

THE CALVIN FORUM

A MONTHLY

How Dead Is Calvinism?

An Editorial

War, Peace, and Pacifism

Two Views and a Round Table

A Calvinistic Political Program

The Party of Colijn

Rembrandt, Vermeer, Frans Hals

Three Decades

Reformed Preaching

God-Centered and Vital

Ethiopia in the Shadows

A Letter

Science and Religion

Complementary

The CALVIN FORUM

PUBLISHED BY THE CALVIN FORUM BOARD OF PUBLICATION:

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

THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:

DR. CLARENCE BOUMA (Managing Editor), DR. HENRY J. RYSKAMP, PROF. HENRY SCHULTZE, DR. RALPH STOB, and PROF. HENRY J. VAN ANDEL.

CONTENTS—Vol. I. No. 3, OCTOBER, 1935

EDITORIALS

How Dead Is Calvinism?.....	51
Crime and God.....	52
Chapman on Dante.....	52

ARTICLES

The Church and Peace. By Bernard J. Mulder, D.D.....	53
The Modern Pacifism Movement. By John Bovenkerk.....	55
Our Readers Have the Floor. On War and Peace.....	58
A Calvinistic Political Program. By Henry J. Ryskamp, Ph.D.....	59
Rembrandt, Vermeer, Frans Hals. By H. J. Van Anandel, A.M.....	62
Reformed Preaching. By P. A. Hoekstra.....	63
Ethiopia in the Shadows. By John A. Cremer, M.D.....	66
Science and Religion Complementary. By John B. Schoolland, A.M.....	67

CORRESPONDENCE	70
----------------------	----

BOOK REVIEWS

The Delights of Poetry.....	71
Peter Brueghel Novelized.....	71
Recent Dutch Fiction.....	71
With Psychopaths	71
The Religious Situation in Germany.....	72
Glimpses of Russia	72
South America	72

VERSE

Leaves	57
The Defaced Image.....	69
Autumn on the Hill.....	70

THE CALVIN FORUM is published monthly. Subscription Price: Two Dollars per year. Address all editorial as well as business correspondence to: THE CALVIN FORUM, Calvin College and Seminary, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Application for entry as second class matter pending at the Grand Rapids, Michigan, Post Office.

The CALVIN FORUM

VOLUME I

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., OCTOBER, 1935

NUMBER 3

EDITORIALS

How Dead Is Calvinism?

CALVINISM has been pronounced dead so often that one cannot help wondering whether the repeated assertion of its demise is not a mere instance of wishful thinking. The vehemence with which such assertion is made on occasion by certain people might turn out to be psychological evidence for the very opposite.

Plain historic fact is that Calvinism is not dead but very much alive. It is not dead, for the simple reason that it cannot die. Calvinism is faith in God raised to the n-th power. It is religion come to its own. It is Christianity at its best. It is full-orbed theism. Calvinism will not die—unless God Almighty dies.

It cannot be denied that Calvinism has often been placed low in the scale of evaluation, not only by unbelievers and atheists, but also by certain Christian groups. Possibly Calvinists themselves have at times been to blame for this low estimate on the part of their fellow-Christians. "Calvinists" at times praised their faith to the skies, and meanwhile failed to realize that it must be brought down to earth to be exhibited a living power. They have at times written encomiums of the marvelous unity of the Calvinistic way of thinking as apparent in the eternal decree of God, and then promptly allowed this glorious truth to deteriorate into a bit of scholastic speculation, thus robbing it of the real driving power which it had in the thought and life of its great exponents. They have at times taken the doctrine of predestination and made it an excuse for a pharisaic unconcern about the redemption of man, the missionary enterprise, and the redemption of the whole of life in all its phases.

But all this was not and is not Calvinism. It was only a caricature. Let Calvinism be tried, really tried, and its power will be seen. Calvinism produces men who can stand the bracing air of the timber-line of truth. Calvinism makes men who fear God and no one else—neither man nor devil. Calvinism makes men who are filled with one holy passion: The redemption of a sin-stricken and sin-cursed world in the one way ordained by God and for the glory of His Name.

You ask, possibly, Can Calvinism stand the test of modern thought and life? The only reply to make to that query is: Can any system but Calvinism stand this test?

Out of all the confusion of modern intellectual endeavor to grasp the meaning of reality and human life there comes the cry for unity, coherence, inter-relatedness, meaningfulness. Is there any system of thought outside of Calvinism in which the unity of the speculative thinker and of the religious believer is so marvelously exhibited? Is there a higher, a deeper, a richer unity of all reality than that grounded in the eternal counsel of the living God, sovereign in His grace, all-inclusive in His redeeming purpose for this life and the life to come?

But it is on the score of its ability to effect the redemption of human society that any philosophy of life is ultimately judged. Can Calvinism redeem human society? Has it a vital and effective program to meet the challenge presented by human society today?

There can be only one answer to this challenging question. There is no outlook so stimulating and so powerful for the redemption of human society as the God-centered view of the Calvinist. If Calvinists have been neglectful on this score, it is not because of, but in spite of, their Calvinism.

That this is no idle boast can be shown from history. The gist of the, later, Calvinistic faith in the sovereignty and supremacy of God is found in the message of the Old Testament prophets. They were not humanitarians—on the contrary, they were men who had had a vision of God in His greatness, majesty, transcendence, and holiness. But it is these very men of God who were filled with a passion for social righteousness. Their pages abound with denunciations of the social oppressors and the exposé of social evils. For God's sake they would not and could not keep silent on the social as well as individual sins of their contemporaries.

Again, John Calvin will undoubtedly be considered a good specimen of the Calvinistic faith. All students of his life know with what a social passion he labored to make Geneva God's city. True, in such matters as the relation between church and state he was himself a child of his age, but this can in no wise dim his achievements in the application of Christian demands to the civil life of his day. His *Institutes* offered not only a consistent dogmatic but a powerful ethic as well. He was deeply interested and practically active in the establishment of the justice of God in the society in which he lived. His conception of basic political and economic principles was a potent and liberating force in his day. Wherever his influence was felt, men not only preached the gospel

of sovereign grace for the redemption of poor sinners, but also the call to a God-consecrated life on the part of all so redeemed in every sphere of human society: religious, educational, social, political, and economic.

Once again this great social dynamic was exhibited in the little country of the Netherlands in the nineteenth century. Abraham Kuyper was a Calvinist who knew his Calvinism. He extolled the grace of God in the redemption of poor, undone sinners. He found in the electing grace of God, and not in the shifting desires of man, the ultimate explanation for man's redemption from sin. He found peace of mind and soul in the truth of the sovereignty of God, and having found Him redemptively in Jesus Christ, he dedicated his whole life in gratitude to that God. Under his inspiring guidance a university was founded, a political party was organized, and numberless Christian social organizations and agencies sprang into existence. What the practical program of this Calvinistic political party is today under the leadership of Holland's present prime minister, Hendrikus Colijn, may be read at greater length in the article of Dr. Ryskamp on another page of this magazine.

Calvinism with its belief in the divine vocation of redeemed man, with its conviction that God is to be honored in every sphere of human life, and with its grounding of social service in social righteousness and of social righteousness in the service of God, furnishes the noblest program and the most powerful dynamic for the solution of the ills of human society.

Such Calvinism is not dead. Such Calvinism cannot die. The only question is whether we, who call ourselves Calvinists, can measure up to the challenge of our own faith. C. B.

Crime and God

SHOEMAKER, in one of his recent cartoons, pictures the criminal as a huge tree approached by Uncle Sam, ax in hand, with the superscription: Time to get down to the roots. The roots, made visible in the picture, are designated as follows: Sob Sisters, Parole Abuses, Sentimental Judges, Shyster Lawyers, and Crooked Politicians.

It is indeed time to get down to the roots in the matter of crime. The situation in our land is appalling. It is doubtful whether there is a civilized nation that takes crime as lightly as do we. This is true of the government as well as of the individual citizen. Dr. Clarence E. Macartney says in a recent article: "We have great national plans for the conservation of forests and water power, but apparently no plans for the conservation of the spiritual and moral life of the nation. Even in the Nazi state, with all its abominations and tyrannies, there is a definite program of action against the vices and immoralities which are attacking the people. But here the state does nothing." (*Christianity Today*, July, 1935.)

A deeper root than any of those exhibited in the Shoemaker cartoon is found in the apathetic attitude of the people. It seems to be part of our dollar-

chasing, pragmatistic, movie-trained mentality to extol the shrewdness of the criminal rather than to abhor crime. We are fast losing our capacity for moral indignation. Respect for public office is at low ebb and respect for public justice suffers correspondingly. There is something basically wrong with public opinion in a society that looks with unconcern upon a system under which crooked politicians, aided by easy parole regulations, succeed in having criminal-friends released from prison.

It is not the courts first of all that are to blame, but the system under which many a criminal lawyer is given high rating in the public mind for his ability to "make out a good case" for the criminal. Under cover of the half-truth that even the worst offender is entitled to a fair hearing in court, we are giving full sway both to the attorney of naturalistic convictions who denies all guilt in any real sense and to the shyster lawyer who believes that he ought not to allow his moral convictions to enter into his professional activities. The mental attitude toward crime on the part of many lawyers is alarmingly "professional" instead of moral.

It was no outsider, but a prominent member of the bar himself who, in an address before the American Bar Association, recently met in Los Angeles, is reported to have proposed complete outlawing of the criminal attorney as the surest way to end crime. Pleading for state-paid defenders, the speaker, Mayer C. Goldman, a New York attorney, stated: "The surest way to promote crime is to permit the hiring of private lawyers who defend crooked gangsters and crooked financiers."

It is refreshing from time to time to hear of judges that really believe in the sanctity of the basic demands of God's moral law for human society. The basic social malady of our day is not social, nor is it merely moral, it is religious. The current glorification of the criminal as a shrewd man who "gets away with it," so common on the screen and in the public press, is possible in our country only because the sacred demands of God's law for human society have faded out of our public consciousness. Crime must be signalized as sin. God must come into the picture. The fading of God out of our national consciousness is the most disastrous revolution that is taking place today in our land and under our very eyes.

This is the deepest root of the prevalence and appalling increase of crime in our land. C. B.

Chapman On Dante

CHAPMAN is a poet of no mean ability, and he certainly knows how to translate Dante. But though he catches the vision of Dante's individual scenes, he does not understand the immortal poet of whom Michael Angelo said, that there was none like him, and none greater. In all probability there is some kinship between these two artists, and if Angelo is famous for his *terribilitas*, or his terrible indignation, which he pours over and into his sculptures, to express that the time for a troubadour's entertaining is past, and to proclaim loudly that the judgment of

God is coming upon the earth, why should not Dante be viewed from the same angle? To say that Dante is tribal, provincial, egotistic, self-conscious, self-complacent, proud, haughty, ambitious for his fame, and ready to avenge himself on all his enemies, sounds interesting. But the amazing fact remains

that thousands upon thousands reverence him as a noble poet who did not hesitate to put the righteous in heaven, and the oppressors, liars, cowards, adulterers, rebels and rainbow-chasers where they belong.

H. J. V. A.

The Church and Peace

By Bernard J. Mulder, D.D.

SOME years after the World War, Field Marshal Haig declared, "The Church is the only hope." And a recent symposium by twelve great authors comes to this conclusion: "The hope of any permanent world peace must be on a spiritual basis." These cause us to remember that Church Father Origen pled for peace through the efforts of the church, and Athanasius proclaimed that "when Christianity is really spread, wars will cease."

That the common people of the civilized world, the people who bear the brunt and burden of any war, are looking to the Church for leadership in this great international question of world peace, is but natural. Bearing loads too heavy to bear and surrounded by unsolvable problems, men have sought the comfort of the Church. So too, in this greatest question of the hour, the Church must show the way. It may well be true that "except the Church find a solution, the people will feel delusion, and the Church is dead."

The Church's Failure

What does the Church have to offer to the world? Up to a few years ago, the Church as a whole offered little; rather, championed war. From the opening of the fourth Century, when Christianity, officially at least, became the religion of the Roman Empire, to the hour when public thanks was offered in the churches of Germany for the sinking of the Lusitania, and Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis went about our country and in public address advocated the sterilization of German men and the segregation of German women in order to blot out this race from the face of the earth, the Church championed war. From Milvian Bridge, through the Crusades; the evening of St. Bartholomew's Day, through the singeing and torturing of a captured Catholic by William of Orange; from the death of countless Russians in a swamp and the declaration of Pastor Lober, "Ring the bells and sing, 'Now thank we all our God'," through Billy Sunday's prayer in the United States House of Representatives in January, 1918, "Thou knowest no nation so infamous, vile, greedy, sensuous, bloodthirsty has ever disgraced the pages of history; smite the wolfish Hun, and we will forever sing Thy praise," the Church has championed war. Indeed, an English general declared that the churches were the best propaganda agencies in the entire country.

But the Church has something to offer the world. And everywhere individuals and congregations and groups and whole communions are beginning to realize it. Witness the resolutions and declarations of representative groups and ecclesiastical gatherings.

Listen to the forward-looking proclamations of Young People's assemblies. The Church, at this late date, is ready to offer the teachings of the Prince of Peace.

In championing peace, the Church does not present a host of proof-texts. But it presents the character and teachings of Jesus Christ. The Church declares that the character of the Christ is totally at variance with the prevalent war psychology: *greed, suspicion, fear, hate, war*. The Church makes bold to declare that the teachings of the Christ are the direct opposite of those of the military opportunist and the swash-buckling dictator. This does not mean that the Church is the preacher of pacifism, as such. It does mean that the Church stands for and preaches the principles that break down the war-idea and promote the peace-idea, and actively fosters and assists the agencies that look toward this end.

Sin and Social Consequences

What is the church preaching?

