.

Weighty enough
On their lone casement
Is the cold roof
Of earth's dark basement.

Sealed are their tongues, . . .
Their windows broken, . . .
Their last songs sung, . . .
Their last words spoken.

Slowly dear faces
Grow strange and alien;
Stripped of their graces
Leaving the frames within.

What is remaining then,
God shall transfigure.

Tread not on these;
Do them no violence;
Do as the trees, . . .
Watch them in silence.

—Albert Piersma
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Calvinist Voices Around the World

AUSTRALIAN CALVINISTS

21 Brunswick Pde.,
Ashfield, Sydney, N. S. W.,
Australia,
20th May, 1946.

Prof. Clarence Bouma, M.A., Th.D.,
Calvin Seminary,
Grand Rapids, Michigan, U.S.A.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

SINCE the cessation of hostilities a wave of industrial unrest is sweeping through the land. Undoubtedly one of the main reasons for this unrest is that the people lack a sense of physical and external security, which gives rise to worry and inward agitation.

The war-created environment lent itself to a fuller expression of man's sinful nature; in many cases moral consciousness seemed to disappear and the philosophy of the day was 'eat, drink and be merry'. This philosophy was in some measure fostered by the government being forced to take over many of the responsibilities that were previously shouldered by the individual.

The false standards established by a war-time economy are now beginning to disappear and men and women are being forced to consider the future in relation to their responsibilities, with the result that the material and physical aspects of life have caused mental concern and emphasized the sense of insecurity. Such an experience amply demonstrates the limitations that time and sense impose upon man's spiritual and intellectual development and the frustration of his material ambitions.

We do not believe that the average Australian citizen has any desire for industrial turmoil, but the greater barns of the rich fool appear to dominate the mind and little, if any, consideration is given to the great questions put forward by the Master, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul, or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"

Presbyterian Church in Australia

In my last letter I briefly stated that the Presbyterian Church had passed a motion to admit women to the ministry. The Presbyterian Church in Australia holds Assembly meetings annually in each State. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia is held once every three years, to which each State sends ministers and representative elders.

In 1944 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia passed a motion that women should be admitted to the ministry of the Church. This decision was remitted to the State Assemblies. The Victorian State Assembly affirmed the principle in 1945.

Recently a woman, who served in Korea as a member of the Presbyterian Mission, applied to the North Melbourne Presbytery in refusing to deal with the responsibilities that were previously shouldered by the individual.

Mr. Swanton contended that the innovation would mean a radical departure from the established practice of the Church, and that the Assembly was being asked to decide in 15 minutes a change in a 1600-years-old practice!

The Rev. W. A. Alston, who also appeared for the North Melbourne Presbytery said, "The radical change entailed in the admittance of women ministers could not be forced without all the courts of the Church first discussing it."

A motion was then moved, seconded and carried that the appeal be dismissed. Notice of appeal to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia was then given, and the State Assembly appointed the same respondents: The Rev. Robert Swanton, and the Rev. W. A. Alston. The matter will now come before the Australian General Assembly, which meets during September, 1946.

Another matter of the utmost importance is at present being discussed in the Victorian State Assembly, in the form of a new 'Declaratory Statement'. The aim of the new statement appears to be to completely obscure the Westminster Confession of Faith. The framers of the New Statement will undoubtedly have some difficulty in getting round the position created by the judgments of the House of Lords in the Free Church of Scotland vs. Overtown.

Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia

The year 1946 marks the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, of which I have the honour of being a minister. The Church is generally known as the Free Presbyterian Church, but the correct title is the 'Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia', and the supreme church court is the Synod of Eastern Australia, and it is the parent body of Presbyterianism in this country. The Church was founded on 10th October, 1846, three years after the disruption in Scotland, 1843, and was brought into existence for the same purpose, viz., to conserve the whole reformation heritage of doctrine and worship and to maintain the Presbyterian Church of Scotland vs. Overtown, with regards to property.

FROM CAIRO, EGYPT

113 Sharia El-Kasr El-Aini,
The American University at Cairo,
Cairo, Egypt,
June 10, 1946.

Dr. Clarence Bouma,
Editor, CALVIN FORUM,
Corner Benjamin and Franklin,
Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Dear Editor:

CAIRO, though warm and relatively quiet politically, is still a place where one need not look for news. There is always a chance that something will happen—like a bomb explosion or a street demonstration.

By the time that this reaches you, it will no longer be news that the English have agreed to evacuate Egypt. Although the terms of evacuation have not yet been settled, there is no doubt that the British are pulling out. Nationalist extremists are not satisfied with the present cabinet negotiations. They represent...
the group which demand evacuation first, followed by negotiation. Further, they balk at any kind of alliance of friendship with Britain and feel confident of Egypt's ability to defend the Suez alone, should the necessity for this arise. The cabinet, however, consists of political realists who are willing to take what they can get—which at this stage seems to be complete evacuation of British troops from both Egypt and the Suez plus a treaty of friendship with Great Britain which will allow the British to move in for canal defense when war threatens. The negotiators continue to haggle over the details of evacuation and over the exact statement of the treaty. British-owned newspapers here have been stressing the fact that British defense policy no longer requires a strangle hold on the Suez canal and further, that British troops in Transjordania will be sufficient to cope with any danger in this area. It is interesting to note the possible reactions to British evacuation. Many observers predict a tremendous deflation (the index for the cost of living is now 287 compared with the base year of 1939), disastrous unemployment, and a dearth of foreign capital for industrial development which Egypt so badly needs. Pessimists believe that a precipitous decline is as imminent as the next six months or a year. Should this occur, repercussions will follow along the line. In Egypt, where there is a vast Moslem majority, it is entirely likely that the pressure for jobs would make it more difficult for Coptic and Protestant Christians to obtain positions. Then, too, when economic distress starts to pinch, it is not unlikely that the excitable public will seek a scapegoat, which is always available in the form of religious groups with jurisdiction over litigation arising out of matters of personal status such as marriage, divorce, inheritance, and other problems occurring between members of the same religious group. Each group has its own court with its own officials. It is obvious that the patriarch whose pronouncements are authoritative for the Coptic religious community has a tremendous influence in many areas of Egyptian life. Among other difficulties the new patriarch faces the problem of placating the Ethiopian church, whose bishops are appointed and consecrated by Egyptian ecclesiastical authorities and which is now struggling for autonomy in the throes of an incipient nationalism, now that Mussolini's henchmen have been thrown out and the ruthless "lion of Judah" is once more enthroned. The new patriarch is said to be eminently qualified for this task both temperamentally and by political antecedents. He took part in the anointing ceremony of Hallie Salassie at the latter's coronation as king of kings in Ethiopia.

