

# The Standard Bearer

**A REFORMED SEMI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE**

***IN THIS ISSUE***

**Meditation:**

**The Suffering Prophet--Choosing His Betrayer**

**Editorial:**

**The Erring Views of Dr. H. M. Kuitert (conclusion)**

**The Basis for Dissent (see The Strength of Youth)**

**The Consequences of State Aid to Education  
(see All Around Us)**

Meditation —	<b>CONTENTS:</b>
The Suffering Prophet — Choosing His Betrayer . . .	218
Editorials —	
Editor's Notes . . . . .	221
The Erring Views of Dr. H. M. Kuitert (13) . . . .	222
All Around Us —	
A Resolution on Creation and Evolution . . . . .	224
The Consequences of State Aid to Education . . .	225
The End of Another Anti-Evolution Law . . . . .	226
A Loss of Church Property . . . . .	226
Pages from the Past —	
The Believers and their Seed (Chapter III) . . . .	227
Studies in Depth —	
An Underground Movement . . . . .	229
From Holy Writ —	
The Book of Hebrews (7: 20-22) . . . . .	231
Contending for the Faith —	
The Doctrine of Sin — Gottschalk . . . . .	233
The Strength of Youth —	
The Basis for Dissent (2) . . . . .	235
Contribution —	
Protestant Reformed Scholarship Fund . . . . .	237
Book Reviews . . . . .	238
What Others Think . . . . .	239
Church News . . . . .	240

## THE STANDARD BEARER

Semi-monthly, except monthly during June, July and August.

Published by the Reformed Free Publishing Association, Inc.

*Editor-in-Chief: Prof. H. C. Hoeksema*

*Department Editors:* Mr. John M. Faber, Rev. Cornelius Hanko, Prof. Herman Hanko, Rev. Robert C. Harbach, Rev. John A. Heys, Rev. Jay Kortering, Rev. George C. Lubbers, Rev. Marinus Schipper, Rev. Gise J. Van Baren, Rev. Herman Veldman, Rev. Bernard Woudenberg

*Editorial Office:* Prof. H. C. Hoeksema  
1842 Plymouth Terrace, S.E.  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506

*Church News Editor:* Mr. John M. Faber  
1123 Cooper Ave., S.E.  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49507

*Editorial Policy:* Every editor is solely responsible for the contents of his own articles. Contributions of general interest from our readers and questions for the Question-Box Department are welcome. Contributions will be limited to approximately 300 words and must be neatly written or typewritten. Copy deadlines are the first and the fifteenth of the month. All communications relative to the contents should be sent to the editorial office.

*Business Office:* The Standard Bearer,  
Mr. H. Vander Wal, Bus. Mgr.  
P.O. Box 6064  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506

*Subscription Policy:* Subscription price, \$7.00 per year. Unless a definite request for discontinuance is received, it is assumed that the subscriber wishes the subscription to continue without the formality of a renewal order and he will be billed for renewal. If you have a change of address, please notify the Business Office as early as possible in order to avoid the inconvenience of delayed delivery. Include your Zip Code.

*Advertising Policy:* The *Standard Bearer* does not accept commercial advertising of any kind. Announcements of church and school events, anniversaries, obituaries, and sympathy resolutions will be placed for a \$2.00 fee. These should be sent to the Business Office and should be accompanied by the \$2.00 fee. Deadline for announcements is the 5th or the 20th of the month, previous to publication on the 15th or the 1st respectively.

*Bound Volumes:* The Business Office will accept standing orders for bound copies of the current volume; such orders are filled as soon as possible after completion of a volume. A limited number of past volumes may be obtained through the Business Office.

## Meditation

# The Suffering Prophet--Choosing His Betrayer

*Rev. M. Schipper*

*"I speak not of you all: I know whom I have chosen: but that the Scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me."*

John 13:18.

*"Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me."*

Psalms 41:9.

The season of Lent is fast coming upon us again!  
That season of the year when the church of Christ is reminded, more than at any other time, of the passion

and death of the Saviour; and which issues into the glorious and victorious resurrection of the Lord of glory!

Most certainly we have no quarrel with those who insist that all gospel preaching for all the days of the year should have as its heart and basis the truth of the suffering, crucified, and raised Redeemer. Nor do we have any criticism of those following the custom of preaching on the passion and death of the Saviour during the annual Lenten season. It has been a custom in our churches of which we hope our people shall never tire.

In the next few meditations we shall try to dwell on the general theme of: The Suffering Prophet Fulfilling His Scriptures. And in this first of the series we call attention to this suffering Prophet fulfilling the Scripture: In Choosing His Betrayer.

Notice, first of all, the betrayer who is chosen!

Judas Iscariot he is called! Literally his name means: Judas, the man of Cariot. Cariot comes from Kerioth, a town in southern Judah. Accordingly, Judas is from the tribe and province of Judah. As far as we know he was the only one of the apostles who came from this region. All the rest came from Galilee in the north. That the Scripture calls him Judas Iscariot is most probably to distinguish him from another of the apostles also called Judas, namely the brother of James.

Judas was a Jewish nationalist, that is, one who believed in the future earthly glory of the State of Israel. He envisioned the time when his nation, now in bondage to Rome, as it had often in its history been in bondage to other nations, would break off these shackles. He believed that the time would come when Israel would rule the world in a golden age, a glorious state which would far surpass the glory of David and Solomon.

Judas was also one of the twelve! He had followed Jesus for three long years, being instructed of Him, and an eye-witness to all His wonderful works. And he was not the least among the disciples. He was a man of energy, ambition, and ability, especially in mundane, material matters. Evidently he was a man of foresight, and a man who had ability to get things done. It was most likely for this reason that he was entrusted with the treasury of the disciple group. Obviously the other disciples had confidence in his ability and integrity, never suspecting that actually he was a thief.

Apart now from the fact that he was chosen to be an apostle, it is important to consider the question how he ever consented to be Jesus' disciple. Evidently, he, too, had sacrificed all to follow Jesus. He must have set aside his family and friends. He must have left his earthly vocation and his possessions. The answer is not far to seek. As was said, he was a nationalist, looking for the future glory of his nation, but particularly for his own personal interests and a place of honor in it. Evidently he conceived of Jesus as the hope of Israel and the promised Messiah Who would raise up an earthly kingdom and Who would be pleased

to have Judas serve as His Secretary of State or of the Treasury. And when Jesus at the beginning of His Galilean ministry appeared to be so popular, Judas became most encouraged in his hopes. What a wonderful kingdom was this Man capable of establishing! Manifestly in this kingdom there would be no suffering or want, no cripples, not even death. Verily, this was the Man all the world would seek after! And as Judas followed Jesus and considered his relation to Him, his own glorious opinion of himself and his position in the Messianic kingdom grew brighter by the day.

The impression must not be left here, however, that Judas was the only one of the followers of Christ who had this earthly conception of the promised Messianic kingdom. Fact of the matter is that they all held this view more or less, and retained it until after His death and resurrection. Do we not hear the Emmaus travelers exclaim on the afternoon of the resurrection day: "But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel?" The difference between Judas and the rest was that he, in distinction from the others, was the first to conclude that the Lord had no intention whatsoever to establish such an earthly kingdom.