To begin with, the Church is writing a new definition of sin. This does not mean that men have not and do not know what sin is. Neither does it mean that the Church has not stood out against sin. But sin has been regarded as an individual problem. We dwell so much upon sin in the individual that we are prone to forget that sin may be also social. And war presents a social composite of all the great sins. We do well to speak against lying and stealing, murder, rape and adultery, and many other sins in the individual life. But we must not forget that war presents these in mass. War inbreeds them. These sins become a part of the soldier not only, but find their way into the national life. In the army they are taken for granted. The philosophy of "not what you do, but what you get caught at" is popular. Prophylactic stations everywhere are not a caution to keep clean in body and spirit but a means of protection against disease.

In the ethical standard of the Old Testament, God said, "Thou shalt not kill." And Jesus re-emphasized the teaching in the New Testament, in His Mount Sermon, looking, indeed, beneath actuality into purposes and motives. May the State declare wholesale aggressive killing? And shall the Church sanction the declaration? Rather, let the Church keep clear of the whole nefarious business, and preach mightily against this social composite of all the great sins, always remembering that these sins are more deadly in their social consequences than in the individual. If the Church ever hesitates, let us ask, Do these sins square with the character and teaching of Jesus Christ?

The Attitude of Good Will

The Church is also preaching a new attitude of goodwill. We are often asked, Is the religion of Jesus practical? Many believe it to be a dream-theory, with the result that men may believe in high ideals, but do not follow them. So the "Blessed are the Peacemakers" of Jesus is regarded as a heavenly condition, and not at all to be thought of as pertaining to things in our world. Here there is to be no peace. Has Christianity become so weak and anemic? Has it lost its transforming power? One now and again hears someone say, "So long as there is sin in the world, there will be war." Well, perhaps so. But does such spineless philosophy present an adequate reason for doing nothing about this great sin? Is the Church simply to accept this social volcano, and conform itself to the level of the devilish lava?

Another says that this beatitude refers to "spiritual peace". Exactly so. Wars are born because men are not reconciled. And the first and supreme business of the Church is to preach the Gospel of salvation, which is the Gospel of peace through the blood of His Cross. But is that individual only? As Jesus touched the souls of men through the healing of bodies and the feeding of those a-hungred, may not the Church lead to the salvation of souls through a declaration of goodwill? Jesus said, "Whatsoever ye would . . ." That must express our attitude toward our fellowmen. Is war included in that attitude?

The Church must continue to preach that rule of goodwill. Until men accept it completely, they have not "surrendered all to Jesus". It cannot be an attitude like that of the Pharisee, who believed in brotherhood, but only for the chosen; or that of the slave owner, but not for black folks; or that of the Christian, who repeats, "Let us overcome evil with good", but continues to use the bayonet and the bomb. We may not agree with the theology of Shailer Mathews, but he does make us think ethically in his recent book, "Creative Christianity", when he says in substance that men will have little faith in the peace of a heavenly world, which the Church declares, unless that Church can show the way to some peace in this world in which we live.

War Is Sin

Preaching the above, the Church is declaring a new resolution of purpose. This question faces us: If war should break tomorrow, what would the church do? After the last war, when asked why she did not take a different stand, the Church pled lack of experience. But now it has experience, and is sensing new values in the teachings of Jesus. Judging by the host of resolutions and proclamations, and individual and congregational declarations, the Church is saying, *The Christian Church must no more have part in that sin*. And that is not pacifism, but Christian. For nations, in their best moments, to declare, and for the church to know and to preach that war is sin, and then to go out and commit or give sanction to that sin, is utter, wanton sinfulness in itself. The Church, as Church, must get out of the war business forever.

And that may mean a cross. Shall the Church ever again be afraid to bear a cross? I believe that by its sanctions of the past the Church has crucified the

Christ afresh. Could the Church teach cross-bearing in the life of the individual, when it would not or dared not itself bear this cross? This stand will bring shame and ignominy. Curses will be heaped upon the Church. But were they not also upon the Head of the Church? As the Master bore the Cross, so the Church must show the way to cross-bearing by bearing a cross.

Having touched on some of the things the Church is preaching, it is in order to say what the Church must do in addition, in a practical way. It would be well if the Church would help folks remember. The oncoming generations must know. In an Armistice Day sermon recently, I told of the cost of war, especially in suffering and moral degradation. After the service one came forward, and said, "It took participation in the war for you to see that". He spoke the truth. It seems that we learn only by experience. But need it be so? If poets and historians have declared the glories of war, cannot the Church provide the counter-balance, and tell the truth? Indeed, some disillusioned poets are telling the truth today. And songs depict the living hell. Let the Church declare the horror, in all its parts. And if its leaders have no experience, they may acquire it synthetically from reading Remarque's *All Quiet on the Western Front*, or *War Is a Racket* by General Smedley D. Butler, or glance through the numerous "Pictorial Reviews" of the war, with their ghastly scenes of death. Or follow the "munitions investigations" with their revelations of planned butchery. When I recently suggested in an address that there should be, before the declaration of war, a plebiscite of those who were to do the fighting, a listener answered that the mass mind was too dumb to decide such questions. These should be decided by their representatives. What else could one say than that these same representatives did all they could to get this "dumb mass mind" to vote for them and keep them in office. Help folks remember and let people know the motives and purposes and most wars will be eliminated. The Church might well perform this duty.

War and Crooked Thinking

The Church must also help people to disarm their minds. Many years ago Mr. George Steininger — now the Reverend George — said in his oration in an Intercollegiate Oratorical contest, "War is the result of crooked thinking." Men have war in their heads before they practice it on the battlefields. At the various disarmament conferences the talk is not of peace but of limitation and security. Nations do not say, we will not fight, but how little or how much shall we have to fight each other with. The Church must teach that war is not inevitable; that it is not the only final method of adjudication. Cannot men adopt the philosophy of Aesop's Fable of the Lion and the Goat? Each would drink first at a waterhole, and the fight started. Thus fighting, they saw the vultures overhead, waiting to devour the first carcass. Since neither wished to be food for the vultures, they quit their fight and reasoned together and drank in peace, in turn. On several dark nights I have paraded a short stretch of the Rio Grande, with rifle at ready, and watchful eye on the opposite shore. And on the other shore was the Mexican sentry. If Italy and Ethiopia

fight, will not the war have been set off at least by the clashes of border patrols? On the long line between the United States and Canada there is neither soldier, nor fort, nor gun. I have heard Col. Hanford McNider, recent Minister to Canada, say that the records are filled with incidents, which in other nations would have precipitated war. But these two countries, in their relations to each other, have disarmed their minds. So they need no guns on their borders. And there is no war. Let the Church declare more boldly the teaching of the Prophet, "Come, let us reason together".

Supporting Peace Propaganda

And last, the Church must assist in fostering and supporting peace propaganda and programs. These are of secondary Christianity, it is true, but the Church can ill afford not to be interested in them. Let the Church say with these that there is no security equal to the word of an honorable man. Let the Church work for the change of hearts, the while not forgetting that methods must also change. Let the Church see in vision with Isaiah the day when no man is afraid

of another, believing that "the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it". The world is interdependent. We need traffic rules for this great family of God. Let the Church be assistant with her good offices in setting up these rules.

Thus will be born a newer patriotism. The old patriotism of war leads to ruin. The newer patriotism of peace, which it is the privilege of the Church to foster, will teach us to love those who love their country. That patriotism talks in terms of the nation's worth to the world, and forecasts the greatness of the nation's future. Let the Church preach that day of peace, which Isaiah saw in vision 3000 years ago, the vision of the Christian age, when religion and worship would be supreme, and there would be transformation of the implements of war into the implements of agriculture and peace. Let the Church stand with Argentinians and Chilians at the foot of The Christ of the Andes, and help the nations to make the covenant which they made, "Sooner shall these mountains crumble to dust than Argentinians and Chilians break the peace which they have made at the feet of Christ, the Redeemer".

The Modern Pacifism Movement

By John Bovenkerk

UNDER the title of *Philisophical and Biblical Reflections on World Peace* (Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 35 cts.), I have written a pamphlet which is virtually a vigorous protest against the modern pacifism movement. "Why protest against a good thing?" — "Is not the present-day agitation against war an excellent sign of the times?" — "You are very bold to condemn a movement that has so much in it that is commendable." These are some of the reactions that have already come to me.

Barring the deplorable phenomenon that we have too many people in our churches who are deadly afraid of controversy — and I wish them a very peaceful death bed and a nice, quiet funeral — and barring the growing tendency, so characteristic of this day and age to have and maintain peace at any price — we have multitudes of spineless people inside and outside of the Church — the undeniable fact remains and must be faced, that there is nothing at a standstill. In spite of all the peace philosophy with all its pious wishes and all its grandiloquent ethical teaching, the world is heading for more war. No amount of delusive idealism, such as marks the modern movement for permanent world peace, can obliterate the naked reality of war and more war. We can decorate a coffin with a grand display of the most exquisite flowers that scatter their fragrance over a considerable area, but inside of that casket are death and decay.

Pacifism Anti-Christian

"Why protest against a good thing?" The protest is not against a good thing, but against a pernicious thing. The modern movement for world peace is saturated with ungodly, unbiblical and unethical ideas and has virtually become an anti-Christian propaganda and a national menace. We bring in an indictment against the leadership of this crusade. That

leadership is characterized by men and women who unblushingly have gone on record as Atheists, Modernists, Humanists, Socialists and Communists. The national and international propagandists of Pacifism and World Peace as carried on before and after the World War are the type of people with whom it is extremely dangerous to make alliances. There have been and are among them Jews and Roman Catholics, but that religious coloring has no more significance than the fact that in our country a goodly number of the ardent Pacifists are ministers in Protestant churches. It is a well-known fact, that Protestant preachers, Roman Catholic priests, and Jewish rabbis, if only they proclaim the same "gospel" which is not "the Gospel" can sit on the same platform, join hands, and sing most solemnly: "Nearer, my God, to Thee" and "Beautiful Isle of Somewhere". The leadership of Modern Pacifism is essentially and professedly Humanistic. It is on the basis of Humanism that they work together.

Pacifism and Humanism

"Is not the present-day agitation against war an excellent sign of the times?" On the surface it would seem to be. It seems to fall in line with the progress of the human race, its civilization, education and culture. Humanism can be and ought to be the handmaid of Christianity. But today Humanism has become a false religion and it is fighting tooth and nail to replace Christianity. Not only in the pamphlets published by the American Association for International Conciliation (before and after the Great War), not only in the speeches and sermons of noted Pacifists ("The Unknown Soldier" by Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick is a brilliant example), but more specifically in late books on the subject the venomous snake has come out of the grass. That poisonous reptile is an un-

biblical theology and a false philosophy. Their God is not the God of the Scriptures; their Christ is not the eternal Son of God; their Holy Spirit is not the third Person in the Trinity; their Kingdom of heaven is based upon an utterly false conception of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men. The sovereignty of God, as we, Calvinists, believe in and stress (we do not stress it enough) is ridiculed by many Pacifists. To a host of them God is not a Personal Being at all but an abstraction, say Truth. Jesus Christ is placed on a level with Buddha and Tolstoy and Gandhi; outstanding Pacifists were they! Universal brotherhood is preached, ignoring sin and regeneration, ignoring Christ the Mediator and the Christian Church, His body; a universal brotherhood based upon the so-called inherent good in all men. Man is naturally good and loving and righteous; that must be cultivated; the God in man must be brought out.

In the July number of *Harper's Magazine* is an article, under the caption, "Men Like War," in which the writer, Mr. Leo C. Rosten, comments on the inherent tendency of the human species to fight. To quote: "At no time in history has Pacifist sentiment been so widespread and articulate. And yet, despite speeches, warnings, and impassioned harangues, we are impotent to check the headlong march of preparation in materials, and—more important—in attitudes, which leads straight to another cataclysm. The moral is that war has a profound *psychological* attraction for man. Its compensations offset the rational advantages of peace. To put the axiom before the argument: Men like war." The arguments follow. Mr. Rosten brings out psychologically and biologically what we believe theologically, based upon the word of God and universal experience, namely, that man by nature hates God and his neighbor; in other words, total depravity. It does not appear from his article that the writer is a Christian; he does not treat his subject from the viewpoint of Christian theology; but it is mighty interesting, to say the least, that as a sample of truthful realism the writer's observations stand in the most striking contrast to the false idealism of the modern Pacifist. The latter ignores the reality and seriousness of sin and its awful abiding consequences, entertains a shallow and illusionary view of human nature, and, building his reform movement upon the presumption of universal goodness, in the Humanistic sense of that term, he builds his Peace Palace upon a foundation of shifting sand; the storms and the floods will overthrow his structure and great will be the fall thereof.