The religious situation in Egypt is characterized by a number of distinct cleavages. The Moslems are in the vast majority and number about 12 millions at present. There are perhaps 40 thousand Protestant Christians in Egypt, all except a few of whom came originally from Coptic Christianity and most of whom have been gained for Protestantism by the efforts of the American Mission of the United Presbyterian Church. The converts follow the pattern of the mother church and are genuinely conservative and evangelical. Converts from Mohammedanism to Protestantism are so few that one can count them on the fingers of both hands. At one time missionary strategy here centered about the hope that if the Coptic church could be revived and Protestantized, the Christian gospel would eventually penetrate the Mohammedan masses by domestic missionary tactics. This expectation has now proved to be unfounded after more than sixty years of missionary activity in Egypt. The Coptic church has not been evangelized and missionary efforts have been compelled to proceed with the founding of an entirely new church organization. Missionary contacts with Moslems have been most easily engineered by and through educational institutions. However, strict government control over foreign educational endeavor has cut the amount and often the quality of definitely evangelical religious training down to the bare minimum. Almost every missionary school can testify to some battle royal which has taken place because of Moslems being exposed to classes in the Christian religion or being required to attend chapel exercises. Any forecaster of possible governmental action in the field of the missionary educational enterprise can safely predict that the situation will become even tighter in the future. Then, too, there are the million and a half Coptic Christians who have survived centuries of persecution and whose Christianity has changed little since the days of Justinian. The Copts appear on the whole to be better educated than the Moslems, and a large percentage of them occupy important positions in the commercial and industrial world. However, constant social and economic pressure—not to say political—is wearing thin the Coptic convictions of many; in fact it is said that annually more than five hundred Copts become Moslems, which transformation, it must be remembered, requires a change in registration with the governmental religious courts. Finally, there is a virtual babel of smaller Christian groups in Egypt: the Armenian Church, the Greek Orthodox, the Church of England, the Syrian Church, and the Roman Catholic Church, not to mention others.

The American University

On May 30 the American University at Cairo held its annual commencement exercises in Ewart Memorial Hall. This year's program was double-barreled since both graduation and the inauguration of the institution's new president, Dr. John S. Badeau, occurred on the same occasion. At the inauguration ceremonies greetings were read by representatives of several leading American universities including Chicago, Harvard, Princeton, the University of Pennsylvania, and Columbia. The American minister to Egypt, the Honorable H. Pinkney Tuck, read a special letter of greetings and best wishes from President Truman. Dr. Badeau then made his inaugural address on the topic, "Education and World Peace", in which he stressed the need for education in individual responsibility, in intellectual honesty, and in international brotherhood. Concerning the development of a capacity for individual responsibility he said, "We must produce a generation, each member of which feels personally and intelligently accountable for the affairs of the community, the nation, the world." Concerning intellectual honesty Dr. Badeau stated among other things, "Only when the mental atmosphere of the world is that of intellectual honesty will propaganda thinking wither and die." He defined the task of internationalism in education as that of bringing "the horizon of the world into the classroom until students think and feel about other nations as they do about their own." Dr. Badeau is a minister of the Reformed Church in America. A graduate of Union College, Schenectady, and of New Brunswick Theological Seminary, he also undertook graduate work at Union Seminary, New York. In 1942 Union College granted him the degree of doctor of divinity. Previous to his election to the presidency he was dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

Sects and the Gospel

There never seems to be a surcease of new religious movements in the Middle East. This time a Dr. Selim Dahash, a 34-year-old Assyrian mystic turned prophet, who is now meditating somewhere in the hot dusty desert of Northern Iraq, expects to descend upon the religious diversity of the Near East with a brand new gospel of the brotherhood of all mankind. With this he seeks to unite Moslems, Jews, and Chris-
tians into a single cult. One of his disciples puts it thus: "All we seek is to make Christians better Christians, Moslems better Moslems, and Jews better Jews, and to bring their life into line with the laws of Moses. In this way the world will be a better place in which to live." The prophet appears to be just another fa#ir under a slightly different cloak. He claims the usual occult powers and has undergone typical fa#ir experiences of being buried in a steel vault for days in a river—in his case in the river Seine in France for six days.

The Near East is arid in more ways than one. What is needed in these parts is the gospel of Jesus Christ—pure and simple—which is a big order for both Christian educational and missionary institutions out here. It is only too easy to make of oneself merely an emissary of good will instead of an ambassador of Jesus Christ.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE LLUBERS.

THE RACE PROBLEM IN SOUTH AFRICA

University College,
Potchefstroom, South Africa,
June 14, 1946.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

In the letter I wish to confine myself to a discussion of one of the most serious political problems in South Africa.

South Africa is a large country but very thinly populated. In this vast area there are only some 10 to 12 million people of all nationalities and of particularly all colours under the sun. The white people are scarcely one-quarter of the total population. The main sections amongst the whites are the descendants of the Dutch and of the English from overseas. In South Africa the whites came, particularly from the first landing, in contact with non-whites, firstly with light coloured races, like the Hottentots, and later the mysterious Bushmen, and lastly with the pure black, the so-called Bantus. The Bantus were originally not indigenous, but came from northern and central Africa. The Bantus again form not one single nation but a veritable host of small and large races, speaking different languages and looking physically quite different.

Problem of the Black Race

Political development (or rather history) has been largely a continuous strife, peaceful and otherwise, between the European and the Bantu. On the whole the old Dutch people treated the black man, when once he was overcome, in a Christian spirit. In many a country the black man has practically been exterminated by the colonizing white. In South Africa, however, the black man has thrived under the control of the white, who has put an end to the unceasing strife among these blacks themselves. South African history teaches us that some of the black races, particularly the Zulu, had only one aim and that was the extermination of all other blacks. Some of the smaller races were practically on the verge of extinction when the white man put a stop to the inroads of warlike races, and since then they have grown in numbers. There are today millions of black and the Bantu.

We, that is, the true Afrikaners, consider the presence of about a quarter million Indians in South Africa a serious menace to the survival of white, western European civilization in South Africa. We consider the Indians as foreign, unassimilable, non-European. And yet these people demand in South Africa, not their country, the right to legislate and administer. They want total equality with the whites, because they call themselves "burghers of South Africa." We say that they are not burghers of South Africa; they have their own home in India, and if they wish political power and rights they are free to go back there. The Rev. J. V. Coetzee of the Reformed Church, Potchefstroom, has stated our policy very succinctly in one of our periodicals, viz., "Insan," the official organ of "Die Reddingsdaadbond en die Federasie van die Afrikaanse Kultuurverenigings" (The Association for Rehabilitation and the Federation of Cultural Societies). In the May issue of this periodical the Rev. Coetzee laid down the following points: 1. White South Africa has a definite calling to be the rulers, because white supremacy is the essential condition for sound political administration. 2. The Indians in South Africa are strangers and must as such be fairly and justly treated. 3. We, the true Afrikaners in South Africa, re-assert our right to exclude those Indians who wish to stay in South Africa and assign to them a separate area. 4. There can be no equalization and no political vote or rights for them in South Africa. This is our country and we cannot allow foreigners to have a voice in our state economy and administration. 5. Indians may not acquire any of our land, because South Africa belongs to us.

In this connection I may draw your attention to a very important and authoritative statement of the Afrikaner standpoint
in this matter by Prof. Dr. G. Cronjé of the University of Pretoria, who holds there the chair of Sociology. He has just published a study on “Afrika onder die Asiats” (Africa without the Asiatic). His main contention is that the Asiatic should go to Asia and leave Africa to the African, white and black.

This whole question has once again raised the problem of European supremacy and existence in South Africa. The whites are too far outnumbered. The only solution lies to our mind in the right sort of immigration. We need thousands of assimilable Europeans—Hollanders, Germans, Frenchmen and, of course, Englishmen. We need people from Western Europe and should avoid any immigration from the East. But this is a topic worthy of a separate letter.

Just one last remark. We are gradually, exceedingly gradually, returning to normal, but the food position is very critical. Luckily we have no great political storms, and communist influence is still rather weak, although Communists are massing their forces over here to penetrate into black South Africa.

With kind regards,
J. CHR. COETZEE.