This opinion began to jell when the Lord renounced earthly acclaim and popularity. He had heard the Lord rebuke the multitude for following Him merely for earthly bread; and when the Lord had confronted the disciples with the pointed question: "Will ye not also go away?" Judas began to see more than ever that there was to be no such imagined earthly kingdom. This adverse opinion reached its highest point just before the celebration of the Passover, and particularly at the occasion in Bethany in the house of Simon the Leper when there came in a woman with an alabaster box of very precious ointment and poured it on Jesus as He sat at meat. The disciples were indignant because they considered it a waste, it being their opinion that the ointment could better have been sold and the money have been given to the poor. John tells us that the spokesman for the disciples on this occasion was Judas Iscariot and that he had objected to this so-called waste not because he was concerned with the poor, but because he was a thief, and had the bag and bare what was in it. When Jesus had commanded them to be silent, informing them that the poor they had always with them, but that He would not always be with them, and that she had anointed Him unto His burial; then Satan entered into Judas' heart and the desire to betray Christ became an impulse which could not be suppressed. Knowing that the rulers of the Jews had secretly plotted to do away with Jesus, he went to them and offered to give Jesus into their hands for what he sought to salvage out of his relation to Jesus — money.

What we have said so far explains who Judas was and how psychologically he could and did become the betrayer. But this is not all that can and must be said

on this point.

Judas was chosen to be a traitor!

We must not understand our text in such a way that we conclude here that the Lord, when He says: "I know whom I have chosen," is merely saying: "I know who are truly elect among you." Though this was true, of course, for He knew who the sheep were whom the Father had given unto Him. And He certainly knew that in even the disciple group election and reprobation was to be realized. Yet this is not the meaning of the Lord.

Rather, the Lord means to say: "I knew what I was doing when I chose you to be My disciples. I knew what I was doing when I chose Judas Iscariot, for I chose him exactly to be a traitor who would betray Me into the hands of wicked men to slay Me." This same thought is expressed in John 6:70,71 where Jesus said: "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil? He spake of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon, for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve." The Lord chose Judas to be in the company of His friends, that he with them might eat bread with Jesus, too, as one of His friends.

That the Scripture might be fulfilled!

God's Prophet, the suffering Prophet, fulfilling the Scriptures and pointing to that fulfillment even in the choice of Judas!

Christ, the anointed Servant of Jehovah, is appointed and qualified to serve the three-fold office of Prophet, Priest, and King!

Here He is portrayed as God's appointed Prophet to reveal all that the Father had given to Him to speak concerning the salvation God had ordained for His people through the suffering Servant of Jehovah. The end of all that long line of prophets, who suffered as they brought to God's people His revelation; and at the same time the One of Whom all that long line of prophets spoke. Here He is consciously fulfilling the Scripture!

The Scriptures must be fulfilled which said: "He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me." That is the Scripture of Psalm 41:9 quoted above, the prophecy which is repeated in another form in Psalm 55:12,13 "For it was not an enemy that reproached me; then I could have borne it, neither was it he that hated me that did magnify himself against me, then I would have hid myself from him. But it was thou, a man mine equal, my guide, and mine acquaintance."

The historical reference in the Psalms is of course to the time of Absalom, the Son of David, whose plotting and conspiracy drove David from Jerusalem into the wilderness, away from the throne and the temple, planning there to overtake David and kill him. In this conspiracy Ahithophel, David's counselor and friend, who sat at his table to eat bread, lifted up his heel against him, having turned traitor, and connived with

Absalom in the plot. Thus Ahithophel became an Old Testament type of Judas, who now had agreed with the rulers of the Jews to betray Jesus into their hands.

The question arises here: Why were all these things foreshadowed in the Scriptures? Not merely were there the shadows of the sacrifices, and the more direct prophecies of the suffering of Christ such as that found in Isaiah 53; but there were also those shadows that were enacted by persons in the history of the old dispensation. Why was this? Was it merely for the sake of instruction of the church of that day? But this can hardly be true. How could the church of that day understand that Ahithophel was a type of Judas who should betray Christ? And again, Why must this Scripture be fulfilled? Was it only to show how the type and antitype meet in Jesus? O, to be sure, this is true. But there is much more.

The suffering Prophet must follow the prophetic Scripture as He treads the way of suffering — all the way to the cross!

And so, when He chooses Judas to betray Him, He was only walking precisely in the way the Father had mapped out for Him. Not only had the Lord God determined in His counsel the fact and the manner in which the Saviour should suffer, but He had also prescribed in the Scriptures all the steps the Saviour would have to follow as He descended as it were into the valley of suffering. This prescription the Redeemer had to follow in detail. Hence, the Scripture must be fulfilled!

Now it should be remembered that when David wrote by inspiration the history of his betrayal by Ahithophel he was at the same time reflecting on the suffering of Christ. And Christ, Who understood clearly that these Scriptures were the revelation of God's counsel concerning Himself and His way of suffering, chose Judas as the betrayer, both to fulfill the Scripture and to enter into the depths of His suffering — also into that aspect of it as inflicted on Him by Judas Iscariot.

But why could not the Lord Jesus have been captured and crucified without a betrayal? Why must He be delivered into the hands of sinful men by a familiar friend?

The answer is: Judas' sin is our sin!

We have lifted up the heel against our Friend, and that Friend is our Covenant God. Jesus must bear away in His suffering all our sin and make satisfaction for all our sin, also this sin. Let us not in pride condemn Judas, though he is to be condemned; but let us humble ourselves before the face of God and taste His salvation.

Now the suffering Prophet may prophecy to His disciples, and to us!

Almost a year before He had told them that one of them was a devil and would betray Him. But they had not understood. And it was well that they had not

understood, for had they known they might have cast Judas from their midst. But now the Prophet must speak clearly so that the betrayer can also understand: "The Scripture must be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me."

And the reason why they must know now is expressed in the verse following our text: "Now I tell you before it come, that, when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am he."

That ye may know that in spite of all that is about to take place, I am the Messiah; and that I am the One of Whom David did write in the Psalms. And that I am the One Who took your sins upon Me, also the sin of lifting up your heel against your Covenant Friend, the God of your salvation.

That ye may believe!

And believing, ye may be saved!

## Editorials

## EDITOR'S NOTES

*The Pre-publication Sale* is now one-fourth over. The moral is this: do not continue to postpone sending in your order! Before you know it, April 1 will be here; and then it will be too late to take advantage of the sale price. Hence, get your order in today, accompanied by \$7.95. Look up the handy order envelope in the February 1 issue. As of this writing, we are on schedule with our publication plans; and "Behold, He Cometh!" should meet our publication deadline of April 1.

\* \* \* \* \*

*Mind your i's and e's.* Someone recently called my attention to a commonly made error in pronunciation (and sometimes even in spelling). Arminians (with a short *i*) are the followers of the heresy of James Arminius. Armenians (with a long *e*) are inhabitants of the country of Armenia. Whom the shoe fits, let him put it on.

\* \* \* \* \*

*The reference to government subsidy of schools* in "All Around Us" reminds me of a report in a recent issue of the Dutch paper "*Tot Vrijheid Geroepen*" that the Free University of Amsterdam is 99% supported by government subsidy. The article in which this is reported attributes the decline and decay of the Free University in part to this fact. It claims that in this manner the Free University has increasingly gotten out of the control of the Reformed people. It refers to "the bulldozer of government subsidy" as having "shoved aside the influence of the Reformed people upon the course of affairs at the university." This is a significant aspect of government subsidy. As government subsidy increases, two things happen: 1) The schools become independent of the people's support, and proportionately less responsive to the control and desires of the supporters. 2) And the people become proportionately less concerned and less able to control

an institution which they do not have to support and whose purse-strings are out of their control.