Divine Declaration of War

"Is not the present-day agitation against war an excellent sign of the times?" One can conceive of a Christian movement to foster arbitration, to take the racket out of the manufacture of munitions, to mitigate the horrors and alleviate the sufferings of warfare, to prevent as much as possible unrighteous and seemingly unnecessary wars; but I cannot conceive of a Christian (Christian in the Biblical connotation of the word) propaganda to outlaw war. One might just as well start a movement to annihilate disease, eradicate insanity, abolish crime and kill the devil. Sweeping statements are made by the Pacifist; slogans of a warless world, resolutions never to enlist in any

future war, denunciations of the government as it takes active steps toward preparedness, declarations that all wars are of the devil and nothing but butchery, wholesale killing. The present-day agitation against war has run riot, has overthrown the boundaries of God's truth in a destructive manner; worse than that, it has falsified the truth of God to make it serve the end in view. This, indeed, is a sign of the times, a sign that spells disaster! It is next to impossible for Modern Pacifists to see any sense in such a declaration of war as God has made after sin came into the world of mankind: "I will put enmity." This perpetual enmity does not fit into his philosophy. That Jehovah actually commanded His ancient people to war and to destroy, he can only explain on the false assumption that the Old Testament God was a tribal deity, a war-god, and that now we have a god of love and peace. Samuel must be regarded by the Modern Pacifist as a monster of iniquity, for it was he, who "hewed Agag in pieces before the Lord in Gilgal." The imprecatory Psalms of David must logically be classified with the vengeful poetry of some savage Indian tribe according to the exegesis of Scripture by the Humanistic, Pacifistic preacher. "The Son of God goes forth to war, a kingly crown to gain" is a heart-stirring hymn for the Calvinistic Christian; if I were a Pacifist, I would not sing it. To the pacifist of today the main consideration is the noble life of Jesus as he interprets that life in terms of his peculiar, pacifistic, ethical theology. That Christ is the greatest Warrior and has fought the hardest battle, single-handed, against the most formidable enemy, and for the most worthy cause imaginable, that "the Son of God was manifested", as John says, "to destroy the works of the devil" and that "having spoiled principalities and powers, He made a show of them openly, triumphing over them," as Paul puts it, is Greek to the dyed-in-the-wool Pacifist of this day. That Christ Jesus is the Warrior of all warriors and will put His foot upon the necks of His enemies, that He is a Conqueror of Whom Joshua and Samson and David were types is a conundrum to the worshipers of the Prince of Peace. Now Christ is the Prince of Peace, verily and truly; not one of the princes of peace, but the only Peace-Maker, and yet not again in the exclusive ethical implication of the preacher of World Peace. I reject Tolstoy's interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount. I deny that Jesus conquered by non-resistance and that His passion and death must be regarded solely in the light of passive obedience. I challenge the Modern Pacifist (particularly the preacher) to furnish a sane and sound explanation of the dictum of Jesus, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's", and to tell me why Jesus made "a scourge of cords" when He cleansed the temple, and to account for His prophetic vision of continued warfare till the end of time, and to settle the fact that Jesus more than any prophet spoke of the righteous punishment of the wicked in hell. Verily, Jesus taught the love of God and personified it; but must not the same be said about the justice or righteousness of God? Did Christ ever in His teaching evade the punitive justice of God? Did He not announce Himself as the Judge who will sentence His enemies to everlasting punishment? Something far more horrible than the sufferings on battlefield or death by bayonet or bomb constitutes

a vital part of the teachings of the good Master. We know full well the patent objection of the Atheist against all this; but it can rightly be expected that Ministers of the Gospel preach not only the love and grace of God but also the righteousness and wrath of God. And what applies to God applies to Christ; when the One is caricatured, the Other will likewise be misrepresented. This is the thing that is taking place today and the sentimental, ethical Pacifistic preacher has made himself guilty of it; it is a sign of the times, one of those signs in which you see Satan in the apparel of an angel of light. Shall we welcome this Modern Pacifism Movement? Shall we aid and abet it? Shall we join the parade? The A.A.A.A. is trying hard to enlist the Modernist preachers for their ungodly cause. This is not difficult to understand, for the heart of Modernism (or Humanism) is Atheism. The Communists endeavor to get the cooperation of the Pacifists; and that is not surprising, for both proclaim a gospel to the effect that man, not God, but man, must and will usher in a millennium of peace and prosperity. At the root lies the substitution of Man-Power for the Sovereignty of God and that is Atheistic in principle. Verily, it is a sign of the times; the sign of the Antichrist. Let us beware!

Is There No Good In It?

"You are very bold to condemn a movement that has so much in it that is commendable." Yes, I welcome this reaction too. It, too, is indicative of the present day tendency to compromise and of the current philosophy of Pragmatism, not to speak of a prevalent apathy to fundamental thinking and to live emotionally.

Just at present Muskegon is in a state of ferment on divine healing. A satellite of Ameer McPherson is the cause of it. The large tent is filled to overflowing at every meeting. With the most unctuous piety, giving all the glory to the Lord, the "divine healer" is mesmerizing her audiences and incidentally raking in the dollars. A marvelous attraction, for sick people want to be healed. Health and happiness constitute the *summum bonum* of the masses. What attitude shall the Christian take to divine healing? Shall we say that there is apparently so much good in it—for some people are healed—that we might better leave it alone? Or compromise with it? Or join the movement? There is only one thing to do and that is to condemn it, because the whole thing rests on false premises. On the basis of Divine Revelation divine healing must be condemned.

On the same basis the movement for World Peace stands condemned. People want peace, just as they desire health. But God permits war, just as He permits sickness. Is the highest good health of body? Is the highest good continued peace? What is the verdict of human experience, personally and nationally?

Common Grace Not Sufficient

The slogan, "A warless world" as the future goal has truth in it; however, it becomes a falsehood, when presented in the light of human endeavor. We, Calvinists, believe in the common or general grace of God. It's a great blessing. But the common grace of God does not remove sin and its consequences; it checks, and guards, and alleviates, and mitigates, and often prevents, but it does not eradicate and remove

sin and its consequences. I believe that preparedness and even just wars belong to the realm of common grace, just like hygiene and hospitalization and physical operations. Romans 13, by the way, teaches that the State and the execution of justice (including the use of the sword) belong to this category. Common grace will continue till the end of time, but cannot usher in a millennium. One of the unaccountable things in the Pacifism Movement is the endeavor to "create" universal peace instead of "fighting" for universal righteousness. Only when right relations of man to God and man to his fellowmen exist, can we hope for the realization of a warless world.

World Peace is coming! The Prince of Peace will establish it in God's own time. How? By human goodwill? By the effort of nations and peace treaties? Through the instrumentality of the Church? No. Emphatically, No! The voice of History says No; and what is more, God says No. The Scriptures tell us in no uncertain way that the end of the world is cataclysmic. Not by a process of evolution (which is essentially Atheistic) but by the almighty act of God, connected with judgment and renovation, will eternal peace be established. World Peace is not a state or condition of man's creation or a goal of perfect tranquillity attainable by human cooperative effort. It is God's creation; it is an inheritance not bequeathed to the human race, born, living, and dying in sin, and rejecting the overtures of peace as revealed in the Gospel, but given graciously to that cosmopolitan family which is being gathered from all nations, kindreds, peoples, and tongues, by virtue of the great and good Shepherd who laid down His life for His sheep. "AND THOU SHALT CALL HIS NAME WONDERFUL, COUNSELLOR, MIGHTY GOD, EVERLASTING FATHER, PRINCE OF PEACE." "MARANATHA!"

LEAVES

Rose, amber leaves are falling, falling fast,
Sun-dipped, frost-chilled, and soothed by autumn
rains,

Borne gently in the bosom of the winds
To die in flaming beauty on green turf.

The winds are lonely for the summer leaves;
The sadness of the leaves is in their sighs.
The birds are gone now that the leaves are dead.
No leaves, no song, for leaves and song are one
To him who loves the music of the woods,
And finds lost symphonies in all that breathes.

Come, let me rest and dream among the leaves
While yet the mother-tree weeps o'er her dead;
But once before I rest beneath the leaves
And clutch their fragile corpses with pale hands.

The fragrance of the leaves is in my breath;
Rose, amber hues are whirling in my brain.
Soft whisperings, as of lips whose bloom is fled,
Are faintly blown upon my dreaming sense—

'That violets lift their heads where leaves have lain;
And Spring's caress is as the breath of God;
That souls rise from the sod where leaves have lain;
And death is but a leaf that hides a star.'

BASTIAN KRUITHOF.

Our Readers Have the Floor

Voices on War and Peace

New Testament Teaching and War

Especially the article of P. G. Berkhout came to my mind. "There is much in Scripture that has merely historical and pedagogical but not normative value . . . And I am sure that if the writers of the New Testament were living today, they would not so readily write that we must be subject to the higher powers in regard to the imperialistic wars of today."

From the paragraph quoted the New Testament apparently has nothing to say about "going to war". Is it true that Rom. 13, etc., has no principles of normative and permanent value? If so, whence do we get our principles? From "Man" in general? Apparently so, for the author of the article gives a hint: "In our day of universal military service I cannot imagine Jesus or Paul ramming a bayonet through the body of a Christian of one of the nations."

What we "imagine" to be truth will be *the* principle?

This leveling process of General and Special Revelation is deplorable. We are afraid that the author has made an ambiguous statement when he says: "Let us not forget that there is progress in divine revelation, and that God acts pedagogically in Scripture." Does that mean that "divine" (we prefer Divine with a capital D) revelation extends beyond Scripture? Then we are once more on General Revelation ground. And since it concerns principles of truth and conduct, it can only mean that "Man" is capable of discovering these principles by himself and in himself. We would say to our author: "Thou art not far from the kingdom of Thomas Hill Green."

Grand Haven, Mich.

J. G. VAN DYKE.

« « « » »

Voluntary Service and Compulsory Conscription

Bruinooge's statements can be blasted full of holes, and they are void of "chronological" reasoning. Says B., "The entire structure of the Roman Empire was held together by means of the omnipotent mandates of the Roman authorities and the absolute obedience of the legions of the Roman army." So far so good. But I wonder whether B. in all his extensive studies has ever read the footnote which Rousseau placed on one of the pages of his "Social Contract" (Book I, Chapter IV) under the title of "Slavery". It reads as follows: "The Romans, who understood and respected the right of war more than any other nation on earth, carried their scruples on this head so far that a citizen was *not allowed* to serve as a volunteer without engaging himself expressly, and against such and such enemy by name. A legion in which the younger Cato was seeing his first service under Popilius having been reconstructed, the elder Cato wrote to Popilius that, if he wished his son to continue serving under him, he must administer to him a new oath, because, the first having been annulled, he was no longer able to bear arms against the enemy. The same Cato wrote to his son telling him to take great care not to go into battle before taking this new oath." You may notice here the voluntary service under a dire oath in an absolute pagan country in contradistinction with the compulsory conscription and service by "Christian" nations. I may add that it was Blaise Pascal who wrote: "When I kill a person on this side of the river I am called a murderer; should I kill one on the other side I would be called a hero."

Paterson, N. J.

HARRY P. WINSEMIUS.

« « « » »

Civil Law Not Moral Law

The distinction between civil law and moral law and the validity of both should penetrate more into our Christian consciousness, not only that pacifist ideas may not take hold of us, but also that we may be armed against other evils.

It seems that the validity of the civil law with its principle of retaliation, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, is lost sight of in our days. In a meeting I once spoke in favor of capital punishment. A Presbyterian minister disagreed and said that it was against the teaching of Jesus: Jesus says that we must love our enemies and, therefore, we may not kill them. The article of brother Berkhout contains about the same idea, and so do other articles I have read. We also know that the idea of punishment is lacking in our national consciousness . . . Ignoring the law of retaliation in the political sphere of life and substituting for this the moral law with the principle that we have to overcome evil with good, has also another result. It

urges the government not to prepare for war, in order that it may preserve peace. Moreover, when an unprepared nation is involved in war, the government is unable to protect its citizens and there will be much bloodshed and misery which could have been prevented. It is true what a certain negro, who refused to fight in the Civil War, said to his master. In reply to the question of his master, "What would become of our country if they all refused to fight?" he answered, "Then there would be no war, massa." This is perfectly true in itself, but it is an impossibility in this evil world that all men should refuse to fight. History has taught that even the pacifist will fight when he is in danger. We have to figure with realities and not with fictions.

Grand Rapids, Mich.

M. BORDUIN.

« « « » »

Theological Shackles and the New Deal

I see the Fundamentalists, the Literalists, etc., are taking exception to the statement, "What was permissible in Old Testament times and is condoned in the New Testament is not necessarily right today." It is becoming more evident to me from day to day how impossible it is for some of us to remain shackled to the old reactionary group of theologians . . . Who said the Bible is a Fairy Tale? The Editor of the G. R. paper must be sore at the New Deal. I suspect he belongs to the large group of folks who are sitting pretty and did not like the spirit of the New Deal, viz., "A little less for the big fellow and a little more for the little fellow."

Chicago, Ill.

PAUL H. WEZEMAN.

« « « » »

Jeremiah a Dangerous Fellow

In re the article on war I notice Romans XIII is leaned upon rather heavily. Strange to say, no one seems to take into account Jeremiah who told his people not to fight. He was considered a dangerous fellow in his day. I am glad the question has been discussed. It is not settled in my mind. You remember how the Southern preachers defended slavery because Jesus did not condemn it and Paul mentions the system by name. Then, too, we would not excuse a policeman who killed a squealer simply because the captain demanded it. Pacifism is self-contradictory, I think. At the same time a change must take place. What it is, how to bring it about are questions that are bothering me.

Englewood, N. J.

JACOB T. HOOGSTRA.

« « « » »

War and the Ballot Box

I enjoyed the discussion between Dr. Bruinooge and my old friend, Dr. Berkhout. I wondered why neither of them mentioned the responsibility of and the necessity for having good representatives of the people, in order that no arbitrary war shall be declared by the government without it having first consulted the people through their representatives chosen in the legal way.

Zierikzee, Netherlands

J. VAN LONKHUYZEN.

« « « » »

Devilish Butchery

Fundamentalists agree with the Christian Reformed Church leaders that we have to follow the wicked leaders of this world. Even when imperialism leads up into devilish butchery, we have to follow the leader. He is responsible, not we. I consider this the most subtle, devilish thought that Satan has brought forward since Christ's crucifixion.

As a former, drafted man in the Dutch army I have seen and experienced how the devil rules supreme in the heart of Christians when it concerns "the obligation to our government" . . . For me it is written: "Those that take the sword shall perish by the sword", and I obey God rather than men.

Holland, Mich.

D. VELTMAN.

A Calvinistic Political Program

By Henry J. Ryskamp, Ph.D.

(What thoughtful Christian would not welcome an acquaintance with the program of the one successful Calvinistic political party in the world? That party is found in the Netherlands; is known as the Anti-Revolutionary Party; and is headed by Hendrikus Colyn, Dutch Prime Minister and prominent leader in international affairs. Professor Ryskamp in this article gives us an insight into the main features of this Dutch Calvinistic political program by offering an interpretative review of Dr. Colyn's recent commentary on that program entitled, *Saevis Tranquillus in Undis, Toelichting op het Anti-Revolutionair Beginseelprogramma*. — Editor.)