FROM NORTH IRELAND

Dr. C. Bouma,
Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Dear Professor Bouma:

I COME MESSAGE this letter with little to report. *The Churchman’s Magazine*, edited by Mr. J. A. Kenisit of the Protestant Truth Society, is now established for a century; and this month saw the issue of a centenary number. The P.T.S. exists to maintain a witness against the Romish practices which are creeping slowly but surely into the Church of England. With a trainig college for its “Wickilife preachers”, motor caravans to convey them from village to village, and a printing press of its own, the P.T.S. has done a splendid work in the past, and we wish them success in the future. The Church of England is departing from her Calvinistic Articles by turning her face Romewards.

Our Link with Holland

We of the Irish Evangelical Church have been in touch with the Council of the Dutch Reformed Church. A church at Oosterbeek received our V-E Day offerings in 1945. Oosterbeek is a town near Arnhem where airborne troops put up a gallant fight for the liberation of that occupied zone. In the March 1946 issue of the *Irish Evangelical* appeared an article specially written by the secretary, J. Caspers, of this church. He vividly told of the alarming events which took place in the Netherlands from Sept. 17th to June, 1946. Our hearts go out to our brethren on the Continent; we often pray for them in public and in private; and trust that God will speedily restore to them the many treasures so ruthlessly destroyed by the invader.

The Attitude of the B. B. C.

As Calvinists we are far from satisfied with the attitude of the British Broadcasting Corporation towards religion and culture in general. For instance, time and again we have listened to programmes foisting the theory of Evolution upon the young as an established fact. Attempts to have the other side broadcast have failed, the B.B.C. following the advice of leading evolutionists in this respect.

We are dissatisfied with the whole moral standard of many programmes, which often paint sin in gay colours, and surround it with glamour and wit. If our young people are to listen to such broadcasting, the result will be far from desirable.

But perhaps the most serious symptom to be seen in this body is its laxity and leaning towards Rome. This has been evidenced in many ways. “Historicus” commenting in *The Churchman’s Magazine*, states that “in Protestant Britain, we are beginning to witness much Roman Catholic propaganda. . . . That Jesuit priests are allowed to broadcast and take equal place with Protestant ministers is a scandal. When the Jesuit broadcasts, he sees to it that he uses similar language to that of the Christian minister so that the uninitiated are misled into believing that we are all in the one church.” The attitude of the B.B.C. was made clearer recently when among the names of five new Governors appointed, appeared the name of Miss Barbara Ward, who is a devout Roman Catholic. In a democracy, with a Protestant tradition, we feel that the B.B.C. is hardly playing the game; but rather providing the Papacy with a means of injecting us with their propaganda. It has been pointed out in different circles that it is not right for one body to dominate the air. We need, what you have in America, competition; nothing less will bring the B.B.C. to its senses. However, we will probably have to endure the present system for some time yet, as broadcasting stations are not produced overnight, and existing systems are not easily altered.

With Christian greetings,

Yours in His service,

FRED S. LEAHY.

THE ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

Wyckoff, N. J.,
June 18, 1946.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

THE year 1946 is an anniversary year for the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. On June 11, 1936 the Presbyterian Constitutional Covenant Union was dissolved and the first General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of America was constituted. The new denomination was born as a result of the decision of the 148th General Assembly of the Presbyterians in the U.S.A., meeting in Syracuse May 28, 1936, to uphold the deliveries of the Permanent Judicial Commission against Dr. Machen and his colleagues in their fight for doctrinal purity in the work of the boards and agencies of the church.

The ecclesiastical infant was not born into a life of ease and luxury. It has lived a hard, trying life. Before one year had passed it lost its spiritual leader, Dr. Machen, who died January 1, 1937. Furthermore, it soon become apparent that the unity which characterized the movement in its more negative task, its battle with modernism, did not carry over into the prosecution of its inevitable and essential positive program as a church of Jesus Christ. Demands for modification of the professional standards of the church indicating the congruity between the secondary standards and the premillennial position were debated sharply and then rejected at the third general assembly. The inevitable split ensued and those who were dissatisfied with the decision of the church on these two issues withdrew to form the Bible Presbyterian Synod. A phase of this same movement was the establishment of Faith Theological Seminary at Wilmington, Delaware.

Shortly after these events a court decision was handed down favoring the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. in its suit against the new church contesting its right to the name it had chosen. The church decided not to press its defense further, and the Presbyterian Church of America became the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

The history of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church is the history of a slow growth toward doctrinal self-consciousness and consistency in a day when so much of life, ecclesiastical and otherwise, has fallen under the spell of the utilitarian, truthless philosophy of the times. Likewise we would view the church as to its polity, seeing here also a slow growth toward mature...
ity as an ecclesiastical body with proper standards and methods of ecclesiastical action.

The 13th General Assembly

To the mind of your correspondent this is the point of view from which the history of the O. P. C. must be both sympathetically and critically approached. This also holds true for the very recent history of the movement as that may be examined in concrete form in the recent Thirteenth General Assembly meeting at Westminster Theological Seminary May 21-27. Of special note is the issue that consumed most of the assembly's time, namely, consideration of the majority and minority reports of the committee elected by the last assembly to study the doctrinal portion of the Complaint brought against the Presbytery of Philadelphia in its action in licening and ordaining Dr. Gordon H. Clark.

The majority report, contending that in the main Dr. Clark's position had not been correctly understood by the Complainants, found no reason for complaint against the Presbytery, although this report did express dissatisfaction with Dr. Clark's statements on the question of the free and sincere offer of the gospel to the non-elect. The minority report, submitted by Professor Murray of Westminster Seminary, expressed dissatisfaction with or disagreement with Dr. Clark's views at several crucial points and hence found cause for complaint. Debate on the issue was prolonged and vigorous. Yet, it never became acrimonious or personal. In fact, the assembly behaved with commendable restraint during the long, tense hours of debate.

In the vote on this issue, a vote in which the presbytery complained against could not participate, the Complainants were defeated. But this does not mark the end of the matter. A protest against this action of the assembly was drawn up and signed by no less than forty-three commissioners, about one-half of the total number of delegates to the assembly. Among the signatures to this document are the names of all the faculty members of Westminster Seminary. The protest with its surprising number of signatures made its impression on the assembly and had no little to do with the passage of a motion which erected a committee of five to re-study the doctrinal issues involved in this case. These issues center in four points of doctrine: the incomprehensibility of God, the place of the intellect in a Christian psychology, the relationship between divine sovereignty and human responsibility, the free offer of the gospel to the non-elect. In his views on these points the Complainants have urged that there is a rationalizing strain in Dr. Clark's thinking, a strain suggested, for example, in his admission that he gains his definition of truth from "common sense" and not from any explicit or accepted, inerrant, revelation. The debate will be continued at Cedar Grove, Wisconsin, next May.

Discussion so prolonged and intense could be expected to produce moments of drama. At one point Prof. R. B. Kuiper declared that a vote favoring Dr. Clark would not end the "Clark case", as some had indicated in their remarks, but would rather for him be only the beginning, as he would fight for these "precise" doctrines to his dying breath. On another occasion a commissioner made an impressive speech in which he said he was in the position of reaching for the souls of thecommissioners, and warned that the assembly must beware lest, by its action in the "Clark case", it be starting down the long treacherous road of doctrinal indifference. Still a third commissioner, his voice choking with emotion, charged the assembly with the sin of party spirit, asserting that there were those in the church whose primary concern was not so much purity of truth as the intent to get their man in.