\* \* \* \* \*

*A further study* of the question of government subsidy of schools will begin in the next issue. Through the courtesy of State Senator Milton Zaagman, I received a copy of "A Report and Recommendations of the Joint Legislative Committee on Aid To Non-Public Schools." I requested this report so that I might base my study on accurate information. However, the report arrived too late to write about it in this issue.

\* \* \* \* \*

*Footnote to a Review*, or, The Story of the Pot and the Kettle. In a recent issue of the *Reformed Journal* the redoubtable James Daane reviews Harry Kuitert's book, "The Reality of Faith." In his usual genial manner Daane takes the occasion to go a bit afield and to get in "a few licks" at other theologians. I must confess my amazement, and my amusement, at the blissful manner in which he can dismiss with one wave of the hand the theology of Abraham Kuyper, Herman Hoeksema, L. Berkhof, C. Van Til, and, in fact, all of orthodox Protestant theology. Meanwhile, he virtually excludes himself from "orthodox Protestant theology" in the process. But I especially was struck by his critique of Kuitert. As might be expected, Daane has high praise for Kuitert's denial of the possibility of metaphysical theology (knowledge of God-as-He-is-in-Himself). But he mildly faults Kuitert for going to extremes. Daane wants to keep some metaphysical theology, it seems. And he proceeds to engage in some highly abstract theologizing about God's grace. But Daane should criticize himself, not Kuitert. For when Daane denies that grace is an attribute of God, his basic trouble is a denial of so-called metaphysical theology. He should ponder this seriously. For this is a case of "the pot calling the kettle black." True to form, Daane is right, but dead wrong!

# The Erring Views of Dr. H.M. Kuitert (13)

An Evaluation of Kuitert's Dogmatical Views (Continued)

Prof. H. C. Hoeksema

## *Christ and Creation: Common Grace Dualism*

At the close of my last article on this subject I proposed that the failure of some Reformed theologians to see and to maintain an intrinsic connection between Christ and creation is connected with the common grace theory. I pointed out that I was not referring to the general-offer aspect of the First Point, the notorious "*puntje van het eerste punt*," (which is more properly called "general grace" in the Arminian sense), but to common grace in the Kuyperian sense. And I suggested that there is a theological connection between the theory of common grace and the failure to teach the unity of creation and the work of Christ.

In other words, the theology of common grace posits a *dualism* between creation and Christ, rather than seeing in Christ the focal point of all the work of God, including creation.

This I shall now explain.

First of all, what is implied in this common grace theory of Dr. A. Kuyper, Sr.?

Kuyper makes a distinction between "common" and "special" grace. Only so-called special grace is of saving power and efficacy; and it, according to Kuyper, is strictly particular, for the elect only. The fruit of "special" grace is eternal life and glory in Christ. "Common" grace, on the other hand, is not saving. It has to do only with the present life and history of man in the world and is common to all men. Kuyper sought to differentiate the two by using the term "*gratie*" to indicate common grace, and reserving the word "*genade*" for particular grace. His purpose in developing this theory was to show that there is still a positively good world-life and development of the human race in connection with all created things. By the theory of common grace he meant to offer an explanation of this alleged positive good in the world in view of the fact of the fall and the curse of God in the world and the total depravity of the natural man. It is also significant that according to Dr. Kuyper, "common grace" is a grace that does not flow from Christ Jesus as the Mediator of redemption. Not only is it true that according to Kuyper all men receive this grace, regardless of their relation to Christ Jesus, regardless of whether they believe or not; but Kuyper also develops the idea that this common grace does not flow from the Mediator of redemption, but from the eternal Word as the Mediator of creation. Even as before the fall, according to him, all things were made and sustained through the Word, so after the fall all that is of common grace comes to men through the

same Logos. It is not a grace that is based on the atoning blood of Jesus Christ, but a grace outside of atonement and satisfaction.

Secondly, where does this alleged dualism enter the picture?

Dr. Kuyper makes of the history of this present world an interim. Permit me to quote the exposition of Rev. H. Hoeksema in his "Reformed Dogmatics," p. 740: "His theory is as follows. God had in mind an original purpose in the ordinance of creation. And in spite of all the attempts of sin and Satan, He nevertheless realizes this ordinance. Although Satan opposes this purpose of God, the Lord nevertheless causes His creation to develop, and causes her to reach the purpose, the destination, which it should have reached also without sin. This is effected by what Dr. Kuyper calls 'common grace'. He maintains that if common grace had not intervened and begun to operate immediately after the fall, the end of all things would have been reached in paradise with man's eating of the forbidden fruit. The whole world would have relapsed into a chaotic state. Adam would have died the complete and eternal death. And there would have been no history, no development of the human race in the world. As a result, there would have been no room for the establishment and development of God's covenant of grace in Christ. The elect would not have been born. Christ would not have come. And the works of God would have been completely spoiled and destroyed by the wiles of Satan. The devil's purpose would have been reached. However, by His common grace God intervened. The universe did not suffer destruction. Man did not immediately die. And the original, divine idea in the ordinance of creation can be, and is realized in the history of this world. At the same time a sphere is created for the realization and development of special grace in Christ Jesus. He therefore conceives of the work of God in a dualistic way. God has an original purpose with creation, the normal development of all things under man as their king. This purpose is apparently frustrated by the temptation of the devil and sin. But through the operation of common grace God carries out the original idea and brings about a positively good development of the human race in connection with the earthly creation. But, on the other hand, God also carries out His purpose of predestination in the redemption of the elect and the damnation of the reprobate. Kuyper, therefore, makes of the history of this present world really an interim."

Now there is much to be criticized in this theory of Kuyper. But this is not my purpose now. I only want to point out that in Kuyper's view there are two parallel lines in history: 1) God carries out the covenant of His election, and saves the new mankind. 2). Along the line of common grace God realizes His original creation-idea. And although Kuyper makes the common-grace-world the stage upon which God realizes His work of election, nevertheless there is no intrinsic, unified connection between the two. And what is the basic trouble? This, that Kuyper fails to view all the work of God as one, and that he fails to see Christ, the firstborn of every creature, and that too, as the first begotten from the dead, as the focal point in Whom all the work of God concentrates. For this reason he has an organic conception of sorts, but he includes merely the church, as the new mankind, in that organic conception. He does not further apply the organic idea to the organic whole of all creatures. For this reason, he speaks of an original creation-idea, separate and distinct from the work of God in Christ, the work of particular grace. Kuyper has two works of God: a common-grace-work outside of Christ, and a special-grace-work in Christ; and the two are essentially unrelated. They are lines which never meet. Moreover, lurking beneath this dual conception is another dualism, which views sin, death, and the curse as powers outside of and apart from God, which He must restrain.

Now I do not know whether Dr. Kuitert in his lecture had in mind any criticism of the theology of Abraham Kuyper. Kuitert mentioned no specifics, but made the general charge that traditional Reformed theology failed to connect creation and Christ. As a general charge, the charge is false. The main line of Reformed theology is not guilty of this failure. As a specific charge against the presentation of some theologians, the charge is true. And though Kuyper undoubtedly would not have accepted all of the consequences of his theory, yet essentially his theory is guilty of the dualism mentioned. Perhaps Dr. Kuitert, consciously or sub-consciously, sensed a lack in the theology which has always claimed the Free University as its citadel and which was developed by the father of the Free University. However this may be, it is indeed strange that from the very citadel of common grace theology a voice should be heard which complains of a failure to connect creation and Christ. And yet it is not strange: for the dualism of this common grace theory is, after all, productive of a sterile, disunified theology; and it must needs leave one with a feeling of dissatisfaction.

#### *Conclusion*

There was a third question which we were to face in this connection. It was this: what does Dr. Kuitert, with all his criticism of so-called traditional theology, have to offer in its place?