"CALM in the midst of turbulent waters." That was the motto of Prince William of Orange. Unperturbed because guided and guarded, that is the state of mind of one whose assurance is the never changing love of the Almighty. Paul, the apostle, was certain in his conviction that God was with him, confident amidst the severest of trials because he believed in the providence of God, and he could rest himself in the performance of God's will. His tranquility is difficult for us to equal, but, creatures and children of the same Lord we can with the same assurance be calm no matter what befalls us today.

Such a peace of mind does not, however, mean an attitude of abject submission to blind fate, does not mean resignation, inactivity. A Paul aboard ship at sea hears the reassuring words that those in great peril because of storm will be saved, but he himself uses every means to accomplish that end. So, paradoxically perhaps, the peace of mind of the Christian is a peace that comes from doing, a doing in the belief that what is done in accordance with the eternal verities of God will have God's blessing. Believing, knowing, doing!

What disturbs millions upon millions today is a situation that is so largely beyond the control of one individual, and that, therefore, involves vast organizations such as our economic institutions and the state. In such a situation the individual desires to know what should be done in order that he may discriminate between right and wrong economics and political action. What he needs is a guide to action, and, if possible, such organization as will make his feeble efforts when joined with those of many others more effective.

Such organization has been effected in some of the countries of the world, a noteworthy instance of a successful effort being that of the Anti-Revolutionary party in the Netherlands which has brought together Christians for training and action in political, and thus also in social and economic life. At present writing the man whom Queen Wilhelmina looks to to hold the Netherlands ship of state on an even keel is Dr. Hendrikus Colyn, a leader of this Calvinistic political party. The puzzled citizens of any country may well peruse the statement and the explanation of the aims and policies of the Anti-Revolutionary party by this internationally known leader. According to Time, August 12, 1935, the queen insists that her country "stands for sanity". The sane and sound views of Colyn should stand as a challenge to Christians throughout the world.

Divine Sovereignty and Human Authority

The chief tenet of Calvinism, at least so far as state activity is concerned, is the sovereignty of God. God with all the attributes that He has revealed to us is the center of life and man must constantly live as in

His presence, and own Him Lord. The world of God's creatures is not an atomistic one but one organic whole. Mankind is biologically one, as descended from one original pair, and also mentally, spiritually (in the broader sense) one, as our knowledge of man and of God's word attests. Each individual is unique but he attains to this uniqueness only in the God-appointed relation with his fellows. The Calvinist opposes, therefore, the individualism of the French revolution which denies God as master and does not recognize the true nature of man's dependence upon his fellows. The Calvinist recognizes man as a sinner and, therefore, repudiates that conception of the individual which, in socialism and other isms leads to the conclusion that man by means of his own organizations can radically change human nature. He does, however, recognize the need of co-operation not only of individuals, but also of the various organizations which man through God's grace has effected, for he believes that all these together constitute one organic whole which must be so ordered as to enable man the better to serve and glorify his Creator. The Calvinist thus bases his views squarely upon the Word of God, recognizes the nature of man and society, and further recognizes God's guidance in the course of history and present day events. He is, as Colyn characterizes John Calvin, realistically minded and knows that changing conditions and increasing knowledge mean changing relationships among the various parts of the whole body politic, and, therefore, require changes in human organizations.

So far as authority in this world is concerned, God is Sovereign and all authority is delegated by Him. God in His grace has instituted the authority necessary in this sinful world to enable men to live together. He, however, has also given to men their rights, and their freedom. The state is, therefore, bound to exercise its authority in accordance with God's laws, and, further to recognize the freedom, the rights of the individual. God is Sovereign, it must be remembered, not in a remote sense as if He must be recognized through the people but directly, immediately. Both rulers and the ruled must acknowledge God. The ruled may, however, also exercise control over the rulers, for in this sinful world rulers are not free from breaches of the right any more than are the ruled. Therefore the Calvinist insists upon the right of the people, through regularly constituted organs, to check their sovereigns.

The State

The state is not established from above without any relation to life. It involves rather an organic development, to wit, from family, tribe, large community, to the state, and, therefore, in the representation of the people in the government this organic nature of the whole as represented in its parts must also be

preserved. The Anti-Revolutionary party under the tutelage of such men as Dr. A. Kuyper and Dr. Colyn believes in a political organization in which these smaller units shall be represented. In this political organization it is the head of the family, or one who performs a similar function, who should have the right to vote. In addition to such political organization and voting Colyn believes there should be representation on the basis of social functions or occupations. Alongside of the regular political bodies there would then be industrial councils, agricultural councils, professional councils, etc., and in these each mature individual whether male or female would be permitted to vote according to his calling in life. Because there is no such distinction made at present he believes it is no more than right since the state is called upon to function in regard to so many economic and social matters concerning women that women should also have the vote. The conception of the individual as the unit of the state rather than the family he condemns, but he admits that there is little possibility of a change in the near future. This distinction between political and functional representation may seem academic and hair-splitting to us in the United States, but the idea of functional representation in a world that is as complex as ours is not only proof of an awareness of the vital relationship that exists between the various aspects of life and that should be respected by the government but also of historical-mindedness and of practical good sense. Carrying this into effect is, however, another matter.

No Concentration of Power

This practical-mindedness of the Dutch Calvinists is brought out in their attitude toward the form of the state. The particular form a state takes depends upon time and circumstances. Switzerland, for example, is a democracy, the Netherlands a limited monarchy. It is not the form of the state but the essence of the relation between the government and God and between the government and the people that counts. In many respects the form may change. Therefore, also, Colyn does not regard it essential that a constitution be either written or unwritten. Whether the one or the other he believes it should be flexible, should change, but, as in the case of the Netherlands and of the United States, he prefers that constitutional amendment require a special procedure, be not undertaken too hastily. He is opposed to too much democracy and, therefore, opposes such measures as the referendum as impracticable, and as confusing too much the role of ruler and the ruled. On the other hand he is even more strongly opposed to fascism and any similar concentration of power.

Believing firmly that each of the basic institutions of human life has its own sphere and function the Calvinist does not permit any one, the state for example, to dominate others and interfere with what is essentially the function of the others. Lines are, of course, difficult to draw but he does not believe in the government's determining what the religion of the people shall be. He would be opposed to such interference with church and family life as has taken place in Russia. Regulation in the interest of public morality and in the interest of general welfare and culture is, however, necessary. On this ground the

Calvinist not only permits the state to undertake the task of education (which he believes to be the task of the families, and therefore of private initiative) but insists that certain forms of special education, that of the blind and of the deaf, for instance, and of higher education be undertaken by the government.

Centralization vs. Decentralization

The moot question of centralization or de-centralization is also answered in the light of the party's emphasis on the organic nature of society. Regarding the nation as having developed from and as composed of families, small communities, provinces, etc., Colyn believes that due consideration must be given to the functions of each of these, that local autonomy must be safeguarded, that cultural differences must not be sacrificed in the interest of dead uniformity. This is evidence of his appreciation of God's guiding influence in history, evidence also of his appreciation of the practical advantage of not attempting to do all the governing from one center. To one whose background is American, where there is so little of the historical tradition and of cultural difference some of this emphasis seems strange. In the interest of a wholesome variegated life it is perhaps sound. Certainly such autonomy as Colyn would grant local communities and provinces in obtaining finances and even in owning utilities where these become natural monopolies is evidence of the appreciation of the value of division of function and of labor. On this matter of decentralization he points out, however, that there must not be so much decentralization as to encourage unwarranted centralization as a reaction. On this, as on other practical matters, he warns against taking a "doctrinaire" stand.

Throughout his book (*Toelichting op het Anti-Revolutionair Beginselprogramma*) Colyn insists that the sphere of influence of the state must be limited to such an extent that it does not, generally, curb individual initiative. He believes that there is danger that the government may directly weaken individual initiative by too freely supporting its citizens by charity, and more indirectly by the way in which it manages its other affairs. Therefore he contends that the government must always strive to balance its budget, and so limit expenditures that individuals do not come to look to the government for satisfactions that they should provide for themselves. The government should also be careful in its borrowing. Borrowing and thus making expenditures outside of what is provided for in the budget Colyn would regard as permissible only when the government is making self-liquidating acquisitions such as public utilities or when, as in the present emergency, it borrows to help the unemployed. In doing this, however, he believes the general rule should be this, that each generation should meet its own obligations. Careful regard for the hard lessons of the past leads him to offer such sound advice.

Social Legislation

The discussion of the party's stand on social legislation is based on the belief that the second part of the summary of God's Law must be emphasized as well as the first. Colyn contends that, with the rapid development of large scale production and the rapid

increase in population, new problems have arisen. The appearance of these problems in their acute form he attributes first, to the fact that the old order did not change quickly enough because the leaders refused to see the need of change, and, secondly, to the influence of the anti-christian individualism that emanated from the philosophy that dominated the French revolution. One is inclined to wonder, with him, why it was that more voices did not rise, in the past, to oppose these wrong developments. The free competition desired by the *laissezfaire* school he insists makes both employer and employee unfree. He condemns both economic liberalism and socialism as springing from the same root, anti-christian individualism. Both the individual free to act as he pleases and the individual whom society can supposedly completely remake because he is innately good he considers as unjustifiable abstractions. Society, he repeats, is an organism. Scripture, he insists, honors the personality of the individual, but also emphasizes the need of cooperation. To effect the latter government assistance and even government compulsion is frequently necessary. In this connection he states that the sphere of governmental activity must not be too greatly limited for the weak must be protected. Nor does he believe that governmental activity in this regard must be negative, the mere fighting of evils, but as he states, Dr. A. Kuyper also believed, positive, the prevention of evils and the promotion of the general welfare. As if anticipating that this may be regarded as socialistic he insists that government activity must not be confused with state socialism according to which all of society exists solely for the state. He believes the Anti-Revolutionary party may take pride in the fact that it has helped to give the Netherlands a measure of social legislation which causes the Netherlands to stand out among the countries of the world in this regard. That this means some change in the economic system he regards as evident. Scripture, he avers, does not furnish the system but the abiding principles, and these must be applied even though conditions change and systems change their form.

Industrial Organization and Social Insurance

Colyn is convinced that the nature of industrial relations today demands organization on the part of labor and on the part of the employers. Such organization should, however, he believes, lead to voluntary cooperation between the two parties to production. They should come to terms concerning hours, working conditions, wages, etc. He writes approvingly of regulations for the building trades, and certain other industries that remind one of the regulations desired when the N. R. A. was first introduced. His firm conviction is that such regulations should be made within industry. Where, however, employers and employees do not voluntarily come to terms the government may impose such.

Social insurance he regards as an accepted fact. Accidents, ill health, old age are conditions that the laborer may not be permitted to face without the necessities of life, and must not have to face with the idea of having to receive charity. Colyn not only believes social insurance advisable but believes it must be made compulsory if the dangers which threaten labor are to be forecome. He approves of government

support because at present it is necessary, but believes that government assistance should decrease rather than increase. Outright government pensions he disapproves. This is consistent with his general position that the state should not weaken individual initiative. Insurance does not destroy nor even weaken this, but outright pensions, he fears, will. In general, then, the government must encourage, help, and if necessary support with funds the cooperation of men in industry to give to each what he should have, a decent livelihood.

Free Trade and Internationalism

God in His providence has not only determined that one geographical area can best produce one good and others other goods, but He also wills that men shall help each other toward the fullest utilization of the productive powers of the earth. Protection, as the student of economics knows, tends to prevent the attainment of this goal. Only when absolutely necessary to defend a people against unfairness on the part of others is Colyn willing to permit the use of protective tariffs. He is, quite consistently, as his insistence on the organic nature of all of society would lead one to believe, an advocate of the principle of free trade.

A firm believer in nationalism on practical historical, cultural, and scriptural grounds, he is opposed, as he believes Scripture is, to any attempt at the formation of a world state. But he does wholeheartedly support the attempt of nations to get together, and he, therefore, endorses the League of Nations, deploring the fact that nations such as ours have not yet entered it. For him such entrance is a moral obligation, notwithstanding the weaknesses and failures of the league.

To summarize: In the platform of the Anti-Revolutionary party as elucidated by Colyn certain ideas stand out. These are the sovereignty of God, and the complete dependence of man; the organic nature of society, and, thus, the interdependence of men; the fact of sin and the frustration of perfect relations among men, the necessity, therefore, of effecting such cooperation as through the grace of God we can; the necessity of cooperation which, through leadership, even that of the state, may be enjoined upon men; the necessity of honoring personality, and, therefore only such a measure of enforced cooperation or interference with the individual as will enable society as a whole best to serve God.

The Gold Standard

Dr. Colyn's book is written for the average party member, and, therefore, does not delve into some of the more highly theoretical questions of political science, economics, and sociology, nor does he bore his reader with technical discussions that may be beyond the reader's understanding. That he does, however, have a real grasp of these subjects his discussion of international affairs reveals. He is, as current news items inform us, still a strong adherent of the gold standard, and still opposed to relaxing very much his insistence upon free trade. Not that he believes gold in itself is to be revered, or that the value of money may not be controlled; his stand is based, rather, on the fact that gold standards have in the last few years so generally been left because

of disturbed trade relations brought on, as he believes, by wrong tariff policies. For the Netherlands simply to follow suit would not improve matters. He hopes that the world may soon return to sanity on the matter of international trade, and realize the utter necessity of stabilization of currencies at some fixed ratio to gold if world trade is to be restored.

Absolute Faith in God

The American reader will be struck by this Dutch writer's absolute faith in God, by his constant references to Divine ordinances, by his sense of perspective which is the product of his respect for Divine guidance in history, therefore, by his positiveness, conviction, and courage. He will see that in him fundamental principles become meaningful through an ex-

ceedingly well trained and well-informed mind, in a life lived close to reality. One's great respect for Colyn will completely outweigh the significance of any queries that may arise because of his obvious respect for class distinctions, his distrust of very great dependence upon democracy, his insistence upon limited monarchy for the Netherlands. His perspective may be truer than ours. And he, himself, is fair-minded, insisting that allowances be made for differences of opinion on matters that are not fundamental.