The charge of "party spirit" is not without foundation in fact. Documentary evidence exists to show that a small but determined group had decided on a "program for action" in the church, and the first four "Specific Objectives" to be sought after was the ordination of Dr. Clark. Men with minds so definitely set on a course of action before Dr. Clark had been examined could by no stretch of an elastic imagination be expected to vote objectively on the theological examination. Thankfully it can be stated that the number of those committed to such an improper and ill-advised approach to the ordination of a man to the sacred ministry of the Word is not large. And by no means is it true that all those whose vote was favorable to Dr. Clark were prompted by sympathy for this attitude.

It should be added that, although the supporters of the Complaint did lose their major battle, the assembly did find ground for complaint against the Presbytery of Philadelphia in that the Presbytery failed to observe the Form of Government in the particular point that a period of time is called for between licensure and ordination together with a second examination for ordination. The motion pointing out the failure of the Presbytery to abide by these provisions of the Form of Government closes with these significant words: "in circumstances which made the propriety of these provisions apparent".

The O. P. C. is getting a post-graduate course in theology through its discussion of this celebrated case. Unfortunately this course does not lead to the Th.D. degree.

Other Matters

The assembly voted to erect a committee to study the National Association of Evangelicals and to consult with the Christian Reformed Church regarding its relationship to this organization. This Committee will also continue study of the American Council of Christian Churches. Along this same line the assembly continued the committee to study union with the Reformed Presbyterian Church, General Synod. The latter church has also erected such a committee.

A letter to the President of the U. S. A. protesting the presence of Myron C. Taylor at the Vatican with rank of Ambassador was approved. A committee of five was elected to explore the question of the proper application of the principles expressed in the report on Secret Societies approved by the Ninth General Assembly. The report made clear that membership in the church of Jesus Christ is not compatible with membership in a secret, oath-bound organization like the Masonic Order.

Of no small moment was the historical address in the form of a sermon delivered by the Rev. Calvin Knox Cummings of Pittsburgh. This excellent sermon on A Kingdom of Truth (John 18:37) heralded the Tenth Anniversary of the O. P. C. Part of the sermon appears in the Anniversary Edition of The Presbyterian Guardian, June 10, 1946. This issue is well worth reading.

Dr. N. B. Stonehouse was elected Moderator of the 13th Assembly. The Rev. Eugene Bradford was re-elected as president of the assembly. The Rev. Arthur W. Kuscho served as Assistant Clerk. At the religious service held prior to the official constituting of the assembly the Rev. Robert S. Marsden preached a very appropriate sermon on Christian Humility (Phil. 2:5-8).

Anniversary Celebration

Some 240 members of the O. P. C. returned to the place of the church's birth, the New Century Club in downtown Philadelphia, on June 12, 1946, ten years and one day after the denomination was born. Presiding over the meeting was the Rev. Robert Strong, pastor of the large church at Willow Grove, near Philadelphia. The address on this historic occasion was delivered by Professor R. B. Kuiper. His subject was What's Right With Our Church. His usual succinct style of outline was followed as he developed two points: 1. the O. P. C. is narrow in a healthy sense of the word; 2. the O. P. C. is broad in a healthy sense of the word. The speaker dwelt on the note that concern for doctrinal matters is historically and actually of the very essence of this church.

Westminster Seminary Notes

Especially noteworthy is the news coming from Westminster that the seminary is working on a curriculum leading to the Th.D. degree and that the school hopes to obtain the right to grant this degree in the near future.

At the spring meeting of the Board of Trustees the Rev. Edwin H. Rian failed to win re-election as president of the
Board. The Rev. John P. Clelland of Wilmington, Delaware, is the new president. Mr. Rian's sharp difference with the faculty on the matter of the ordination of Dr. Clark had no little to do with this change.

In the second term of the past academic year the undersigned enjoyed the privilege of teaching a course on The Christian Faith and Healthy Personality at Westminster Seminary. The course sought to examine the nature of personality failures as exhibited in the psychoses and neuroses, and to demonstrate the personality-building character of the Christian Faith. The teaching of this material to a class of some thirty to forty members (regulars and auditors) was a most stimulating experience. Students from three different theological seminaries were enrolled.

I hope to report the latest news about the Christian University and the Calvinistic Philosophy Club in a subsequent letter.

Cordially,

EDW. HEEREMA.

WESTMINSTER SEMINARY AND THE O. P. C.
137 West Commerce Street, Bridgeton, New Jersey, July 29, 1946.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

HEARTY thanks for your invitation to tell the readers of The Calvin Forum something about the new Calvinistic magazine, The Witness, and to report the activities of interest to Calvinists in the Philadelphia-New Jersey area.

The Witness, according to its own designation, is "A Christian Magazine For The Family." It is published monthly by COVENANT HOUSE, Willow Grove, Pa., an association of some thirty odd ministers and laymen which publishes the monthly variety tract, The Home Evangel. Sensing the need for a popular magazine which could be used by churches to present the truth according to the Reformed Faith to the families of their constituencies, the directors of COVENANT HOUSE chose Everett De Velde, Richard W. Gray, and Robert Strong to revive the parish magazine of this title which was edited by Mr. De Velde from 1934 to 1936.

The official editorial policy of The Witness is: 1. To present Biblical Christianity in harmony with the exposition given in the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms; 2. To set forth the Truth clearly and simply with a view to appealing to the average church family; 3. To give full consideration to the need of helping to preserve the unity and foster the growth of the local church, not retracting from dealing with error, but seeking to exercise the most careful judgment in the selection and treatment of subjects that could involve controversy.

Though only four issues have appeared, its circulation is nearing the 2,000 mark and it has been praised for its attractive format, its colored cover, and its tasteful admixture of the simple and the profound, the doctrinal and the devotional, the educational and the inspirational. While as a parish magazine it serves a number of congregations outside of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church, the bulk of its readers are from that communion.

This raises the question of the relation of The Witness to The Presbyterian Guardian, which, while not an organ of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, also aims to serve its members. Ideally, there is no conflict in purpose between these two. They co-existed from 1894-36; The Guardian appealing to the more intellectual Christian as a sort of conservative Christian Century; The Witness appealing to the average Christian. Practically, The Witness was revived not only because of the need for a Calvinistic paper to instruct the average church family, but also because of dissatisfaction with The Guardian. At most of the General Assemblies during the past seven years, The Guardian has been criticized rather severely for its manner of raising and handling issues. Pastors have said that this lack of tact and charity have alienated people they were trying to reach and has offended Christians from a general Fundamentalist background whom they were endeavoring to win to the Reformed Faith. And in a church which is trying to weld Calvinists from the American, Dutch, and Scotch traditions into a Reformed Church, The Guardian has increasingly been charged with becoming a spokesman for one viewpoint when differences have arisen.

In recent months, Philadelphia has been the scene of the Seventeenth Annual Commencement Exercises of Westminster Theological Seminary, the celebration of the Tenth Anniversary of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church, the Thirteenth General Assembly of that church, and the Second Annual Meeting of the Christian University Association of America.

WESTMINSTER SEMINARY Commencement

Westminster Seminary on May 8th graduated five men and awarded the Master of Theology degree to three more. J. Marcellus Kik of Montreal, editor of Biblical Christianity and radio pastor, delivered a stirring address on "The Confession of the Church." It was announced that Mr. David Kerr was appointed instructor in the Old Testament department and that Dr. Edwin H. Rian had been replaced as president of the Board of Trustees.

Tenth Anniversary of O. P. C.