My answer is, in the first place: very little!

Recall, now, the scant positive presentation which Dr. Kuitert made of his dogmatical views. He spoke in vague generalities. We must see the Genesis record as a "teaching model," whatever that may mean. And then a teaching model of what? For one thing, the creation story can be told as the story of development, of evolution. Mark this! This is sheer nonsense. Creation story told as the story of evolution? But worse than this, it is poorly disguised corruption of the truth. Put in plain language, Kuitert does not mean to speak of creation at all, but of evolution. And if one believes in evolution, and means evolution, then to me it is blasphemous to talk as though he still believes in creation.

Again: he suggests the point that we must learn to see the whole of our history as the course of God's action. God the Creator is not something of the past, but He has to do with the present and the future. Now here is supposed to be a real dogmatical contribution, I suppose! Is this something new, something fresh? Is this supposed to be an advance over traditional Reformed theology? Do we need Kuitert and his radical views to teach us that God the Creator is not something of the past? Amazing! Are we just learning now that God has to do with the present and the future? Astounding! Must we still be talking about first principles and learning that the whole of our history is the course of God's action? I always thought that our God, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, was the God of providence, Whose counsel shall stand and Who does all His good pleasure. I have a not-so-sneaking suspicion that Kuitert does not even mean the same thing as we tradition-bound theologians mean, or understand, by this statement; but however that may be, I much prefer the formulation of our Heidelberg Catechism (Lord's Day X) on this subject. It is much clearer, much more precise, much warmer, and much more Christ-centered. Besides, how, pray tell, if theology first throws God out of His own creation, and substitutes evolutionism, can the whole of our history be the course of God's action? I have always learned to confess that it is precisely the God of creation Who is the God of providence (Heidelberg Catechism, IX, X; Confession of Faith, XII, XIII).

Again: sin is the "contra"? Sin is regression? Someone in the audience sensed immediately, — and correctly, — that this very terminology smacks of evolutionism. Is this the Biblical and, — if I may be pardoned for using the favorite terminology of the new theology, — the *kerygmatic* concept of sin? I challenge anyone to show this, — from Scripture, of course. Again: Christ nullifies the regression, deflects what interferes with history, completes the development, is the measure of creation as history, as progress? Is this, perhaps, what Dr. Kuitert makes of Colossians 1? Thank God, the Scriptures speak a clearer language than this theological jargon. Thank God, too, that they

speak of expiation and propitiation, — ideas which Kuitert conceded as an after-thought when he was confronted by them in a question, but whose place in his view he did not attempt to explain.

Finally, is it responsible theologizing to do as the doctor did in his address, that is, iconoclastically throw out all that is old, and then speak of many problems which remain with regard to the development of his own theology, and leave us with the sop of a “panorama unfolding and of life becoming meaningful under this view?” All this, — and precious little it was — was offered, I suppose, as being more Biblical, as being an emphasis on the content of the Bible. But the language is not Scriptural language, and there was no attempt whatsoever to relate what was said to the Scriptures.

In conclusion, therefore, I can only say, in the first place, that if I must choose between a dogmatics which prizes the historical order of creation-sin-salvation and this theological jargon of Kuitert, give me the former, — by far! For the former, to me, has the power and authority of “Thus saith the Lord.” The latter, to me, has the false ring of “Thus saith Man.”

In the second place, it is high time, — more than time, — that those who hold dear the Reformed faith

stop dilly-dallying around with this new theology. Perhaps some will think my language sharp and impatient. But I insist that it is about time that such as love the truth be stirred with some holy impatience for a change. And I insist that it is time to let the sword of the Spirit cut. It is time to stop working even on the abstract possibility that this kind of theology could be Scriptural and could have a plausible place in the Reformed sun. It is time to stop acting on the basis of the liberals, acting as though it is possible to have a lovely and friendly and brotherly dialogue about this kind of theology. The issue is far too clear and far too simple to be in doubt. And it is far too serious! Let it be understood that this is no limited, academic issue of creation versus evolution. Kuitert’s views go to the very roots of Reformed theology, the Reformed faith. Anyone who does not think so had better examine not only his own theology, but his own heart. What is so sorely needed today is not dialogue, but militance. Dialogue plays into the hands of the liberals: they will dialogue you, and the church, to death. Militance, a willingness to do battle in the name of the Lord and with the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, will bring about reformation. And where there is reformation, there is the blessing of the Lord.

## *All Around Us*

# **A Resolution on Creation and Evolution The Consequences of State Aid to Education The End of Another Anti-Evolution Law A Loss of Church Property**

*Prof. H. Hanko*

## ***A RESOLUTION ON CREATION AND EVOLUTION***

In the Presbytery of Southern California of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church the question arose what should be expected of ordained officebearers of the Church with respect to the doctrine of creation. In answer to this question the Presbytery adopted the following resolution (quoted from the *Presbyterian Guardian*):

1. The one true and living God existed alone in eternity, and beside Him there was no matter, energy, space or time.

2. The one true and living God, according to His sovereign decree, determined to create, or make of nothing, the world and all things therein, whether visible or invisible.

3. God performed His creative work in six days. (We recognize different interpretations of the word “day” and do not feel that one interpretation is to be insisted upon to the exclusion of all others.)

4. That no part of the universe nor any creature in it came into being by chance or by any power other than that of the Sovereign God.

5. That God created man, male and female, after His own image, and as God’s image bearer man possesses an immortal soul. Thus man is distinct from all other earthly creatures even though his body is composed of the elements of his environment.

6. That when God created man, it was God’s inbreathing that constituted man a living creature, and thus God did not impress His image upon some pre-existing living creature.

7. That the entire human family has descended from the first human pair, and, with the one exception of Christ, this descent has been by ordinary generation.

8. That man, when created by God, was holy. Then God entered into a covenant of works with the one man Adam. In the covenant Adam represented his posterity, and thus when he violated the requirement, all mankind, descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him and fell with him into an estate of sin.

The Presbytery believes this to be the teaching of the Bible.

While this is, on the whole, a commendable resolution and while it is a serious effort to combat the increasing threat of evolutionism, we find it difficult to understand the insertion of the parenthesis in point 3. There are other subordinate points which could, no doubt, be criticized, such as the idea of the covenant of works. But the parenthesis in point 3 is a serious concession which really weakens and will eventually destroy the thrust of the entire resolution. This is worth calling attention to since there are many nowadays who are convinced that the line can be held against evolution while a certain openness is permitted in the exegesis of Genesis 1. This is impossible.

Apart from the fact that there is no sound exegetical reason to interpret the word "day" in Genesis 1 in another way than a normal day of 24 hours (and there are several sound exegetical reasons for this interpretation), the fact remains that the meaning given to the word "day" in Genesis 1 lies at the heart of the creation-evolution controversy. This ought to be clear if we consider the fact that there is no reason at all to give to the "days" of creation any other meaning than a 24 hour period unless one wants an older earth than such an interpretation will permit. If the days are days of 24 hours, the whole chronological import of Scripture forbids an old earth. If an old earth is nevertheless desired, the only way to fit such an old earth into the chronological data of Scripture is through an interpretation of Genesis 1 which is less than literal. But the only reason any one would want an old earth is to make room for various findings of science which, on the surface, demand an old earth in order to be understood. But it is precisely at this point that the error is made. For it is at this point that greater weight is given to science and the findings of science than the revelation of God in the Scriptures.