Willing to be guided by the eternal principles of God's word, being realistic in facing every new development, using every available bit of knowledge, Colyn and his party may well choose Prince William of Orange's motto, printed on Colyn's book, *Saevis Tranquillus in Undis*.

Rembrandt, Vermeer, Frans Hals - Three Decades

By H. J. G. Van Andel, A.M.

AMERICA has recently passed through three distinct decades. There was, first, a decade of energetic strife. Then came one of false prosperity. And now we are living in the decade of new hope.

It is remarkable that these decades are also reflected in the American appreciation of old Dutch artists. The decade of struggle was devoted to Rembrandt. The decade of victory to Vermeer and De Hooch. The decade of new life belongs to Frans Hals.

There was a time that Americans thought the world of Rembrandt. This was shortly after the bi-centennial of Rembrandt's birth in 1906. In these days we still believed that America was only another name for opportunity, and every one worked hard to reach his self-appointed goal. In those days the middle class was getting on top, and the lower classes were reaching out for liberty. There was faith in the conquest of material forces. There was faith in spiritual values. America was still church-going. The press and the public school were still under the New England spell. So we believed in the contemplation, in the mystery, in the profundity of Rembrandt. We felt that life was worth more than death. We were living in the last hour of the colonial period with its belief in simplicity, in goodness, in decency, in self-restraint, in eternal verities, the heritage of Puritan days.

Then came the decade of false prosperity. The war turned everything upside down. We lost our sense of proportion. We discarded old-fashioned morality. We broke loose from our moorings. The new weeklies stimulated fresh thinking. The old monthlies cast out the old fogies, and let young editors publish anything that sounded radical. We were to be ourselves. We were to bring democracy and mass production to the rest of the nations. We were to do some independent thinking and goad the world on to new experiments. We built towering skyscrapers. We projected magnificent skylines. We threw aside our old outfit and we dressed up like kings. We began to fill the roads with autos, the homes with radios. We established universities, museums, and art galleries. We set the pace for the universe in style and show.

These were the days that Vermeer was called a bigger artist than Rembrandt. And after Vermeer, his

twin brother De Hooch, came in for his share. They are the painters of sunshine, of brilliant contrast, of rainbow-hues, of plein-air, of the rhythm of light and dark, of the lust for life. They proclaim the full-orbed vision. They tell their admirers that it is good to enjoy the conveniences and luxuries; that it is excellent to forget your troubles; that it pays to be optimistic, and that it is best to smile, and to laugh off your worries. There is no struggle, no pain, no tragedy in Vermeer and De Hooch. They are the painters of ecstasy and of the exuberant life.

Now that we are passing through one of the greatest crises in our national life we begin to turn to the pioneers of our history. We admire the qualities of honesty, straightforwardness, indomitable courage, heroism in the face of death, tenacity in the midst of adversities, genuine optimism based on character, experience and religion. We are trying to rid ourselves of bluff and insincerity, we are campaigning for decency and clean movies, we are spending thousands upon thousands of dollars to destroy the kingdom of the gangsters and the racketeers, we are sobering down to the facts of every day life. We are even paying our tribute to the semi-orthodoxy of Barth. We believe that we have our ups and downs in life, and that we need them to make real progress.

To this new spirit corresponds the cult of Frans Hals. He was the first painter to break with the Italian technique of central light, and to disclose the simple fact that the forming of a picture means sacrifice of detail in the circumference. He was also the first one to strip human nature of all mediaeval conventions and to depict man as he is. But above all he had an eye for the qualities of the pioneer. His figures are active, self-assertive, brave, peppy, unafraid of adversity and criticism, open-minded, straightforward, spontaneous, enterprising. He reveals the spirit of people who are ready to start a new civilization, and ready, if necessary, to cross the ocean to start a new life. He calls us back to the Dutch colonizers of our greatest American city. He calls us back to ourselves, and reminds us of the invincible ancestors of our nation. It is refreshing and encouraging to gaze at his works, to absorb their humanity, free from mediaeval inhibitions, and brimful of the Calvinistic love for liberty!

Reformed Preaching

By Peter A. Hockstra

IT IS well for us of the pulpit at times to critically examine our own preaching to see in how far it conforms to the Biblical standard and it will not hurt any of us occasionally to become keenly aware of how far we still are from the high mark of our holy calling to be Ministers of the Word of God.

Reformed preaching is not at every point different from all other preaching. It need not become odd or queer in order to be truly Reformed. A Reformed sermon need not always be divided into three points even though all Gaul was divided into three parts. It need not necessarily be divided into any points, as firstly, secondly, thirdly, *ad infinitum*. It may be pointless and in spite of that be very pointed. It need not have an application attached as a caboose and yet it may be applicatory all the way through. It need not be constantly attacking 16th and 17th century foes. It need not be distinguishable from other preaching by its provincialism, or by its excessive intellectualism or by certain prevailing stock phrases or certain pulpit mannerisms or by a dozen other oddities that are patiently waiting for some humorous cartoonist to picture to us for our edification and entertainment.

Yet Reformed preaching should be just as distinctive as the Reformed view of religion and of life is distinctive. In distinction from Roman Catholic and Episcopal groups which are sacramentarian and ritualistic, the Reformed group places the preaching in the emphatic center of worship. In distinction from the Lutheran view that emphasizes the soteriological, the Reformed view emphasizes the theological approach. In distinction from the traditional Baptist and Methodist and present day undenominational preaching that emphasizes the narrowly evangelistic phase of the gospel, Reformed preaching emphasizes the whole truth in its significance for the totality of life. Over against the Modernist emphasis which is humanistic and naturalistic, the Reformed type emphasizes the theistic and the supernatural.

I

Let me therefore single out as the first salient feature of Reformed preaching an element that is easily suggested by the salient feature of our Reformed view. Truly Reformed preaching is such preaching as is interpenetrated and transfigured by the consciousness, at once humbling and inspiring, of standing in the presence of the Infinite and Eternal God. As Warfield has very beautifully said, "the Calvinist is the man who has seen God, and who, having seen God in His glory, is filled on the one hand with a sense of his own unworthiness to stand in God's sight, as a creature, and much more as a sinner, and on the other with adoring wonder that nevertheless this God is a God who receives sinners."

Now it requires a man who is at heart Reformed, of course, to be a distinctively Reformed preacher and the preaching of such a man will be baptized in the consciousness of God's presence. His pulpit work will share with the rest of his life the inspiration and power that come from that trembling, sensitive consciousness. There will be something of the atmosphere of heaven about his preaching. His approach will be

dominated by a holy reverence that will lift him up above the unworthy, the sordid, the cheap, the low-toned, the purely mundane. His supreme passion will be to lift his congregation with all its daily needs, its problems and temptations up into the presence of the Ineffable One.

This position of the Reformed preacher gives him standing ground, leverage, vision, and a horizon bounded by heaven and eternity. Moreover, courage and fearlessness come with vision. He will never consent to becoming a cowardly servant of a totalitarian state nor will he yield to the threat of a political or ecclesiastical dictator. He will be saved from the temptation of bidding for popularity, of selling his ministerial birthright for a mess of pottage. He moves in the atmosphere of utmost freedom. His is the inspiration of a prophet.

So, in a word, the primary distinctive feature of Reformed preaching is its God-consciousness, its conscious standing in the living, throbbing presence of the holy and infinite God, its vivid sense of the reality and the centrality of God, its consuming passion to lift the audience into the Presence of His sublime Majesty.

II

In the second place there follows easily, almost as a corollary, from the foregoing what I should like to single out as a second distinctive feature of Reformed preaching, namely the supreme emphasis upon the sovereignty of God. This emphasis will lie at the foundation of his thinking and be in the radiant center of his preaching. Because he wishes to magnify God as God in everything, he will ascribe salvation from beginning to end to the grace of God. He will give the Biblical doctrine of predestination its proper place and emphasis not as a formative principle but as a means to the end that the sovereignty of God's grace in the salvation of sinners and of the world may be safeguarded. For the same reason he will emphasize properly the doctrine of the supernatural character of regeneration and faith and conversion and of the definite design of the Atonement. In fact all the so-called five points of Calvinism will serve not as ultimate ends but as means to the end of emphasizing the sovereignty of the God of saving grace, that God may be God in all our thinking and willing and feeling.

In such preaching there will be no room left for the praise of man or for the glory of human achievement. There will be no sympathy whatsoever with all those compromising schemes of salvation wherein God and man share the field. Wherein the salvation of man is made to depend ultimately on the free will of man rather than on the sovereign will of God. Rather their purpose will be to smite the sinner down and bring him to a consciousness of his own utter helplessness and of the sufficiency and efficiency of the grace of God in Christ Jesus. True Reformed preaching will proclaim the poverty and bankruptcy of the sinner and of the sinridden world and the inexhaustible resources of an infinite God of love. It will not induce the hearer to say at the end of the service: "What a fine sermon!" but rather "What a great God!"

Yet, here too there will be balance as well as emphasis. That is to say, the emphasis on the solemn responsibility of man will be commensurate with the emphasis on the sovereignty of God. There will not be lacking the appeal to active expression of all the innate and acquired powers of man in response to the call of the sovereign God, whose right it is to be obeyed. Such preaching will not be intellectualistic. It will be far removed from cold dogmatism. It will pulsate with the warmth of a stirred emotion and vibrate with the energy of a mighty dynamic. An emphasis on predestination which leaves God's people in the attitude of an easy, helpless passivism is not Reformed. Our Reformed fathers put the doctrine of predestination into such vital relation with the rest of truth and life that it became a central and irresistible driving power for energetic and victorious living.

Or again, to put the same truth in another frame, Reformed preaching will give primacy to the mighty doctrine of the transcendence, the sovereign Kingship of God, as over against the Lutheran and Romish and Modernistic, pantheizing emphases, and as over against every tendency to reduce God to the size of a democratic constitutional ruler, or to an oversized servant, a daddy, a Santa Claus, a pale, anemic copy of a God but out of which all of majesty and holiness and judgment has evaporated.

III

As a third distinctive feature of Reformed preaching may be mentioned the note of objective, divine authority, the profound conviction and convincing proclamation, "God hath spoken", "To the Law and to the testimony! if they speak not according to this word, surely there is no morning for them." The Reformed preacher wishes to walk in the footsteps of his Master who spoke with authority and not as the Sadducees, Scribes, and Pharisees.

Even as the ancient Sadducees, so, too, do their modern and Modernist children abhor the note of external authority. They substitute the subjective authority of individual or collective religious experience.

Over against all these, your Reformed preaching holds firmly and faithfully to the divinity of the Word of God and therefore emphasizes the authoritative character of its content but in the presentation of its message also strives to do justice to the organic unity and progressive character of the Revelation of God as we find it recorded in Holy Writ.

Not that Christian experience should have nothing to say, or that the Reformed preacher will be purely, one-sidedly objective. There will also be a certain note of subjectivity, but on the basis of the objective. He will strive to let the objective truth of the Word of God go through his own warm, living, Christian soul-experience as he brings its message to the people. It will come from the Word of God, but through the fire of his own spirit. There will be an experiential note in his preaching. The preaching from the Heidelberg Catechism will afford an abundance of examples. For it is very largely cast into the mold of the subjective approach on the basis of the objective truth.

And may I add as a corollary under this head that the Reformed preacher will conscientiously avoid such topical preaching as virtually reduces the text to a springboard, or a convenient hook to hang the sermon

on. He will refuse to be occupied with the ephemeral topics of the day. Instead of using the text as a pretext, he will emphasize the context because the Word of God is one, indivisible whole. He will know the value of the larger background that comes from seeing the organic unity of divine revelation.

And may I add, as a second corollary, that Reformed preaching, because it is authoritative, will not hesitate to be doctrinal. It will not attempt to avoid all controversy in typical American style but, with all due allowance for human relativity, will be ready to stand for the defense of the eternal truth. It will always seek to advance the triumph of the truth rather than to have peace at any price. It will seek to gather all the light that the Holy Spirit has shed abroad out of the Word in the consciousness of the Church throughout the centuries and in that light it will try to see the truth. On the one hand it will not share the anti-traditional spirit of Undenominationalism in its disrespect for the historic creeds of the church and on the other hand it will always be looking for more light to break forth from the Word of God.

IV

I would add as a fourth distinctive feature of Reformed preaching its emphasis on the Covenant of Grace, its covenant conception and its covenant method.

While the covenant of grace in the last analysis is altogether divinely arranged and divinely conditioned so that it is a sovereign testament of the Triune God, in its revelation and realization it is humanly mediated and in all covenants there are contained two parts and two parties. God realizes His purpose of grace and His plan of election and salvation by the way of the historical covenant of grace. That makes Reformed preaching covenant preaching. The children of believers are also included in the church and therefore Reformed preaching, together with its complement, the Catechism class, is directed toward them also. The Ministry of the Word is in a large measure a teaching ministry. Its method is educational. Not that by the method of teaching hearts are changed, nor that in the modernist sense all man needs is religious education, as though regeneration and conversion were not necessary. This modernistic position amounts to a sublimated legalism. Reformed preaching includes a healthy evangelism, and emphasis on the need of regeneration and conversion. It is not a method that automatically works regeneration and conversion but requires the definite call to conversion. However, its appeal is not only on the general basis of the gospel offer but of the specific covenant promise to covenant children.

V

A fifth distinctive feature of Reformed preaching that should be emphasized is its presentation of a full-orbed gospel which includes in their proper order and relationship the two elements of the Saviorhood and the Lordship of Jesus Christ, the gospel that proclaims Jesus as Lord.

There are those on the one hand who incline to emphasize almost exclusively the Saviorhood of Jesus. That is the primary Lutheran emphasis. That, too, is the emphasis of historic Methodism and Baptism and of the present day Pre-millenarian, Unde-

nominal movement. As a result it is narrowly evangelistic, almost exclusively soteriological.