On June 12th, a decade and a day after the birth of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church in the New Century Club in Philadelphia, members of that communion gathered in the same hall to celebrate its Tenth Anniversary. Professor R. B. Küpper's historical address, "What's Right With Our Church," said the O.P.C. was right in that it is narrow in the good sense and broad in the good sense. It is narrow in the good sense because even though "sore-pressed" at times, it has refused to compromise its stand on the Reformed Faith. It is broad in the good sense because it allows liberty where the Bible and the Confession of Faith do not speak. Proof of the latter, he said, is the freedom those holding various views of the Second Coming have, and the inclusion in the denomination of Calvinists from the American, Dutch, and Scotch traditions.

General Assembly of O. P. C.

The Thirteenth General Assembly demonstrated that it is no easy task to be narrow in the good sense and broad in the good sense without being narrow in the bad sense and broad in the bad sense. For the past several years, the church has been engaged in a controversy over the views of the man who nominated Dr. J. Gresham Machen as moderator of the First General Assembly, Dr. Gordon H. Clark. After the Presbytery of Philadelphia ordained him, a Complaint was lodged against that body for its action, alleging that it had ordained a man whose views were contrary to the Confession of Faith at four points: the incomprehensibility of God, the position of the intellect in man's religious experiences, the relation of human responsibility to divine sovereignty, and the free offer of the gospel. The Complainants charged that in ordaining Dr. Clark, the church was being broad in the bad sense. The defenders of Dr. Clark maintained that the objectors to Dr. Clark were being narrow in the bad sense, demanding subscription to views not included in the Confession. The Twelfth General Assembly had elected a committee of five (Edmond P. Clowney, John Murray, Lawrence B. Gilmore, Burton L. Goddard, and Richard W. Gray) to evaluate the Complaint. The Report of the committee in effect upheld Dr. Clark's views as being in accord with the Confession. Professor Murray's minority report dissented on two of the four points. It did not agree with the Complaint's charge of error in Clark's views, but held that the Presbytery did not give an adequate examination. What many on both sides considered the major point at issue in the debate was the epistemological question of the relation of God's knowledge to man's knowledge. Dr. Clark maintained
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that while God knows the truth in a different way from man and He sees all of the implications of a single proposition, nevertheless when God reveals individual propositions to man, man possesses those propositions as elements of the truth, and therefore in that man knows the same truth that God knows. The Complainants charged that this view denied the Creator-creature relationship because they said the knowledge God possesses and the knowledge man possesses does not coincide at any single point. To the defenders of Dr. Clark this oft-repeated statement bears the mark of skepticism and is reminiscent of Barth's famous dictum that the revelation of the Eternal touches the Temporal as a tangent touches a circle, by not touching it.

While much of the discussion has been too abstruse for the average person, one statement of Dr. Clark's has been widely quoted as a simple and clear evidence of his "error." I refer to the words, "regeneration is not necessarily a change in understanding propositions" (such as "Christ died for sinners"). On the floor of the assembly Dr. Clark silenced the criticism of this statement by quoting from Berkhof's formulation of historical faith and James Buchanan's work on the Holy Spirit.

After almost 30 hours of debate, on top of the debate of the last assembly, the interim discussions, and the more than 22 days of study which the Committee engaged in, the General Assembly followed the conclusions of the Report of the Committee and vindicated the Presbytery of Philadelphia by a 2-1 vote in ordaining Dr. Clark. In the light of such extended discussion it was surprising that The Presbyterian Guardian should editorially charge the commissioners with doctrinal indifference.

In view of the divergence of views in the church on the doctrinal points at issue in the Complaint, the assembly appointed a committee (Edmund P. Clooney, John Murray, Richard W. Gray, Ned B. Stonehouse, and William Young) to study the doctrines involved in relation to all the literature the Complaint has produced. This move was satisfactory to all since some think that the doctrine of the Complaint is at points contrary to the Confession, while others still believe Dr. Clark to be in error. It does not affect the status of Dr. Clark.

Christian University Association

The Second Annual Meeting of the Christian University Association met in June. The following trustees were elected to the Board of Trustees: Peter Y. De Jong, Richard W. Gray, John Hekman, Howard Higgins, R. P. Jobson, J. Marcellus Kik, Thomas J. McIlwaine, N. J. Monsma, Leonard Verduin, Thomas E. Welmers, and Richard S. Wierenga. The failure of Professors R. B. Kuiper and Cornelius Van Til to be re-elected was interpreted by some as a feeling that there were too many members of the faculty of Westminster Seminary on the board and a fear that the university might develop as an enlargement of Westminster. The Association expressed its dissatisfaction with some of the actions of the Board of Trustees by making the following recommendations to the Board: 1. That the Board retain the services of Dr. Edwin H. Rian as general secretary; 2. That the Board undertake an aggressive campaign to raise funds necessary to open the university; 3. That the Board in filling vacancies give thoughtful consideration to the following: Dr. Ruth Eckert, Dr. L. Nelson Bell, and Miss Wm. B. Eerdman; 4. That the Board submit next year a larger and more denominationally representative list of nominees for Board membership.

The recommendation to retain the services of Dr. Rian was made against the background of a reported move among some of the trustees to discontinue him as general secretary. It is the feeling of many in the Association that Dr. Rian can scarcely be dispensed with since the Christian University Association is very largely the result of his initiative and since his zealous campaigning up and down the country has gained the interest of many Christians in the establishment of a Christian University. Recognizing his splendid work in this, Bob Jones College this Spring granted Dr. Rian an honorary degree for "making an outstanding contribution to the cause of Calvinism in this country."

There are other things of interest to Calvinists about which I could write, but I have already tried the patience of the readers. Yours in Christ,

RICHARD W. GRAY.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH U. S. A.

SOME weeks ago I received your reminder that of late I have not been very active as a correspondent. I plead guilty. However, my inactivity has been due not to indifference but rather to the feeling that little was taking place within the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. having marked interest for your readers. Perhaps that is no longer the case.

Restoration Fund

The main center of interest in our church, if we are to judge from the stress being placed upon it, is "The Restoration Fund". Our 1945 General Assembly approved the attempt to secure from its members, within a period of three years, the unprecedented sum of $27,000,000 for relief and rehabilitation at home and abroad in view of the needs created by the World War. If and when this sum is raised approximately one-half will be spent for relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction in Europe and Asia and the other half for ministries of various sorts in the American area. The work of collecting this sum—the largest we believe that is being proposed by any of the churches for a like purpose—has largely been of a preliminary nature to date, the main effort to collect is being scheduled for this and the following year. However, marked progress has already been made and the prospects for the full success of the effort seem highly encouraging. It was reported at the 1946 General Assembly which met in Atlantic City, N. J., on May 23rd, that $4,442,197 had already been raised, largely from individuals, and that the appeal will be carried to the entire membership of the church before the end of the current year. Needless to say it is hoped to provide this "Restoration Fund" in addition to, not at the expense of, the regular work of the church at home and abroad.

Church Union

Proposals for church union always receive large attention in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. It cannot be said, however, that any of these proposals seem likely to be adopted—at least in the near future. Negotiations with the United Presbyterian Church ended in failure a couple of years ago, and that church, with complete disregard of our church, is now carrying on negotiations looking toward union with the Reformed Church in America and the Associate Reformed Church. It now looks as though the nine-year negotiations with the Protestant Episcopal Church will also end in failure—certainly they show no immediate likelihood of a successful termination. As a matter of fact it does not seem that there are many in either church who have any strong desire to have the union consummated. Probably the negotiations would already have been dropped if both parties to them were not desirous of avoiding responsibility for terminating them. In this connection the Presbyterians obviously have the advantage by reason of the fact that they were initiated by the Episcopalians. That the Department of Church Cooperation and Union of the Presbyterian Church is becoming impatient over the existing situation is indicated by the fact that its report as approved by the Atlantic City Assembly contained the following: "The Department is expressing to the Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church the expectation that at the next General Convention in 1946, it may commit that Church to some specific proposal, as an evidence of the genuineness of their purpose to achieve organic union. The initial proposal came from the General Convention of that Church in 1937, and it would seem that then, after nine years of discussion, some definite plan of union ought to be submitted for the considera-
tion of both communions.” What the Episcopalians will do remains to be seen. In the meantime it seems clear that but few Presbyterians have any great zeal for the union of these churches, while beyond question many Episcopalians are determinedly opposed to it.