It all comes down to this. The whole discussion of the meaning of the word "day" in Genesis 1 is not a purely academic discussion which really has no bearing on the question of creation vs. evolution. This is what the resolution quoted above suggests. But it simply is not true. The discussion of the meaning of the word "day" in Genesis 1 is an integral part of the whole controversy. And if a certain freedom is permitted in the exegesis of Genesis 1 which makes room for an old

earth, the result will be that the back door is left ajar to permit some form of evolutionism to sneak in after all. The meaning of the word "day" must be decided on exegetical grounds alone. And then it will become obvious that the word can only mean a normal day such as we know it.

#### *THE CONSEQUENCES OF STATE AID TO EDUCATION*

In a recent article in the *Torch and Trumpet*, Rev. Louis Tamminga writes concerning the predicament in which Ohio Valley College found itself after receiving federal assistance in its building program. It had received a total of \$76,000.00 from the federal government which covered part of the cost of an auditorium erected on the campus. This grant was given under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. In a routine visit in 1968 auditors of the Government General Accounting Office, the auditors learned that the auditorium was being used for chapel exercises. The college is allied with the Church of Christ. Further, these chapel exercises are a required part of the students' daily program. The auditors pointed out that the college was therefore in violation of the law. The law states that "no part of the facility or facilities included in the project may be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship." The college was given the choice between suspending all devotional exercises or repaying the amount of the original grant.

It is a strange thing that there are still many who cannot understand that state aid will inevitably involve state control. This same question is being discussed at considerable length here in the state of Michigan once again. There are in this state many supporters of Parochial (Michigan's version of state aid to education) who are pushing hard for the state to support in some measure private education. Increasingly it appears as if some bill is going to be passed which will give the private schools a legal claim on the support of the state. But in this movement there is also the constant provision that any aid given by the State must be used for the teaching of subjects which are "neutral". That is, such aid can only be used in courses which have no religious approach and content. Yet there are many who are supporters of the Christian School movement who nevertheless are lobbying strongly for such aid.

A storm of protest was raised in the state when Romney, departing from his office of governor of Michigan to take up the Cabinet post of Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in the Nixon Administration, said in a farewell speech that rather than go in the direction of Parochial, the private schools should simply permit their children to be taught in the public school system and give religious instruction in the Church and home. His basic premise was precisely that state aid, in any event, can only be given for the teaching of secular or neutral subjects.

The reason for this provision is clear enough. If the state gives aid for religious instruction it is in violation of the First Amendment which establishes the principle of separation between Church and State. Any laws which did not reckon with the First Amendment would be declared unconstitutional in the Courts.

But how can a Christian School have "neutral" subjects in its curriculum? Is not this an open denial of the very idea of "Christian" Schools? Christian Schools are established on the fundamental principle that the truth of God's Word must be the basis for the instruction in every subject taught.

The *Standard Bearer* intends, the Lord willing, to discuss in future issues this entire question.

#### THE END OF ANOTHER ANTI-EVOLUTION LAW

The famous "monkey trial" of the 1920's in almost ancient history. It was in that trial that William Jennings Bryan assisted the prosecution in its case against John Scopes who was convicted of teaching evolution in the public school system of Tennessee. The attorney for the defense was Clarence Darrow. The prosecution won its case although Bryan died shortly thereafter.

That was long ago. Today there are very few states left with anti-evolution laws. Arkansas was one; Mississippi is another. But recently Arkansas's law was stricken down by the United States Supreme Court as being unconstitutional. The case involved Mrs. Jon Epperson, a former Tenth Grade biology teacher in Little Rock. She claims to be herself a believer in Scripture although she insists that evolutionary theory is not in conflict with a proper understanding of Genesis. She did not herself teach evolution in obedience to the law as long as it stood on the books. But she made a case of it because she considered the law a hypocrisy since it was consistently being violated in Arkansas.

The decision to strike down the law was unanimous. But the decision, written by Justice Abe Fortas, has some ominous implications. Apart from the fact that the striking down of the law opened the door to an official seal of approval on the theory of evolution, the argument of Justice Fortas went beyond anything the court has yet done. The decision argued that the old law impeded religious freedom. And it impeded religious freedom because "Fundamentalists" were holding back learning only because the advance of learning might undermine some of their cherished beliefs. Hence, federal intervention was proper.

If this line of argumentation is followed consistently by the courts, one can only wonder what the future holds. The Court has stated that to believe in creation and to deny evolution is to become guilty of impeding the progress of knowledge. And such impeding of the progress of knowledge is sufficient grounds to warrant federal intervention.

All this applied, of course, to the public school system. But the fact remains that, if this principle is applied more generally, federal intervention in the existing Christian schools (and perhaps even in the Churches) can be justified on the grounds that learning is being impeded.

Even some of the other Justices had reservations. Justice Black saw the vagueness of the law as the only legitimate ground to strike it down. He is quoted by *Christianity Today* as saying: "Unless this court is prepared simply to write off as pure nonsense the views of those who consider evolution an anti-religious doctrine, then this issue presents problems under the establishment clause far more troublesome than are discussed in the court's opinion."

It appears as if, after all, a secular and humanistic religion will become the established religion of the nation.

#### A LOSS OF CHURCH PROPERTY

The *Grand Rapids Press* reported on January 27, 1969 that the Supreme Court of the United States had overthrown a decision of the Georgia Supreme Court which had awarded property to a dissident congregation within the Southern Presbyterian Church. The history is briefly this. The congregation of Savannah, Ga. had decided to withdraw from the Southern Presbyterian Denomination on the grounds that the denomination had departed from its historic faith. Some issues to which the congregation objected were the Church's support of civil disobedience, the Church's approval of the ordination of women office-bearers, the Church's support of the removal of Bible reading and prayers from the public school. The congregation kept its property, but suit was filed against it by the presbytery to which the congregation belonged. The Presbytery attempted to get the property away from the congregation. The case went to the State Supreme Court which upheld the right of the congregation to keep its own property. The case was appealed to the United States Supreme Court which overthrew the decision of the State Supreme Court. The grounds were the principle long ago established by the Supreme Court that the Courts have no right to enter into the doctrinal disputes of any Churches. No Court may determine if a Church is adhering to its doctrine or departing from it.

This is, of course, a safe principle. For if the Courts take any other position they assume that they have the right to decide the doctrine of a Church. This right must never be given to the Courts of the nation.

Nevertheless, this is going to be a bitter blow to conservatives throughout the Church world. The conservatives had hoped for a favorable ruling as an incentive to separate from parent denominations when they became apostate. The liberal leaders and ecumenicists were bitterly opposed to the position of the Georgia Supreme Court because they saw a threat to

their plans of holding possession of church property as a club over the heads of recalcitrant congregations. The ecumenicists have won the day. The faithful will have

to sacrifice their property if they want to remain faithful to the Scriptures. But surely this is not too great a price to pay.

## *Pages From The Past*

### **Believers and their Seed, Chapter 3 The Kuyperian View of Presupposed Regeneration**

*(continued from January 1 issue)*

*Rev. Herman Hoeksema*

Now it is at this juncture that Kuyper discovers his baptismal grace. That grace does not indeed consist in this, that by it one is initially ingrafted into the body of Christ. Even Kuyper realizes that all this is bestowed in regeneration. No, but now our personal faith must also function thus that presently it can with full consciousness live in the fellowship of that body of Christ and can seek and desire that fellowship. And that grace by which there is bestowed upon our personal faith that *habitus*, inclination, to desire and seek that fellowship with Christ's body and to enjoy it, — that is the grace which Dr. Kuyper associates with the sacrament of Holy Baptism. Thus he writes (*idem*, p. 543): "If this now is to be realized in you, then it is not sufficient that through grace you *personally believe*; but then it is equally necessary that there be implanted in this your faith the *habitus*, the inclination, by means of which you enter into the *joint* faith, the faith as it is the possession of the communion of saints. And this grace whereby your faith, which at first is exclusively personal, receives the potential, the *habitus*, the inclination, and the urge, not merely to stand before God in a strictly individual sense, but not to rest until you draw near before the Holy One as a member of the body of Christ, — that is the peculiar sacramental grace which Holy Baptism carries with it."