There is, on the other hand, naturalistic, humanistic modernism that lays stress exclusively on the Lordship of Jesus Christ quite apart from His Saviorhood. In its view Christianity simply consists in proclaiming the Lordship of Jesus and following His example, pervading His spirit, carrying out His program.

The former of these two positions proclaims the basis, the dynamic starting point. The latter announces only the superstructure, the fruit.

It is the peculiar emphasis of Reformed preaching to present both together and in their logical relation and organic unity.

Reformed preaching is evangelical in the narrower sense and doctrinal in the teaching of the way of salvation. But it also stresses the way of gratitude. It is truly ethical. It is both at once. It believes in preaching the Law as the will of God for our Christian life and Christianity as a way of living and Christian faith as the dynamic for a new life in Christ Jesus. It publishes salvation but it also "saith unto Zion, 'Thy God reigneth.'" And the organic unity of the two elements in the Reformed message keeps it from becoming antinomian and anabaptistic on the one hand and legalistic and nomistic on the other. It proclaims Christianity as a mighty ethic rooted in the vital, fertile soil of redeeming grace.

VI

As a sixth feature may I add an element that virtually is a corollary of the feature just stressed. I refer to the fact that Reformed preaching emphasizes the heavenly Lordship of Jesus Christ over the whole span of our earthly life. His Kingdom is the Kingdom of heaven. Its center and seat is in the heavenlies. But it is being established on this earth and realized in the various relationships of the natural life. Here again it is the balanced and related emphasis on these two seemingly divergent phases that constitutes at once the glory and the problem of Reformed preaching.

The Roman Catholic Church strives to bring the whole realm of the natural under the control of the church and for the rest allows the dualism of the spiritual and the natural, the higher, heavenly order and the lower, mundane order to remain side by side unrelated. Historical Methodism and Lutheranism emphasize the heavenly other-worldly character of the Christian religion, while they allow the so-called secular life-task of the week days, the earthly calling, to run its own course. Anabaptism has always looked down with disdain upon the interest of earth, maintaining an antithesis between nature and grace. It has been the glory of Reformed preaching to approach an integration of nature and grace on the basis of the fact that this world is God's world, that Christ is Creator as well as Redeemer, that Christ came to redeem God's world, that He is the Cosmic Christ.

The starting point of Reformed thinking and preaching is other-worldly even as Christ's Kingdom is heavenly and God's people are a heavenly people and our citizenship is in heaven. In that respect it differs radically from the Modernist, naturalist-mentality that denies the antithesis of grace and takes its position in this world and considers one world at a time quite enough to be concerned with and hopes to build this present world into a city of God.

Heaven is very definitely within the horizon of the vision of the Reformed preacher. The consciousness of the reality of eternity has always been a dominant factor in Reformed thinking and living. The Reformed preacher is constantly bringing his people before the judgment bar of God and he leads his people to look at life *sub specie aeternitatis*.

But Reformed preaching, whenever it has been true to its position, has never encouraged the believers to fix their eye upon the other-worldly, the heavenly, the age to come in such a way as to lead them to withdraw from the tasks and the problems of this present world. It has always been opposed to withdrawal from this world's life, however evil. Its emphasis has been and is on the fact that we are saved from this evil world not simply to wait for Christ from heaven but to serve the interests of Christ meanwhile on earth. The Kuyperian slogan, which was really a holy war cry, "Pro Rege," "make Christ King in every sphere of life," was not a new interpretation of Calvinism but the restatement in pointed fashion of a principle of action that Calvin himself applied in old Geneva. Christianity in the Reformed preaching is not simply a fire escape but a mighty challenge, a holy crusade and an heroic faith-venture. It is not negative and passive simply so far as present living is concerned, but definitely positive and aggressive, not a fleeing from the natural but a regeneration of the natural and a subjection of it to serve the interests of the Kingdom of heaven. As Bavinck says, Christianity is not only a conversion from sin but also a reconversion to the natural.

VII

In the seventh place may I finally add in just one word without enlarging upon it, that one of the distinctive features of Reformed preaching is its emphasis upon the social implications of the Gospel of the Saviorhood and Lordship of Jesus Christ, an emphasis which easily follows from the immediately foregoing. For if Christ is Lord over all, the social relations can hardly be left out.

In conclusion, may I say that I am well aware of it that I have been presenting an ideal that none of us have begun adequately to realize in practice. We preachers, too, have feet that are of clay. Our treasure we have in earthen vessels. We have not yet attained. But we shall continue to press on. We shall continue to learn from the Word of God, from the Spirit of God in the Word, in us, in the Church and in the humblest saint with whom we may have fellowship. We shall, also, continue to learn from our critics. So shall we move on toward perfection, inspired by the consciousness that ours peculiarly is a message, in the living, throbbing heart of which is Christ and Him crucified and the circumference of which is determined by the cosmic Christ, — a message, therefore, that is infinitely rich, profoundly deep, gloriously broad, touching the sacred but also the secular, covering the church but as well the rest of life, Sunday and week-days, emphasizing the heartlife but also the whole outer realm, reaching down to hell and up to heaven, into the heart's living center and the sacred precincts of the home and out to the ends of the earth and the uttermost bounds of the boundless universe, reaching back into the eternal counsel of peace and on and on into the eternity before us of the new heaven and the new earth.

Ethiopia in the Shadows

By John A. Cremer, M. D.

(This article came from Addis Ababa under date of August 20. Dr. Cremer is a Medical Missionary with the American Mission Hospital at Ethiopia's capital. In the accompanying letter he writes: "I consider it a great privilege to be in Ethiopia at this crucial period of her metamorphosis into a modern nation (or shall it be a mandated territory?). The capital is astir with newspaper men from America, England, and Continental Europe at present." — *Editor.*)

THE darkest period in the long and illustrious history of Ethiopia lies just before us. Though the beginnings of Ethiopia as a nation are lost in antiquity it is certain that this noble race can number twice as many thousands of years as our country can hundreds. While nations rose and fell she has maintained her national integrity largely because high mountain barriers have kept invaders out and in the last 1500 years the integrating influence of Christianity resulted in a common front of resistance against inundation by Mohammedanism. Much of Africa owes it to Ethiopia that the forces of Islam did not sweep all of that great continent.

Only in the last few decades have Western nations been concerned with or about Ethiopia. In the mad scramble for Africa by European powers Ethiopia is the only extensive territory to preserve its independence. It is to the late king, Menelik, that she owes the creation of the modern Empire of Ethiopia and nearly doubling of her territories, to a size as large as Germany and France together. Her continued independence was not expected by the great powers and a Tripartite Treaty was actually made to divide the spoil after she should fall apart due to internal dissensions among warring chieftains, a condition which had obtained for over a century before Menelik. Had the powers concerned not been preoccupied with war in Europe in 1913 at the death of Menelik and at which time the present emperor was appointed regent for the aged empress, the terms of the Tripartite Treaty might have been put into effect.

But the regent had no intention of letting this venerable kingdom fall prey to the avarice of Europe. A man of intense patriotism, of broad outlook, an inquiring mind, and endowed with tireless industry he admitted the backwardness of his country, born of milleniums of isolation. But he was resolved that it should not always be so. When in 1930 Tafari Makonnen was crowned Haile Selassie I, Emperor of Ethiopia, the opportunity had come. The Abuna Matteos, Archbishop of the Coptic Church, and opposed to progress in any form, had died, as had many others of the old guard. As regent, the king had already encouraged mission schools of all denominations and had established and equipped a school for boys out of his personal funds. He realized that his reforms would require a nucleus of young men to form a "civil service" of the future. It is said that he sent about 600 students to Europe for University and professional training, as doctors, lawyers, engineers, etc. A special Education Tax was levied on customs. All of these educational ventures he followed with close personal contact and interest.

When we think of Ethiopia in the family of nations we must not expect her to measure up to the standard of Northern Europe. Surrounded by deserts and hostile peoples and finding economic sufficiency in the green uplands of her beautiful interior, she has developed and maintained a national life peculiar to herself. All that is Western is absent in a wholly Ethiopian community. One thing that is highly developed among Western nations, probably largely due to our so-called progress, and which is almost absent in Ethiopia, is discontent. Ethiopians appear to be the happiest and most contented people imaginable, though direst poverty exists here alongside of abounding affluence. After reviewing the "Century of Progress" expositions of 1933-34, which were pointed to as an index of our development in material things, and when realizing how much godlessness, discontent and strife obtains among civilized nations, we wonder what real progress is after all. Ethiopia received the Christian religion in about the fifth century. Although this ancient form of Christianity is limited to only a small favored class, she has maintained the light she has received undimmed for 1500 years. Western nations with all their progress in material things have all but sold their birthright in their spiritual heritage. Italy herself is an example of an "enlightened" nation.

In the short period of contact with civilized nations many reforms have been put into effect in Ethiopia by her far-sighted ruler. She has been made a united nation, with many dissimilar elements and provinces now giving allegiance to the emperor. Parliamentary government has been established and a constitution promulgated. Splendid efforts are being made in education and results are very promising. A National Bank has been established, new currency introduced to replace the cumbersome heavy silver dollars formerly used exclusively. New roads are being built, the capital city is being modernized, and the whole financial structure has been altered. Wireless communication now connects the capital with the provinces and the outside world.

But Italy's contention is that the pace is too slow, that Ethiopia is backward, a drag on civilization, unable and unfit to govern herself, an embarrassment to her neighbors. As a means of attaining to that progress Ethiopia must be subjected to the tutelage of an enlightened power and Italy believes she must shoulder that task herself, alone. If Italy were really concerned about the backwardness of Ethiopia could she not co-operate with the council of the League of Nations to evolve some scheme for helping Emperor Haile Selassie in his task of promoting the advancement of the country?

If war comes the King will lead his people to battle as a united people, fighting in a cause in which the whole world will recognize that right is on their side. It is a strong appeal to the world's instinct of fair play.

Science and Religion - Complementary

By John B. Schoolland, A. M.

FRIEND, what is your opinion of immortality? I do not mean your personal opinion, I mean your scientific opinion." This question was put to me recently by one of my colleagues. It is by no means uncommon to hear a question put in this manner, but it is interesting because of its implications.

It implies, first of all, that one may entertain two sets of opinions, personal and scientific, and that these may be, and quite possibly are, incompatible with one another. Further, granting this probability, you are delicately assured that your intellectual privacy will not be violated — that a purely objective consideration of the question will spare you possible embarrassment. And, finally, you are implicitly reminded that while personal opinion may be a potent and a legitimate factor in the privacy of your own thinking, the only *rational* basis of expression involves opinions you might reasonably be expected to entertain on the commonly accepted ground of science.

On the very face of it, such a form of questioning is unsatisfactory. It not only suggests insincerity but implies intellectual dishonesty and duplicity as well. As though it could be *scientific* to have a "compartmental" mind, entertaining incompatible views of Truth, each as a true and complete unit, the one representing personal (possibly religious!), and the other scientific opinion! Still further, it is unsatisfactory because it implies an antithetical relationship.

The Reality of Apparent Antithesis

Casual introspection reveals the common frequency of intellectual dilemmas in all of us. Any one who has attempted to stimulate thought and intellectual honesty in students of elementary, high school, or college level, or in catechumens of any age, will readily recognize the truth of this statement. We desire to make both our religious and our scientific views *reasonable* and *understandable* not only, but harmonious as well.

What thinking individual has not experienced or witnessed hesitation with respect to the account of Jonah and the whale, of Joshua's command to the sun and moon, and further to the command that they "stand still"? Frankly, it is generally considered expedient to permit sleeping dogs to lie quietly. But neither the "sleeping dog" policy of side-stepping, or the "ostrich" policy of ignoring afford satisfactory solution of the problem, though they admirably illustrate it. Similarly for the miracles. They lead to apparently incompatible "compartmental" views — those which are supported by "non-scientific" Scriptural statements on the one hand and scientific facts on the other. Thus arises what appears to be an antithesis between two aspects of truth. Thinking students will demand a solution. To fail them here is to fail them seriously, and to leave them to their own devices. To harmonize all the facts and statements seems impossible; to ignore some is intellectually unsatisfactory; and to place all of them in one "compartmental" can be accomplished only at the cost of intellectual honesty. Problems? Difficulties? Dilemmas? Of course! How else

would we need or could we utilize the modicum of intelligence with which we are endowed?

Science & Religion — Complementary

It has become platitudinous to reiterate that there is but one source of truth, namely, God. Also that God reveals himself in a two-fold manner: indirectly and mediately through Nature, and directly and immediately through Scripture. Thus we have a dualism at the outset — two aspects of Truth, not separate and distinct, least of all antithetical, but complementary and interrelated. In their progressive development, however, each phase has assumed an increasingly singular aspect.

Science is the outgrowth of a specialized consideration of God's revelation in Nature — though its revelatory character is commonly neglected. It is concerned exclusively with Nature and its laws of natural causation.

Religion is an almost equally exclusive consideration of God's direct revelation. Its chief concern is Divine purpose in the Universe, and more especially the personal relationship between a Sovereign God and His creation, including humans created in His image.

Either of these, taken by itself, is concerned with only a phase of Truth and is inadequate for a complete — progressively completer — understanding of the Universe or of God and His plan in it. Science and Religion must be brought into clearer harmony and synthesized into one whole.

Science & Religion — Dynamic

Science and Religion both represent dynamic, progressively developing concepts. Embodying, as they do, the two aspects of Truth, their development must run concurrently, mutually complementing and illuminating one another. It is both incorrect and dangerous to regard them as developing parallel with one another — it implies too rigid an independence, a source of false antithesis.

Neither should be thought of as in a complete stage of development. Such a static view could scarcely be in harmony with either a progressive view of God's creation, or of creatures endowed with intelligence. It is obvious to everyone that Science represents a progressive development. It is not equally obvious for Religion. Granting, however, the completeness and sufficiency of divine revelation in Scripture, it also requires progressive development and synthesis. The work of Luther and Calvin, of Kuyper and Bavinck, testify abundantly to this fact.