The situation is somewhat different as regards the Presbyterian Church in the U. S., popularly called the Southern Presbyterian Church. There is little or no doubt but that the Northern Presbyterian Church would approve such a union overwhelmingly; probably not a single presbytery would vote against it. There is, however, a sharp division of opinion in regard to it in the Southern Church. As noted in the report to our Assembly a group of ministers and laymen have been organized in the Southern Church to oppose such union. They have *The Southern Presbyterian Journal* as their organ of expression. The main objection urged against the proposed union is the alleged unorthodoxy of the Northern Church as evidenced by its attitude toward the Auburn Affirmation and particularly by its election in 1948 of Dr. Henry Sloan Coffin as moderator of its General Assembly and the extent to which other Auburn Affirmationists together with their sympathizers occupy positions of trust and influence in its councils. This group and its supporters seem more or less certain that the majority of the Southern Church are opposed to union under existing conditions and altogether certain that the proposal cannot obtain the three-fourths vote of the presbyteries necessary for its adoption. We confess to a large degree of sympathy with this group. Much as we think that a merger of the Southern with the Northern Presbyterian Church would strengthen the more orthodox element in the latter, we do not believe that it would be sufficient to change in any marked way the general situation as regards orthodoxy and unorthodoxy by reason of the fact that the Southern Church is only about one-fourth of the size of the Northern Church.

**Women Ministers**

The 1946 Assembly voted to send down to the presbyteries an overture which, if adopted, would open the way for women ministers in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. This is not as radical a proposal as would appear if it be overlooked that women are already eligible, and in some instances functioning, as ruling elders in this church. If the one office is open to them there would seem to be no very compelling reason why the other should not be also. However, if we mistake not, it is “to go beyond the things which are written” for them to function in either capacity. The outcome of the vote on this overture will be awaited with interest not only for its own sake but because of its possible bearing on union with other Reformed Churches, more immediately with the Southern Presbyterian Church where the existence of women ruling elders in the Northern Church is being used as an argument against the union now under consideration.

**The Presbyterian**

One of the most significant of recent developments in the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. is the reorganization of *The Presbyterian* under conditions that puts its control into the hands of a group the majority of whom are not in harmony with the historic policy of that paper. It is true that with one exception all the members of the old Board of Control of *The Presbyterian* are also members of the new Board of Control, but the size of the Board has been enlarged to such an extent that they now constitute a minority. While historically the paper during the one hundred and fifteen years of its existence has been under the exclusive control of those belonging to the conservative wing of the Church, the new Board of Control is representative of the Church as a whole. This means that it consists of both liberals and conservatives, even the Auburn Affirmationists are not without representation. Dr. Stewart M. Robinson who has been its editor-in-chief for a decade and more has been supplanted by Dr. Jarvis S. Morris. What the latter's qualifications for the position are remains to be seen. As far as we know he has had no previous editorial experience. A graduate of Princeton Theological Seminary who has also studied at Union Theological Seminary in New York City and the University of Berlin, he has been until recently the President of the Polytechnic Institute of Porto Rico. This reorganization of *The Presbyterian*—how marked a transformation it will involve only time will tell—means that the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. is without a regular periodical that is professedly devoted to an exposition and defense of the views of a conservative wing of the Church. It offers further evidence of the degree to which said Church has become an inclusive rather than a distinctively Reformed Church.

**Doctrinal Indifferentism**

I could wish that I could report that the deliberations of the 1946 General Assembly manifested concern over the modernism and doctrinal indifferentism that is so obvious in the councils and activities of the Church. The tone and temper of the Assembly, generally speaking, was excellent. Dr. Frederick W. Evan of Troy, N. Y., who was elected Moderator, is possibly the most conservative man, theologically speaking, that has been elected to this office in recent years. No doctrinal issues, however, were raised by his sponsors so that he owes his election to other considerations. His election in no way affected the adoption by the Assembly of reports of Committees and Commissions that reflected no concern over the purity and integrity of the Church's witness to the "faith once for all delivered." This is not to imply that his election is not an occasion for satisfaction on the part of conservatives.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL G. CRAIG.

**PRINCETON SEMINARY**

Princeton, N. J.,
July 27, 1946.

My dear Dr. Bouma:

RETURNING war veterans and ex-chaplains have swol­len Princeton's enrollment during this past year to 350, the largest in its history. According to Dean Roberts, the enrollment for the fall term will exceed even that of last year. As has been done for the past few years, the sum­mer session has been continued for another year, though with sharply decreased numbers. Plans have been made to discon­tinue this emergency measure after this summer, giving the fac­ulty opportunity to pursue their studies which may have suf­fered because of crowded rosters.

**Annual Lectureships**

Two of the high points in the academic year at Princeton are the annual lectureships. The Students' Lectures on Foreign Missions were held on January 14, 15, and 17. The lecturer was Dr. Charles R. Watson, President Emeritus of the American University at Cairo. Dr. Watson analyzed the problems of Jew and Arab in the Holy Land. He was particularly interested in finding a new and better missionary approach to the Mo­lemen. An alumnus of Princeton Seminary, Dr. John W. Bowman, Robert Dollar Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the San Francisco Theological Seminary, delivered a series of five lectures on the L. P. Stone Foundation March 11-14. He spoke on the general theme: "Jesus and the Religious Quest".

**Inter-Seminary Conference**

On February 12 our Seminary was host to the student confer­ence of the Inter-Seminary Movement. Ten of the leading seminaries in the east sent their representatives to this confer­ence. Speakers chosen for the day were Dr. Van Dusen, presi­dent of Union Theological Seminary in New York City, Dr. Hopper, member of the faculty at Drew Seminary, and Dr. Cal­houn of Yale Divinity School. The theme of the day was "Christian Resources for the Pastor in the Church Today". Students from all parts of the world come to Princeton for their theological training. This spring the Seminary had the unusual distinction of welcoming the first students from the
Cameroon to study in the United States. Francois Akoa Abomo, a member of the Bula Tribe, and Tiejoge Joseph Mbogol, a member of the Bassa Tribe, are graduates of the Dager Biblical Seminary at Loludorf; when they complete their studies here, they plan to return to West Africa to work among their fellow-tribesmen.

A year ago the Archibald Alexander Chair of Church History was vacated by the retirement of Dr. Frederick W. Loetscher. At the annual meeting of the Board of Trustees held this past May Dr. Norman Hope was appointed to fill the chair. Dr. Hope graduated from Edinburgh with double honors, and has for the past eight years been professor of Systematic Theology at the New Brunswick Theological Seminary. No successor to Dr. Henry Seymour Brown, the Vice-President of the Seminary, has as yet been named.