Now it is not our intention to criticize this view in detail and at length. It was only our purpose to demonstrate how the doctrine of a presupposed regeneration was introduced in connection with baptism. Nevertheless, this matter is certainly too serious to pass it by without a brief word of criticism. We too believe that our Reformed people must again understand their baptism and must live out of God's covenant. But we are nevertheless of the opinion that this view of a certain baptismal grace, a grace which is definitely tied to the sacrament of Baptism and which is not bestowed in any other way, should be eliminated root and branch. In the first place, we may point to the fact that there are only a very few among God's people who would be able to follow and to understand this philosophy. In order to

arrive at his conception of a baptismal grace Kuyper must distinguish, and then distinguish once again, and must split hairs. He must distinguish between a root-grace and a grace in the branches and a grace in the fruit. He must distinguish between a personal faith and the fellowship of faith, or a communal faith. In this

# **SCHOLARSHIPS**

● **Applicable to College Tuition**

● **Prospective P.R. Ministers  
& Teachers may apply**

● **Apply before May 1st**

● **Obtain blanks from your  
Y.P. Society secretary  
...or your Pastor**

**Sponsored by the Protestant  
Reformed Scholarship Fund  
and the Federation Board**

faith he must again distinguish between the *habitus*, or inclination, and the activity of it, in order at long last to discover in *the bestowal of that habitus to live in the fellowship of the body of Christ* the grace which belongs definitely and peculiarly with the sacrament of baptism. If it is along such a path of philosophical reasoning that God's people are again to understand their baptism, then the people of God in general will surely never learn to grasp its significance.

In the second place, we may note that in this manner the meaning of baptism is alarmingly impoverished and becomes devoid of content. Notice that this significance then consists of this, that baptism bestows a certain inclination, urge, *habitus*, upon faith, enabling it to live also in the fellowship of the body of Christ. Nothing more! That impoverishes baptism. In the third place, we point out that Dr. Kuyper's entire reasoning with regard to a distinction between a personal faith and a faith in fellowship with the body of Christ is purely philosophical. It is simply not true that in regeneration, in which we already become partakers of the power of faith, a faith is bestowed upon us that would not have the *habitus* to live in fellowship with the body of those who are perfectly righteous, and that therefore a second, altogether separate act of grace is necessary in order to bestow this *habitus*, or inclination, or urge, upon that faith. He who is regenerated is born again out of the risen Lord. He who through regeneration receives the power of faith is through that faith implanted into Christ, at that very moment lives no more unto himself or of himself, but out of Christ. And he who lives out of Christ, by virtue of the very nature of that life of regeneration, also lives out of the body of Christ. In other words, there is no personal faith, and it is impossible to conceive of a personal faith, which does not at the same time have in it the urge to live in fellowship with the body of Christ.

In the fourth place, we point out that thus the entire relation between the sign and the thing signified disappears, and the sacrament is relegated entirely to the sphere of the mystical. Who, when he observes the water in baptism, when he observes the entrance into that water and the emerging from that water, would ever see in it a figure of that so-called baptismal grace of which Kuyper speaks, a figure of that *habitus* or urge to live in the fellowship of the body of Christ? The symbolism of baptism is very rich. First of all, it certainly symbolizes the fact that through the blood of Christ our sins are forgiven and that we are washed in that blood. According to Scripture, it symbolizes that we are dead and buried with Christ and are raised again unto a new life. According to Scripture, it also symbolizes that we are separated from the present evil world, and that now as God's covenant people we walk in a new and holy life. But all this is simply lost if we must seek the real significance of baptism in that altogether special and separate grace of which Kuyper speaks.

And, finally, we would point out that along this path Kuyper brings us again on the road of Roman Catholicism, and he shuts up the grace of God within the institute of a certain church. Of course, we do not deny that the sacrament in the full sense of the word includes a certain operation of the grace of Christ from heaven. But we do indeed deny that that operation of grace is an altogether special one, which would not be bestowed without the ministration of the sacramental form by the church on earth. Along that path we run the risk of exalting the institute of the church on earth again in Romish fashion, even as many do in our day, and of making that institute the dispenser of the grace of Christ, thus shoving that institute between Christ and His church. Hence we also earnestly warn against this conception of Holy Baptism as being not in harmony with Scripture, as a view which impoverishes baptism, and as a view which leads us in the path of Romish sacerdotalism. This view offers us philosophy instead of the Word of God, stones in place of bread.

However, it was not to this view of Baptism that we wished to call attention at the moment. We only wanted to point out that it is this erroneous conception which necessarily led to that other conception, of presupposed regeneration, in connection with the baptism of infants. For it is clear that (according to Kuyper's view) if the baptism of infants is really to be a sacrament, then also in their case at that very moment when the minister of the Word and sacraments sprinkles the water on the forehead of the babe who is baptized that special baptismal grace must be bestowed upon that infant by Christ from heaven. Otherwise, according to Kuyper's view, also infant baptism is empty, a lamp without light. But if that special baptismal grace is to be bestowed on little children, then the life of regeneration must first be present in their hearts, and with that life of regeneration the power of faith. Now Kuyper reasons further (*E Voto*, III) that God is *able* to work this power of faith as well in the hearts of infants as in the hearts of adults. Moreover, he makes it clear that God also does this, by virtue of the fact that He establishes His covenant in the line of generations. And whereas it is established, according to Kuyper, that the sacrament of baptism may be administered only there, where this faith is present, be it then only as a power; and whereas it is also a fact that we nevertheless cannot say with certainty whether or not a certain child possesses the life of regeneration (for after all, Esau also was a covenant child), therefore we must proceed from the supposition that the children of believers are regenerated; and only on the ground of this supposition can the propriety of infant baptism be maintained. Let us allow Kuyper to speak for himself once again:

"We maintain, therefore, without the least bit of hesitation, the old, genuinely Reformed position, which, according to our inmost conviction is completely true, God-glorifying, and Scriptural, namely, that the matter

of our salvation and the salvation of our children is not dependent upon our expression of faith but upon God's hidden work in our soul, and that as far as we are concerned there can be no possibility, now or ever, of a manifestation of faith unless the hidden and mysterious work of God in our soul has *preceded* it. In the second place, that it is unbecoming for us to make any determination or limitation as to how soon or how long before our conversion this work of God in our soul must have taken place, and that consequently we ought to acknowledge and confess the sovereign freedom and power of God to accomplish this hidden work of His grace in our soul already in our mother's womb. In the third place, that only this prevenient grace of God, wrought in us already before or at the time of our birth, affords us a basis for our hope that our children who die in infancy will not be lost. And, in the fourth place, that in view of the uncertainty whether the children born to us will die in infancy or in later life, the *possibility* of such a work of grace in the soul of our child must be accepted *with respect to all of our children*. And, in the fifth place, that therefore *all* children of believers are to be considered as being comprehended in the covenant of grace, not only in appearance but in reality." (*E Voto*, III, 11, 12)

Kuyper writes further:

"The sacrament of Holy Baptism, therefore, belongs to every one of the elect who has received the beginning

of the new life in his heart through the hidden operation of the Holy Spirit. This is our first proposition. And the second follows upon it, namely that God the Lord is able, by His sovereign power, to work this beginning of the new life, or regeneration, by His Holy Spirit as well in the non-adult as in the adult, and even in the very smallest infant; and, considering that half of mankind dies in infancy or early childhood, that God very really has worked and still works thus. Baptism, therefore, where regeneration is present; and regeneration is conceivable as well in the newborn infant as in the old man of eighty years. And to these two, now, we add a third proposition, namely: Neither in the case of the adult nor in the case of the infant does the church, which must administer Holy Baptism, ever possess the absolute certainty that the person who presents himself or who is presented for baptism is indeed regenerated. Farther than to a surmise, a guess, a presupposition the church never attains."