Science & Religion — Equally Sincere

In discussing in our Men's Class some time ago the oft-quoted enmity of Science as opposed to Religion, one member (a Professor of Law, in a State University) refused to regard his colleagues as "designing infidels." It is manifestly unfair to deny honesty, earnestness or sincerity to either group. Where there is real "antipathy" it may doubtless be ascribed to an over-devotion to an accepted principle. Or it may be

due to some psychological twist of mentality which is hostile to providential guidance on the one hand, or to scientific "innovation" on the other. Each has its own aim and its own field for investigation. In addition, each has its own metaphysics, much as the scientist may decry any prior metaphysical conceptions.

The scientist, as such, limits his observations to natural or secondary causes. Supernatural or primary causes he leaves to the field of metaphysical speculation or divine revelation — in either case they fall outside the realm of observable and calculable phenomena. Hence he can brook no supernatural interference in a physical world, such as creative acts, miracles, etc. To do so would be both to end investigation and to destroy his science.

But he has learned much. He has observed the regularity and precision of many natural phenomena, and has discovered and formulated what appear to be universal and immutable laws of nature. They fascinate him. He would pursue them farther. Surely, that is legitimate! Newton and other God-fearing men have done the same, even when their investigations led them to the modification of previously conceived ecclesiastical opinion, as for example, that the earth is a sphere rather than a plane surface, that the earth rotates on its axis and revolves about the sun rather than that the sun revolves about the earth — views that have enjoyed general acceptance. It is not too much to say that these far-reaching scientific discoveries, originating independently of pre-established notions, produced an enriching influence upon religious and theological conceptions which we might not otherwise have had.

We should have the highest regard for Science as a co-discoverer of Truth. Little is to be gained by malignant and narrow vituperation. Derogatory epithets, such as "science-so-called" may frequently be the expression of over-enthusiasm or hasty generalization, and accomplish more harm than good. Scientific facts should be eagerly sought and utilized. Science, as such, *cannot* be hostile to Religion. There can be no danger or harm in facts. It is only in their interpretation — when the scientist turns philosopher — that we need to be on our guard. It is not the facts, but their pre-mature, incomplete, or erroneous interpretation that is perverse of religious — or even scientific — truth. Interpretation requires philosophic and religious scrutiny and synthesis.

Scientific vs. Scriptural Criteria

The origin of most of the antithetical views of Science and Religion is to be found in giving *undue* (advisedly) primacy or emphasis to either aspect of Truth — either an unwillingness or inability to give one or the other its due consideration, or to confused or hasty thinking.

As we look about us we usually find *either* Science or Religion in the saddle. In our churches, our educational institutions, our periodicals, our young peoples' meetings, everywhere, we find that one or the other emphasis is predominant. Either the inspired Word or the conclusions of physical Science is accepted as the major criterion for Truth. And where either predominates the other is apt to be neglected or even despised.

Many christians unconsciously adopt scientific criteria as the basis of their judgment of what is true.

I have talked with many college students from Christian homes, some with distinct Christian educational influences, who have been taught to accept the supernatural and the miraculous in the Scriptures as basically true. Upon entering college, however, they were introduced seriously to scientific criteria for the first time. What they formerly believed they now find to be *physically* impossible—scientifically *inconceivable* — hence untrue. I have met School of Religion students, trained in conservative Christian homes, who freely admit that they have "modernized" their religious views in the light of their advanced studies. Questioned as to the *basis* of their change of viewpoint some were surprised to discover that they were led to do so by an unconscious adoption of scientific criteria. The truth of the Scriptures came to depend upon the dictates of a chameleon science! With several, whose sincerity and honesty is beyond question, I have found this to be a disconcerting revelation, leading to wholesome reconsideration and reevaluation.

The adoption of such criteria, often unconsciously, inevitably leads to the progressive rejection of the "supernatural" phenomena, of creation, the virgin birth, miracles, the resurrection, and even prayer.

Higher criticism has its origin in the application of scientific criteria to Scriptural truths. The signers of the "Auburn Affirmation" doubtless took "scientific refuge" in this document from the dominating ascendancy of science. For this attitude, in emphasizing the non-essential nature of certain scientifically "difficult" tenets, enables one to escape acceptance and repudiation at one and the same time, a doubtful attempt to "save one's face." (Doubtful because evasive.) Its failure to deny, places it in the position of the "ostrich" policy. It is essentially a capitulation to the scientific criterion.

More subtle still is the universal obeisance to scientific criteria to be found in the undisguised joy with which religion seeks and welcomes corroboration of religious or Biblical truths. On each occasion when the findings of science seem to substantiate the truths of religion there prevails an undisguised feeling of elation. This may be due to a sense of weakness and uncertainty, or it may be due to the implied ultimate harmony of Science and Religion. In either case, it must be admitted that scientific criteria gain added prestige and power, whether it be through criticism or through substantiation. Religion seems increasingly lacking in self-confidence, the ability to stand on its own feet. Science, on the other hand, because of its greater assumed independence, does not share in this feeling, and seeks no corroboration outside of itself.

The Integration of Science & Religion

The integration of Science and Religion can be accomplished only through an earnest union of these two sources of truth. It requires an attitude which is at once scientific and Christian. Yet I have been told in all sincerity by a highly respected teacher that a man's being a Christian automatically disqualifies him for a "disinterested science". I do not doubt it. But it may be questioned just how far a "disinterested science" is possible to any one! For scientific views, as all others, are colored by one's own basic philosophy and aim.

Naturally the first and most obvious, as well as the most effective method of integration would be that of unification in basic concepts. It is equally obvious that such, outside of a distinctly Christian institution, is impossible. Lacking this, an alternative is to permit each to continue unhampered in its own way, in the hope that truth will vindicate itself. That this is not altogether a forlorn hope is to be seen in the fact that those few scientists who seem to have progressed farthest, achieve the greatest degree of synthetic insight. (This does not at all mean, as the thesis of this paper implies, that unaided science can ever discover ultimate truth.)

The Frontier

The solution of the apparent antithesis must be sought on the *frontier*—along the line where science and religion seem to deviate. It is not a question of "reconciliation", much less of "compromise". Still less is it a matter of "question-begging". The supernatural, the miracle, in its various forms—the *apparent* contradiction of the laws of nature—affords such a frontier. In science it is the *critical* experiment that is all-important, that determines hypotheses and theories. Likewise in religion, it is the *critical* concept upon which religious beliefs and truths hinge.

To ignore the critical issues is unpardonable, whether it be in religion or science. Church union, for example, which is sought on the basis of "agreement on commonly accepted 'essentials'", is not only intellectual cowardice, but is bound to result in sterility and lethargy. It is the "ostrich" policy, and can never lead to increased understanding. Truth must be sought by concentrating on true essentials, *critical concepts*, not by camouflaging real issues with a barrage of "common agreement". The latter course in religious matters is essentially intellectual laziness and dishonesty, as well as a one-sided capitulation to scientific criteria. In scientific matters it would be unthinkable. In either case it is suicide.

Conclusion

True science and true religion are complementary. Science heeds the injunction to "have dominion over the earth and subdue it". Religion aims at the "thoroughly furnished man of God". To the degree that one succeeds in bringing about harmonious integration of these two aims there can no longer be any thought of "scientific vs. personal opinion",—or of a "compartmental mind". Rather, we shall have a "single mind", aiming at ultimate truth on the basis of God's two-fold revelation, even though knowledge be pitifully small and the gaps discouragingly large.

As yet "we see through a glass darkly". Complete knowledge or integration is impossible, but it is a goal toward which we should strive.

Young students should be taught to seek truth wherever it may be found, whether it be in the field of science or of revealed religion. To train carefully in either, and fail to prepare for the other, is to court disaster, in one-sidedness, compartmentalism, intellectual dishonesty, and confusion.

Unthinking acceptance, complacency, intellectual unpreparedness, and lack of synthesis, are unquestionably four of the greatest obstacles to intellectual and moral stability!

What is the aim of Education, anyway,—particularly Christian Education—if it is not to meet these situations?

THE DEFACED IMAGE

Within a niche in th' ancient temple stood
The image of a lad. A master hand
Had wrought exquisitely upon the pure,
Pale marble till, at last, it seemed
To habit breath.

About the sweet lips played
A winsome smile; adoring eyes were raised
As to a loved one. On the fair face lay
A look of peace and innocent delight.
I stood enchanted.

Once again I came
To feast my hungering eyes and feed my soul
Upon its matchless beauty. But, alas!
Some vandal hand had cruelly defaced
The noble features, until nought remained
Of their delightful charm. I stared aghast!
Then, with averted face, I slowly left
The pillared courts. The while my sad thoughts
Turned to long-lost Eden, where 'neath stately palms,
A perfect man walked softly with his God
At eventide. His noble brow bespoke
A lofty soul. He was a holy man,
Upright in all his ways and truly wise;
Formed in his Maker's image. When his eyes
Were raised in adoration or in prayer,
God saw His own bright graces mirrored there;
And when the swelling tide of th' evening breeze
Brought the beloved Voice: "My son, my child!"
How gladly Adam answered: "Here am I;
My Father and my Lord! To do Thy will
Is my delight."

Once more my spirit sought
To fix its thoughts upon that blissful scene.
But ah! Where once fair fruits and lovely flowers
Diffused their fragrance, thorns and thistles grew;
While on the parched ground a toil-bent man
Stooped in the dust; and from his sin-scarred face
The salty sweat fell 'mid the noxious weeds.
No longer longed his soul for th' evening breeze,
But often now his weary, fear-filled eyes
Turned toward the flaming, two-edged sword, which
gleamed
Beyond the long-barred gate of Paradise.

My sad soul trembled at the wretched scene,
But from the sacred page a radiant gleam
Of heavenly comfort pierced the dismal gloom:
A ray of hope and peace in God's own Son,
That, reconciled by Him, men might again
And ever now, show forth the glorious grace
Of Triune God, in heaven's Paradise.

"LOIS."

Correspondence

A Letter from Scotland

Let me at once congratulate you on the general excellence of your first issue of THE CALVIN FORUM. The format, type, and literary contents are altogether attractive; and I venture to predict a successful career for your undertaking. It meets a need, and bridges the gap between the heavier periodicals and the popular Church Magazines. I shall be very glad to exchange our Quarterly, [*The Evangelical Quarterly*, of which Professor Maclean is Editor] with your FORUM, and hope to take note of its contents in our October issue. I should like you to notice our Quarterly on occasions. In this great enterprise of maintaining and propagating the imperishable principles of our Reformed heritage we must help one another and gather into one great brotherhood those who, in many lands, are today identifying themselves with our Reformed system of doctrine.

Free Church College,
Edinburgh, Scotland.

D. MACLEAN.

« « « » »

An "Open-Minded" Dogmatist!

I wish to congratulate you on the outward appearance, quality of paper and printing of the initial issue of THE CALVIN FORUM. I am tremendously interested in the subjects taken up in this first issue, and also in the long list of subjects promised in future issues. In reading such articles as Prof. Hoekstra's on "Russian Communism", editorials by Prof. Bouma, and the two views on Pacifism, one realizes that here is an array of unusual ability and, to me, apparently honesty of purpose.

Now I wish to say a few words as to what seems to me to be your great weakness. This applies to all the writers in the first issue of THE CALVIN FORUM. You are handicapped by now thoroughly exploded doctrines of theology. To me it seems there is no harmonizing science and ancient beliefs. An orthodox Calvinist does not seek truth: he has already found it!

It seems to me there can be no open-minded approach to the great questions of our age, questions that must be solved. Civilization is in danger of being blotted out if they are not. I say it seems to me there can be no open-minded approach to these great questions that confront the entire human race, unless we first come to the realization of the truth that there is no truth.

Chicago, Ill.

LOUIS BOERSMA.

P.S. A little later I will send in my subscription. I think enough of your efforts at least in the right direction so as not to want to miss a copy.

« « « » »

Timeliness

I am impressed with the timeliness and strength of the new magazine and hope it will have a wide ministry.

Toronto, Canada.

JOHN McNICOL, Principal
Toronto Bible College.

« « « » »

Practical Knowledge of Business Problems

If some of the men on your list of writers were men with practical knowledge of business problems, born of experience, your paper would interest me more. The answers to such questions as "What are a creditor's rights?" "What are a debtor's rights?" "How can we put more men to work?" and many others would undoubtedly be more helpful to many a business man today than the critical attitude so much in evidence.

Grand Rapids, Mich.

N. P. BROUWER.

« « « » »

A Word from a Business Man

I spent a very pleasurable and profitable evening last night reading the Calvin Magazine which was sent to my address. I found this most stimulating. The writing appeared to be very well done and the editing especially fine. It would be most remarkable if you could produce a monthly magazine of this character at your institution. If all of your issues could come up to the standard of the first one, it would seem to me to be most profitable and I would be glad to have you count me one of your subscribers.

Grand Rapids, Mich.

JOHN D. MacNAUGHTON.

Modernistic Monopoly

THE CALVIN FORUM is great. Too long have we been content to let the Modernists monopolize the field of moral and social questions with anti-Christian theories. I am delighted that in line with your consistent Calvinism such a splendid effort is being made to capture this important field for Christianity.

Philadelphia, Pa.

CALVIN K. CUMMINGS.

« « « » »

Positive-Progressive

Keep sounding the positive-progressive note!

Randolph, Wis.

J. J. HOLWERDA.

« « « » »

Encouragement from Arabia

My colleague out here, Rev. B. D. Hakken, has let me see his copy of the first issue of THE CALVIN FORUM. I want to congratulate you with all my heart on this attempt, which has been needed so badly and so long, and words fail me when it comes to trying to express my entire agreement with, and appreciation of the Editorial statement with which you open the paper. You will be receiving at once the \$2.00 which will constitute me a subscriber, this from the Board Office in New York.