Princeton Institute of Theology

Last year the Princeton Institute of Theology attracted members from more than twenty denominations. This Institute, annually held the first two full weeks in July, is intended as a refresher course for pastors. This year's sessions were held July 8-18. Besides members of our own faculty, noted speakers from this country as well as from abroad were on the Institute platform. Outside speakers from this country included Dr. Harris E. Kirk of Baltimore, Dr. Clarence E. Macartney of Pittsburgh, Dr. Robert E. Speer, leader in Foreign Missionary movements and well-known author of many books, and Professor Emile Cailliet, professor of Romance Languages at Wesleyan University. Dr. Herbert H. Farmer, Professor at Westminster College, Cambridge, England, gave the opening address. Dr. Farmer is a noted author and lecturer, having written The Healing Cross, Towards Belief in God, and many other works. Dr. George David Henderson, authority on Church History, gave a course in "High Points in Scottish Church History". Dr. Henderson is Professor of Church History in the University of Aberdeen, Scotland. Professor Bela Vasyi of the Reformed Church in Hungary spoke on "Christianity in Eastern Europe," and Dr. T. Z. Koo, Secretary of the World's Student Christian Federation, gave the final evening address of the Conference on "Christianity in East Asia". Unfortunately Dr. John A. Mackay, president of Princeton Seminary, could not be with us at the Institute this summer. Dr. and Mrs. Mackay are travelling on a four months' speaking tour throughout South America on behalf of the Board of Foreign Missions of which he is also President. Dr. Mackay expects to return to Princeton by the 1st of October.

Cordial greetings to all Forum readers.

Sincerely yours,

John Wm. Wevers.

THIRD AMERICAN CALVINISTIC CONFERENCE

The Third American Calvinistic Conference, held under the auspices of the Calvinistic Action Committee, was held in the auditorium of Calvin College on Monday and Tuesday, August 12 and 13. Extensive comment is found in this issue on the editorial page. Here follows the program and a statement of the resolutions adopted by the Conference.

MONDAY MORNING, AUGUST 12
9:30 a. m.

Prof. Thomas E. Welmers, Presiding

The Rev. Lawrence Veltkamp, Song Leader

Song Service
Devotionals
Word of Welcome
Announcements

Address by PROFESSOR G. CH. AALDERS of the Free University of Amsterdam. Subject: Spiritual Freedom.

MONDAY AFTERNOON, AUGUST 12
2:30 p. m.

Dr. Jacob T. Hoogstra, Presiding

Song Service
Devotionals
Greetings from the Hungarian Reformed Church, by PROFESSOR BELA VASARY of the University of Debrecen, Hungary
Musical Number
Address by PROFESSOR S. DU TOIT of the Theological School of die Gereformeerde Kerk van Suid-Afrika. Subject: Calvinism and Communism
Questions and Discussion
Closing Prayer

MONDAY EVENING, AUGUST 12
8:00 p. m.

Prof. Clarence Bouma, Presiding

...Miss Sylvia Ten Broek at the Organ

The Rev. Lawrence Veltkamp, Song Leader

Prayer
Words of Greeting from the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands, by Dr. J. Hoek, Minister of de Gereformeerde Kerk at The Hague

Greetings from South African Calvinist groups, by Dr. P. J. S. DE KLERSK, Minister of die Gereformeerde Kerk in Pretoria

Solo by Mrs. Grace Bushouse of Holland, Mich., "I Know That My Redeemer Liveth"

Greetings from Ceylonese Calvinism, by Mr. A. G. FOENANDER of Colombo, Ceylon, graduate student at Calvin Seminary

Greetings from Hungarian Calvinists, by Dr. CHARLES VINCZE, Minister of the Free Magyar Reformed Church at Perth Amboy, New Jersey

Offering for the Relief of the Plight of Hungarian Calvinists
Singing
Closing Prayer

TUESDAY MORNING, AUGUST 13
9:30 a. m.

Dr. Jacob T. Hoogstra, Presiding

Song Service
Devotionals
Talk on the Anti-Revolutionary Party of the Netherlands Today, by Mr. ABRAHAM Warnaar, Mayor of Hazerswoude, Member of the Central Committee of the Anti-Revolutionary Party of Holland
Musical Number
Address by PROF. H. G. STOKER of the Potchefstroom University College, Potchefstroom, South Africa. Subject: Calvinism and the Current Scientific Outlook
Questions and Discussion
Singing
Closing Prayer

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, AUGUST 13
2:30 p. m.

Prof. Thomas E. Welmers, Presiding

Song Service
Devotionals
Address by PROF. G. C. BERKOUWER of the Free University of Amsterdam. Subject: Calvinism and Humanism
Questions and Discussion
Resolutions
Closing Words by PRESIDENT WELMERS
Final Singing
Closing Prayer

THE CALVIN FORUM * * * AUGUST-SEPTEMBER, 1946
**RESOLUTIONS**

Resolved, That the members of the Third American Calvinistic Conference express heartfelt gratitude to Almighty God for His great kindness in granting us the privilege and joy of associating with brethren from distant lands and continents in days of fellowship, instruction, and inspiration.

Resolved, That we, conscious of the great challenge present-day conditions present, reaffirm our conviction that Calvinism with its God-centered view of life, recognizing the absolute sovereignty of God and also the value of the human personality, contains the answer and solution to the world's problems, and that we are called upon to propagate and to make known to the world the principles of biblical, creedal, historic Calvinism.

Resolved, That we express to our brethren and sisters in parts of the world where dictatorial governments deny the right of freedom of the spirit or where the danger of the establishment of such dictatorial governments threatens, our desire and determination to do everything in our power to aid these fellow-believers.

Resolved, That we, mindful especially of the sorry plight of our fellow-believers in Hungary, extend to them an expression of our deep concern, That we commend them to the tender care of God, and, That we commend them to the sympathy and prayers of all Calvinistic groups throughout the world.

Resolved, That the widest possible publicity about this Third American Calvinistic Conference be given in order to acquaint the public with the idea of Calvinism.

Resolved, That we express our heartfelt thanks to all who have shared in making this conference the success it has been: —the speakers and visitors from abroad, the committee for arrangements, the sponsors, the press, and the authorities of Calvin College and Seminary.

---

**Book Reviews**

**LITERATURE AND RELIGION**

**GREAT WRITERS AS INTERPRETERS OF RELIGION. By Edwin Mimms. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, Nashville.**

E. DWIN MIMMS, professor emeritus of English literature at Vanderbilt University, is not the first to write a book on the implications of religion in literature. There were already several books on this subject when this book appeared. This should not occasion surprise since the subject is sure to absorb the attention of every teacher of literature who has a wholesome respect for that which is deepest in man—his religion. Such a man is Professor Mimms, who, as he tells us in the preface, made "the magnifying of the spiritual values and the religious elements in English and American literature" the main concern of his teaching for fifty years. In this respect at least he is a man after my own heart. Literature, being the expression of human experience, touches life at all points, and great literature has much of morality and religion in it simply because these are basic in life. No man on any college faculty has more opportunity to arouse in students a sense of the importance of religion than the teacher of literature; no one can do more to kindle in them respect for religion, love of God and his truth. Teachers of literature should be selected with special care.