Such is the doctrine of so-called presupposed regeneration. It wants to consider *all* the children of believers as regenerated on the basis of a presupposition. And precisely on the ground of such a presupposition it wants to administer Holy Baptism to the little children of believers. Where this cannot be presupposed, there, according to this view, baptism also may not be administered.

## Studies in Depth

# AN UNDERGROUND MOVEMENT

*Rev. Robert C. Harbach*

In tyrant-controlled countries the true church has become an underground church. The "token" church in these lands is little more than a facade church for the purpose of impressing tourists. The true church is there, but either in prison, concentration camp, Siberian exile or underground. However, this is not the movement we now have in mind. We rather refer to one which has ministered for nine years to the underground church. It calls itself "Underground Evangelism," and maintains a magazine publication of that name.

Everyone is familiar with the hammer and sickle. The symbol of this church organization is that of a cross and trumpet, an emblem in itself of which the Christian may be proud. It exemplifies the chief purpose of this movement, which is to carry out "the Great Commission." It proposes to do this by bringing the Word of God to the peoples of the communist world, and that means to one out of every three people on earth, and to accomplish this the only way it is possible, under-

ground. It therefore works with the "catacomb" church in communist lands, such as Russia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Red Germany, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Cuba, North Korea, Mongolia and Red China.

It proceeds on the basis of a typical Fundamentalist statement of faith, which contains the usual five points of fundamentalism, the infallibility of Scripture, the deity and virgin birth of Christ, His substitutionary death on Calvary, the bodily resurrection of the Lord and His return to earth from Glory. That is about as much creed or formal theological confession of faith one can get out of Fundamentalism. No different is it in this instance. A bare, almost barren doctrinal statement provides hardly a sound or adequate indicator of what it is that must be proclaimed in all the world to every creature in fulfillment of that Great Commission. Of course, a magazine or a brochure cannot carry a complete layout of a comprehensive statement of faith, like, let us say, the Three Forms of Unity, of the

Reformed Confessions, unless it would do so on the order of a microfilm imprint. But it could, at least, make reference to a broad statement of faith, and to where it may be found.

For assurance of some kind ought to be given that *the Gospel of God* is being proclaimed, and the messengers thereof held accountable to it and so not riding pet hobby-horses. Compromise of that Gospel in the interest of securing the support of as many denominations as possible results in the hiding of many strange and weird organizations behind a meagre statement of faith. Therefore names on the board of reference such as Rev. Theodore Elsner, a Philadelphia undenominational preacher, and Dr. E. Schuyler English, chairman of the editorial committee of the New Scofield Reference Bible, are interesting, but not exciting.

The Great Commission deserves, and demands, the best and highest type of ministry; it demands, not a band of prophets who believe the least, but men of God who believe the most and who will preach "in the fulness of the blessing of the Gospel of Christ." True, some of God's servants with but little knowledge of the truth have far more zeal for it than others three times their number. Such zeal, not altogether without knowledge, and though, it may be, supported by little knowledge, nevertheless deserves some recognition and commendation. Why did not the Lord send a priest or a prophet to Moab to carry the testimony of His truth there? Why did He convey that testimony there for the sake of one of His elect merely by Elimelech and Naomi, and soon thereafter by Naomi alone? Wonderful it would have been if Ruth had been brought to a knowledge of the Lord through the instrumentality of, say, a Moses, one trained in all the wisdom of Egypt as well as in all the knowledge of the Lord. But women in Israel were not trained to be theologians and this mother-to-be in Israel needed not to be converted by a theologian. It was not Joshua so much as Joshua's two spies who spied out one of God's elect in a heathen city, and who smuggled in the promise of God to Rahab.

Underground Evangelism works along such lines. The Word of God is put into the hands of the persecuted underground church of enslaved countries through an organization similar to that of the Gideons which strategically distributes Bibles, "stockpiles" them and puts them into the hands of individual believers, but operates pretty much like a smuggling ring to do it. The doors of these countries are closed to both missionary and gospel. In all there is communism's hardened, unmellowed deathly opposition toward the truth of Scripture. Korean martyrs have long resisted unto blood for the sake of the Gospel. This organization is convinced that the Word of God must be taken to believers in every communist country; that this must be done even though communists will never permit the spreading of the Word to be freely done; that this must be done without waiting for communist permission to

do it; that the task must not hesitate, stop or "write itself off" because of any man-made barriers, like the iron heel of the tyrant; that the work is not to be held in abeyance until better conditions arise, or ceased when conditions become worse; that we must not be "fair weather" brethren to enslaved Christians. Historically, it was not Underground Evangelism which began any kind of underground extension of the Gospel. The oppressed Christians robbed of religious liberties and forced underground by the atheistic Red machine began, as soon as the spiritual blackout was enforced, their underground contact with one another in undercover worship, clandestine Bible distribution and secret reading of Scripture. God's people in the free world give aid and comfort to the underground church by supplying it with thousands of Bibles. They are of small, pocket-sized editions which may the more easily be hidden and smuggled to their destination. With the brutal and bloody crackdown of Russia on Czechoslovakia, so destroying the little freedom enjoyed, pastors and people have returned to underground working, worshiping secretly where they can. The oppressed peoples are very anxious to have Bibles to teach their children the truth and to influence in any way they can the children of the atheistic youth movement forced-fed on atheism but still left with much empty-heartedness.

It must be understood that in the communist state, the ubiquitous police frequently busy themselves stopping people, examining their shopping bags, handbags, boxes, as they perform their ordinary checking routines. Any citizen may be subjected to search at any time. Over a distance of little more than a mile, one may pass a hundred police. Consequently these Christian workers have developed into what some of the people call "gospel phantoms." But the art of Bible smuggling goes on past the police, communists and government planted "pastors." These Bible smugglers know by experience the truth of these words, "But that it spread no further among the people, let us straitly threaten them, that they speak henceforth to no man in this Name" (Acts 4:17); and the truth of these words, "Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, 'We ought to obey God rather than men'" (5:29). An interesting fact about these phantom peddlers of the Word is that neither the Iron Curtain nor "the Wall" can keep them out. They are already there. The Gospel does not stop at the Iron Curtain. It pierces through as easily as the arrow of sunlight through a pane of glass.