You will be getting advice in car load lots these days. Don't let anything drive you away from the technique you start with. Every question which is worth admitting to the FORUM's columns has two sides and it is only as both are given a hearing that anything in the nature of a genuine forum exists. When it is at all possible the ideal way is to have the two viewpoints side by side.

There will be many of us who hope and pray that from its beginning almost, this magazine will become the organ of the entire Presbyterian Brotherhood, and even more. I do not suppose that there is at the moment a more subversive influence abroad than *The Christian Century*. Its power for evil is due to the good it does, as is always the case, of course. I know of nowhere else to turn for any thinking at all on the question of the implications of Christian Faith in the realms of Government or Society, or Economics. Many of us will hope and pray that now a second and better source is available. That paper is edited, of course, with a brilliance that will be difficult to match, but it is not a profound brilliance, and it is loaded with a very formidable mass of dead wood, and limited by the most extremely prejudiced viewpoint. I do not believe that it will be out of reach for you to both pull its teeth, and take its place, and may God give strength to your arm and keenness to your mind and minds, for the task.

Let me put my slip in the hat for questions too. Some time I hope you may find space for a discussion of the place of the Old Testament in the life and faith of the Christian. When a Mohammedan counters our protest against his Polygamy, by asserting that it is endorsed by our Book as well as by his, the missionary suddenly wakes up to the existence of questions in his own mind.

I want you to know that there will be sympathy and prayer and lots of hope and confidence, with you all the time, from at least one corner in Arabia.

Muscat, Arabia.

P. W. HARRISON.

AUTUMN ON THE HILL

We drank in deepest beauty
From valleys cupped below,
The burnished gold of beeches
Had set the world aglow.
Like crimson birds tiptilted
The sumacs lined the road.
From every wind that loitered
The ripened fruit scents flowed.
I felt the quiet dreaming,
My fingers stroked your head.
"The Fall has come," I murmured,
"But not to us," you said.

MILDRED REITSEMA.

Book Reviews

THE DELIGHTS OF POETRY

DISCOVERING POETRY, by Elizabeth Drew. 224 pp. New York: W. W. Norton and Co. \$1.75.

THE title itself is an invitation to explore that vast thesaurus of words and ideas which is our heritage from the poets. Too often even the lover of poetry misses the full beauty and truth of a poem. He is led away by the music and the rhythm, no mean experience in itself, and fails to penetrate beyond the ravishing mists of the trance.

Faithful to her title the author tries to lead her readers into the white shrine of poetry. She succeeds admirably in disclosing it as a place sought not by the esoteric few but by the many who possess initiative enough to throw off the fear of a first journey. We are asked to look at poetry from the point of view of the poet and that of the reader. For example, we are presented with the experiential elements that went into the making of Keats's "On First Looking Into Chapman's Homer." To our surprise mystifying lines become clear as day, and our love for the poem increases with our understanding. When the poet's point of view becomes the reader's, the reader's joys increase, and the incentive to go on reading becomes a burning one.

The author is old-fashioned enough to believe that poetry must communicate as well as express. She holds no brief for those poets who fondle their own arcanum and at the same time attempt to communicate the incommunicable through publication. Poetry should be reasonably understandable. However, this does not take away from the high requirements demanded of the reader, such as intense study, insight, and imagination. In many cases to say that Milton is "beyond me" is simply admitting laziness of mental faculties.

The presence of high morality need not spoil a poem. "There is no reason whatever why poetry should not be ethical, just as there is no reason whatever why it should be." This is a wholesome note contrasting strongly with the "art for art's sake" doctrine whose extremist adherents divorce truth and goodness from beauty.

Great respect is paid the idea of continuity in poetry. In the long line of poetry from Chaucer to T. S. Eliot there is diversity in uniformity. Styles undoubtedly change, but through the many generations the cardinal note of all genuine poetry is the music of humanity, chords struck from the soul in its lovely shallows and awe-inspiring depths.

The reading of this book is a delight. For those who are shy of poetry because it is so very different from prose it is a thrilling introduction into those realms where "new planets swim into our ken." For the lovers of poetry it is a teacher and guide possessed of inspiration. Selections from great poetry are well chosen and profuse. Though the little work lacks the formidable aspect of a text-book, it can serve both the novice and the scholar well.

B. KRUTHOF.

PIETER BRUEGHEL NOVELIZED

DROLL PETER, by Felix Timmermans, Coward-McCann, New York, 1930.

PIETER Brueghel experienced the world through his eyes. Life was mediated in terms of color and line. Landscape, and flower, human symmetry and physical balance were like wine to his soul. He lived to draw, and "when the passion for drawing seized him, he could not be restrained; it was stronger than his will, and his blood pounded as though he were in a fever."

Such is the novelized Pieter Brueghel, the man who drew and painted thousands of merry figures instinct with gaiety and insouciance, but which never laughed. About the authenticity of the narrative I am not competent to judge, but the novel surely has the ring of sympathetic recreation. One cannot read it without feeling certain that Pieter Brueghel has been poetically represented, and that the account is typically true in the sense that poetry is truer and more philosophical than actual history.

The author was confronted, no doubt, with a genuine artistic problem: to give to a real life narrative glow, conversational vitality, analytic insight, absorbing suspense, and yet to do no violence to the poetic truth of the real Pieter Brueghel. If this has been done, and the impression is overwhelming that it has, it is certainly a product of the rarest talent.

As pure novel it is wholly enthralling. Packed with the turbulence of an inquisitorial era, picture after picture enchants the reader. One sees the naive simplicity of the rustic village life, the pestilent avarice of the smugly fat, the haunting misery and uncouthness of the lean, the whirr and sweep of an Antwerp into which the new wine of the Renaissance was just pouring itself to intoxicate all painters but Brueghel, the merry taverns, the light and darkness of love and pain, while the whole variegated panorama is actively mediated by a genius whose own soul was a paradox.

Pieter Brueghel would have delighted the pen of Gamaliel Bradford. Gay and sombre, mystical and mundane, skeptical and believing, a craven and a paladin—a mystery of oppositions—such was the artist.

The translation is surprisingly fine. Image after image fires the heart. Cadence and beautiful sound are frequent. A remarkable book which both imprisons and liberates a vision.

J. TIMMERMAN.

RECENT DUTCH FICTION

TIEN JAREN OOGST. Door Dr. C. Tazelaar. N. V. Zomer en Keuning's Uitgeversmaatschappij, Wageningen, Netherlands.

This work discusses the leading novels of the Netherlands between 1922 and 1932. The summary is not complete, but fully representative. In his preface the author mentions many more writers who tried to produce worthwhile stories, but explains why he limited himself to the thirty-seven which he considered to be of literary value. Though he excludes the protestant Christian novels because another essayist was publishing a special volume on them, Tazelaar does not limit himself to the field of aesthetics. His book reviews are models of criticism from a moral and artistic point of view. He represents the Calvinistic cultural forces in an eminent way, for his Christianity does not lower his appreciation of the true, the good, and the beautiful.

H. J. V. A.

WITH PSYCHOPATHS

ASYLUM, by Wm. Seabrook. Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1935. 13+263 pp.

The publishers, as publishers are apt to do, make exaggerated claims for this book. According to the jacket *Asylum* is "an unprecedented narrative" of "an utterly new kind". As a matter of fact, not to mention earlier books, we have had within a year besides *Asylum* also, *Behind the Door of Delusion*, and *I Knew 3000 Lunatics*. What is more, of the latter two the former is precisely the same kind of book and, in my opinion at least, the latter is the better book, being written with a physician's knowledge and insight. Interestingly enough the two laymen authors were confined for exactly the same reason—neither for insanity, both for excessive drinking. Though *Asylum* is having a better press and, I surmise, a better sale than *Behind the Door of Delusion*, I cannot see that it is much the better book. Seabrook, of course, has the advantage of being a seasoned writer. He is the author of at least four other books all of which have been favorably reviewed by competent critics.

The book is not without real merit. It actually does what it means to do; it lets the reader see a mental hospital from within. There are illuminating incidents and reflections. I am also inclined to think that the author is correct in attributing his drunkenness to something other than a mere lust for strong drink. On page 253 he himself says: "Locked up where I couldn't get whiskey, I was forced to see sober a panorama

that had been nothing but a miserable series of 'runnings away from myself' since earliest childhood, and in which, I now fully realized for the first time, neither whiskey nor the particular trade I had adopted were anything more than incidental. I took sober stock and saw that dissatisfaction, a sense of my own inability to arrive at a harmonious adjustment in any environment—sporadically dotted with flights and attempted escapes—had been the whole pattern of my life. I had run away ineffectually at six to be a pirate, as all children do, and instead of getting maturer powers of adjustment as I grew older, I had been running away ever since. At twenty I had run away to be a tramp. Later, with no better motive, I had run away to war. I had run away to the East and West Indies, to the Arabian desert, the Kurdistan mountains, the jungles of Africa. I had run as far as Timbuctoo, and had stumped my toe, and had hurt it so badly that I ran away once more with a bottle to be a drunkard and forget it. I had said on all these occasions, sometimes proudly, that I had been running to some place or some thing, had invented plausible reasons and produced by-products. Now I know that all the time I had been running away from something and that the thing had always been myself."

That is fine.

Whether, believing himself cured, he is wise now to indulge in an occasional drink, I am inclined to doubt.

Seabrook calls his book *Asylum*, that being the older name for what today we call mental hospitals. He would seem to prefer the older term which, of course, means "refuge" or "sanctuary". Seabrook seems to overlook the fact that the dropping of the word "asylum" is not because of its denotation but because of its connotation, because of a host of unpleasant ideas that in course of time have attached themselves to it.

The book is disfigured by gross profanity.

J. BROENE.

THE RELIGIOUS SITUATION IN GERMANY

THINGS THAT ARE CAESAR'S: *The Genesis of the German Church Conflict.* By Paul Banwell Means. New York, 1935, Round Table Press. \$2.50.

THIS book, just out (in fact, this month's selection of the Religious Book Club), paints the real situation of religion and theology, church and state in Germany at present. It is written in a most engaging style and offers the result of the author's observation and close-up study of the conditions he describes. As might be expected, the author makes the clash between the Nazi government and the Protestant Church the climax of his narrative. However, this is not a mere story of a politico-ecclesiastical conflict. The greater part of the book is

devoted to a careful exposition and analysis of the religious, theological, social, political, and economic forces that have gone into the making of present Germany. Here one becomes acquainted with Marxian Socialism, German Liberal Theology, German Free Thought, the Youth Movement, Anthroposophy, Otto and Heiler, Barth and the Dialectic Theology, the Nationalist Socialist Program, Anti-Semetism, and the so-called German Faith Movement. There is nothing abstruse or scholarly about this narrative. It is an account that everyone interested in the situation in Germany today will want to read. The essential paganism of the German Faith Movement and the heroism of the Church leaders in the face of the Nazification of the German Church stands out vividly. C. B.

GLIMPSES OF RUSSIA

RUSSIA CHALLENGES RELIGION. By George Mecklenburg. New York, 1934, The Abingdon Press. \$1.00.

THIS is a popular narrative of an American Methodist minister's impressions of Russia based upon three trips to that country. The chapters are vivid flashes of Russian life. We learn that Russia has in reality no Communism but a system of State Capitalism. The author deprecates the hostile attitude of the Russian leaders toward religion but finds the American picture of conditions on this score greatly overdrawn. He holds up the social program of the liberal Church in America and Europe as the solution for Russia's ills. C. B.

SOUTH AMERICA

THAT OTHER AMERICA. By John A. Mackay. New York, 1935, Friendship Press. \$1.00.

A FINE interpretative account of the soul of South America. This author, who is a fine mixture of Scotchman, theologian, philosopher, and missionary, offers us in these two hundred pages a most remarkable insight into South American ways of thinking and living. Whoever has read this interesting, yet penetrating, account of our Southern neighbors in the Western hemisphere, will have a distinctive and indelible impression of the factors that shape the moral and the religious life of "that other America." The author champions the cause of Protestant missions. The two finest sentences in this little book are these: "There can be no true and lasting fellowship that is not the fellowship of men and women who have ceased to become self-centered or group-centered, or state-centered, or even centered in social welfare, and have become God-centered." (p. 36.) "Did Evangelical Christianity do no more than give the Bible to Latin America, religion and culture on this continent would be its debtor forever." (p. 153.) For all interested in South America and Christianity the book is worth its price of \$1.00 twice over. C. B.

Who is Who in this Issue

BOVENKERK, JOHN — Pastor of the First Reformed Church, Muskegon, Mich. Author of pamphlet entitled, *Philosophical and Biblical Reflections on World Peace* (Zondervan, 1935).

BROENE, JOHANNES — Professor of Education and Psychology at Calvin College.

CREMER, JOHN A. — Medical Missionary at the American Mission Hospital, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, under the United Presbyterian Board.

HOEKSTRA, P. A. — Pastor of the Second Christian Reformed Church at Cicero, Ill.

KRUITHOF, BASTIAN — Teacher of English at Eastern Academy, Paterson, N. J.

"LOIS" — Wife of the Pastor of the Drenthe, Mich., Christian Reformed Church.

MULDER, BERNARD J. — Pastor of the Bethel Reformed Church, Grand Rapids, Mich. Member of the Commission on International Justice and Goodwill of the Reformed Church in America. Chaplain of the Christian Ex-Service Men's Club. Editor of *Religious Digest*.

REITSEMA, MILDRED — Has contributed bits of verse to various magazines.

RYSKAMP, HENRY J. — Professor of Economics and Sociology at Calvin College.

SCHOOOLLAND, JOHN B. — Professor of Psychology and Education at University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. At the time of writing of article in June Tutor at Duke University, and candidate for the Ph.D. degree.

TIMMERMAN, JOHN — Fellow in English at Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

VAN ANDEL, H. J. — Professor of the Holland Language and Literature at Calvin College.

Note: Contributions signed with initials only are by members of the Editorial Committee, whose names appear on the inside front cover page.