In his introductory chapter the author makes interesting remarks about the nature of literature, the uses made of literature by statesmen, scientists, philosophers, and great preachers, and the value of the "bright interval" when great intuitions come. Next, the author glorifies in the fact that an outstanding service of great writers is to aid man in the important task of harmonizing culture and religion. For him, these two are not mutually antagonistic, but, rightly understood, "are identical, or at least complementary." In support of this conception he takes over approvingly Matthew Arnold's view that culture consists in the harmonious development of all man's powers, those relating to "the intellect, social life and manners, love of beauty, and conduct." With a wealth of material drawn from the best that has been thought or felt he shows that religion to function properly and at its highest must include the use of every one of these powers. But the author is well aware that this ideal has never been realized. There has always been a clash between religion and culture, which, he affirms, can be reduced to a conflict between self-realization (culture) and self-sacrifice (religion), or, as he also expresses it, "between the extremists and the men of balance within each sphere of life and thought." In science such balance can be secured by giving to both it and religion their several distinct domains and taking for granted that by some kind of spiritual osmosis the latter will influence the former. Is anyone, knowing what is actually happening to religion in the name of culture, naive enough to believe that in this way the solution of the problem can be found, that thus justice is done to the profundity of the issue? Does not a scriptural view demand that religion be present as a pervasive and determining force in the whole cultural process?

In the chapter in which Professor Mimms points out that "the greatest of English writers are champions of the idea that there is a moral law, a moral order, and that to sin against it is to bring remorse, retribution, and defeat upon individuals and upon nations," he speaks truly and valiantly. He believes in the moral law as something objective and authoritative before which men must bow, and he extensively shows how Byron, Hawthorne, Milton, and Shakespeare corroborate this truth. We are not surprised, therefore, when he in no uncertain terms denounces the modern man's lack of moral standards. True, the author has a tendency to regard morality merely as a struggle between the good and the evil forces of the universe. Since the element of struggle is essential to drama and fiction, he could scarcely help presenting morality in literature as conflict. But Kipling's poem, The Gods of the Copybook Headings, he interprets as being, rather than a struggle of opposing fundamentals born out of the experience of the race if not handed down from Sinai. We prick up our ears and ask, Which is it?

Keeping in mind the author's purpose, as the title of the book indicates, to call attention to the presence in literature of religion taken in its broadest rather than in its narrower orthodox sense, we can hastily pass over the next two chapters in which great writers are portrayed as "prophets and seers" of a better social order and as "revealers of beauty, wonder, and mystery," and express our appreciation of the many fine things said.

Lastly, Professor Mimms devotes a chapter to demonstrating that creative writers have been "defenders of the faith." Confining himself to the nineteenth century, he quotes freely from Matthew Arnold to give us a picture of the skepticism and agnosticism that began to prevail, and he closes with declaring Robert Browning to be the greatest of the champions of the faith. He sees Browning, whom he calls "the most spiritual, the most Christian of poets," as the poet in whom "all the discords of his age are harmonized." We cannot join the author in thus laureling Browning. When one tries to reduce the thoughts of the poet to some kind of unity or system, one discovers too many inner contradictions. Besides, there are too many ideas in...
Browning’s poetry that simply cannot be harmonized with Christian truths, such as, for example, his view of Christ as merely an idealized David as expressed in Saul and his philosophy of the imperfect, including the morally imperfect, which inevitably leads to the negation of sin. It is because the author exalts Browning as defender of the faith that I present these strictures.

Professor Mimms has read widely and is well acquainted with his field. But no matter how well one is at home in the domain of American and English literature, to be successful in the task to which Professor Mimms set himself is very difficult indeed. Poetry is poetry and differs widely from a treatise in one of the sciences or dogmatics. Much also depends upon the author’s own theological point of view, which, in the case of our author, is liberal rather than conservative. When he names such men as William James, Angell, and McDougall as examples of men who are moderate and balanced in their views, we are sure that we have placed him in the proper category. When he holds that mysticism in its trances experiences, like that of Tennyson, effects the union of the soul with God, he adopts the pagan rather than the Christian view. According to the latter wholesome mysticism consists in intimate fellowship with God rather than in losing one’s identity and becoming one with God.

J. G. Vanden Bosch.

THE LORD’S PRAYER


This review is rather late because of the press of other duties, and also because I wished to use it in preaching on the Lord’s Prayer. I found it helpful, although not as helpful as some others, perhaps because not specifically adapted to preaching as some other books on the Lord’s Prayer.

Professor Chamberlain is professor of New Testament exegesis at Louisville Presbyterian Seminary. One finds evidences of his exegetical training in the book. Yet the approach is on the whole practical rather than theoretical. An attempt is made to relate the petitions and teachings of the model prayer to present-day life. The language is clear, concrete, often epigrammatic. There are many useful illustrations. Many fine insights into the nature of prayer are given.

It is amazing what a world of thought Christ compressed into the few terse phrases of the Lord’s Prayer. Even more amazing is the exalted God-centered spirit which breathes from its lines. It begins and ends in adoration. Would there were more of this, and less of selfishness, in our prayers!

Anthony Hoekema.

EVANGELICAL BOOK AWARD

THE Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, announces an Evangelical Book Award which will be given to the author of a book in the field of Evangelical Christianity meeting the standards set forth in the Award Rules. Final date for submission of manuscripts is September 1, 1947.

Long a leader among evangelical publishers, Eerdmans is seeking to encourage writers, both new and old, to produce volumes which will make a real contribution in this field. All unpublished manuscripts in the field of Evangelical Christianity are eligible except fiction.

RULES FOR THE AWARD

1. Writers from countries throughout the world are encouraged to compete for the Eerdmans Evangelical Book Award, with the stipulation that manuscripts shall be submitted in the English language.

2. Closing date for the award is September 1, 1947. To be eligible for consideration, manuscripts must be postmarked not later than midnight, September 1, 1947, and should not be sent prior to June 1, 1947.

3. With the exception of fiction, all unpublished manuscripts in accord with the spirit and great doctrines of Evangelical Christianity are eligible for the award. Writers should be positively and constructively Christian in their approach.

4. The Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company agrees to pay to the author of the winning manuscript five thousand dollars ($5,000) of which two thousand five hundred dollars ($2,500) will be paid as an outright prize when the award is announced, and two thousand five hundred dollars ($2,500) on publication of the manuscript as an advance against royalties.

5. The manuscript winning the award will be published by the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company on a royalty basis of 10% of the retail price of the book.

6. The Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company will consider for publication, on its regular royalty basis, all manuscripts submitted in competition for the award which meet the firm’s editorial standards.

7. Members of the Editorial Staff of the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company will constitute the Editorial Committee judging entries for the award.

8. The decision of the judges, on all matters pertaining to the award, will be final.

9. In fairness to all contestants, no correspondence can be undertaken with any individual regarding the award.

10. The author is responsible for obtaining written permission from copyright owners for material quoted. Such permissions should accompany manuscript.

11. The Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company reserves the right to withhold the prize of $5,000 should all entries prove of insufficient caliber to justify the award.

Mechanical Requirements

12. Manuscripts must be typewritten in the English language and should be double-spaced on good grade white bond paper, size 8½ by 11 inches. Margins at top, bottom, and both sides should be at least one inch.

13. Submit only the original of the manuscript. A carbon should be retained by the author. The publishers are not responsible for manuscripts lost or damaged, although all possible precautions are taken against such eventualities.

14. Pages should be numbered consecutively in the upper right-hand corner, from beginning of manuscript to the end. Address all manuscripts to: Evangelical Book Award, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 255 Jefferson Avenue, S.E., Grand Rapids, Michigan.

IN MEMORIAM

Gone to be with his Lord since the appearance of our previous issue, Dr. Louis J. Bolt of Rochester, New York. Our readers know him for his incisive, enthusiastic articles on Christian Education which, as a Calvin Forum correspondent, he contributed to our pages.

He gave his life to the cause of Christian instruction, the cause which had the love of his heart and to which at one time three members of his family devoted all their time.

“Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; for their works follow with them.” (Revelation 14:13.)