"The weapons of our warfare are not carnal." "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in the heavenlies" (II Cor. 10:4; Eph. 6:12). Underground Evangelism informs us that the enslaving powers are terrified of freedom and especially fear the spiritual weapon of the Sword of the Spirit. This has always been true of world dictators. The French Revolution was

meant to do away with "bad faith and tyranny, to punish tyrants and traitors, to relieve the unfortunate . . . to defend the oppressed." But it led to the tyranny and terror of an oligarchy which did away with all religion and forced on the people a religion of patriotism. About seventy years after those days it was said, "Note this fact: there is no land beneath the sun where there is an open Bible and a preached gospel, where a tyrant long can hold his place. It matters not who he be, whether pope or king; let the pulpit be used properly for the preaching of Christ crucified, let the Bible be opened to be read by all men, and no tyrant can long rule in peace. England owes her freedom to the Bible;

and France will never possess liberty, lasting and well-established, till she comes to reverence the gospel, which too long she has rejected . . . . The religion of Jesus makes men think, and to make men think is always dangerous to a despot's power. The religion of Jesus sets a man free from superstition . . . . The man no longer cringes and bows down; he is no more willing, like a beast, to be led by the nose; but, learning to think for himself, and becoming a man, he disdains the . . . fears which once held him in slavery." (C. H. Spurgeon, *Treas.*, N.T., I, 636).

Truth will yet win the day!

## From Holy Writ

# The Book of Hebrews

Rev. G. Lubbers

## JESUS — SURETY OF A BETTER COVENANT (Hebrews 7:20-22) (cont.)

That "Jesus" is the surety of a better covenant is a historical fact. It is an accomplished fact in Christ's death, resurrection and in his glorious ascension. We see "Jesus" crowned with glory and honor. He is thus crowned with glory and honor because of the suffering of death, in order that he might, by the grace of God, taste death for all. (Hebrews 2:9) Hence, Jesus has become the surety of a better covenant.

The term "surety" is basically a legal term. Such it is in our daily language. It means to engage, to pledge. It means that one is the guarantor that the terms of the contract or of the covenant be fulfilled. Such a "surety" assures the payment of the note. Such is the meaning of the term in our parlance.

We must not lose sight of the fact that here Jesus is not simply the surety that the guilt of his people will be paid; he does not merely give such a promissory note, so to speak. On the contrary he is the surety of the Covenant of God. He will bring about the ultimate perfection and realization of the covenant, so that the tabernacle of God shall be with man. He will realize what John sees in visionary form in the book of Revelation "And I saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned to meet her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God . . ." (Revelation 21:2,3) Jesus is the surety that the salvation which he has begun will be completed even unto the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.

It is interesting to notice that Luther in his trans-

lation of the term "surety" (*egguos*) translates this with a word which means: executor. The term in the German is *Ausrichter*. He is one who will execute the will of God and will bring it to completion. This seems to be a more expressive translation than the Holland translates which is "Borg." This latter term suggests merely that Jesus gives a promissory note to pay, and guarantees the eternal salvation of all the elect. The German translation expresses the real, permanent and ultimate execution of the covenant, making it a reality in the hearts of all the redeemed.

For such a high priest Christ has now already become!

He is such a high priest up till the present moment, and he shall remain such a high priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek.

Jesus became such a high priest of a better covenant. Yes, the Old Testament covenant of the shadows was good. It foreshadowed the eternal blessings of salvation. However, it was not attended by the oath of God which spoke of the fulfilment of the promises. In that priesthood of Aaron the covenant blessings were not yea and Amen. In it God could not swear by His own holiness. But in Jesus the Lord Jehovah Himself comes to fulfil His own promise which he had confirmed by an oath. When he sent Jesus, Jehovah saves, He could swear by Himself. Here is not the weakness of the flesh, but the power of an endless life. Here is one who said: I and the Father are one. He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. Of this one the Father said: this is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. And this one said: "Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God has been gloried in Him. If God is glorified in Him, God shall also glorify Him in Himself, and shall straightway glorify

Him." And this glorification is God declaring himself fully in the Son in all his power, grace, mercy, loving kindness and endless perfection and faithfulness. (John 13: 31 f.f.)

This Jesus, Jehovah-saves, is the perfect executor of the promise of God, and the One who will realize God's covenant perfectly and bring many sons to glory. (Hebrews 2:9) The Surety of the better covenant is at once also the author of eternal salvation!

ABLE TO SAVE TO THE UTMOST (Hebrews 7:23-25)

Jesus has a priesthood which cannot be transmitted to another priest who would conceivably follow him. There is none to follow the Christ. He lives forever! In this, too, his priesthood excels that of the priesthood of Aaron and the covenant of the shadows and types. The contrast here is drawn sharply and distinctly. "And they truly were many priests . . . but this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood." We have seen in an earlier essay that the priesthood of Aaron was according to a carnal commandment. Now we see that this priesthood had many high priests who succeeded each other. According to certain Jewish writers, (see Polus and Gill) there were eighteen high priests in the first temple, and in the second temple there were more than three hundred. That there were so very, very many in the second temple, points up how petrified and corrupted the priesthood had become during this period, after the Babylonian captivity up till the time of Christ. It is well-known that during this time the high priesthood was viewed as to its political advantage towards the nations which held Israel in subjugation. The priesthood was purchased with money; he who paid the most received the priesthood by the nod of the rulers and sovereigns of the world. It is said that the priesthood changed hands once in every twelve months.

Not so the priesthood of Christ. Christ remains unto eternity. His is a priesthood which cannot change hands. Christ's priesthood continues on. It does not simply continue as long as this present world exists, and then it ceases to be. Not so. It is a priesthood which in the truest and strictest sense of the word abides forever. In the endless ages to come, after the Parousia, Christ will still be a priest. He will continue a priest forever in heavenly glory. It may perhaps be said that such is the aspect of the priesthood wherein the priesthood after the order of Melchizedek differs from the priesthood of Aaron. The priesthood of Aaron only spoke of sin and its removal. Even this, it is true, it could not accomplish. But this priesthood remains even after sin and guilt are removed — even in the perfected state of all things!

We are here reminded of what the late Rev. Herman Hoeksema writes in his *Reformed Dogmatics* concerning the difference between the priesthood of Aaron and that of Christ, a priest after the order of Melchizedek.

"What then is the difference and distinction between

the two orders of priesthood, that of Aaron and that of Melchizedek? We may at once, on the basis of Scripture, note two points of difference. The first is that while among Israel the priesthood and the royal offices were separated, so that one and the same person could not function in the both offices, they were combined in Melchizedek. He was a royal priest. And the second point of difference is that while the priesthood of Aaron in its specific meaning was temporal and must come to an end as soon as the perfect sacrifice was made, that of Melchizedek is everlasting. (Page 377.) Again we read in the same *Reformed Dogmatics* on page 379 the following, "And this priesthood is without end: it is everlasting. This was and could not be true of the priesthood of Aaron. It represented but a phase of the priestly calling of Christ, — that which had become necessary on account of sin. And this phase could not be everlasting. It belonged to the way the High Priest must travel to realize His everlasting priesthood. It was part of the work which must be performed to build the house of God. . . . This phase of the priesthood of Christ . . . was finished when the High Priest laid down His life as a ransom for many. But the priesthood of Christ did not reach its end on Golgotha; it is everlasting. He is a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek. Forever He consecrates Himself and His people and all things in perfect love to the Father. And presently he will come again to perfect the work the Father gave Him to do, to finish the house of God, and to establish it in heavenly beauty in the new Jerusalem, where the tabernacle of God shall be with man. (see above). And in that everlasting house of God Christ will forever be the perfect King-Priest, the King of righteousness, after the order of Melchizedek."

Yes, this Jesus has a priesthood which cannot be changed. He is a priest forever. Wherefore he can save those to the uttermost, who go through him unto God. He is *able* to do this. He is the mighty God in human flesh. He is the good shepherd who is mighty. No one can pluck us out of His hand. He has come to do the will of the Father. And this is the Father's will, that all that the Father gave Him He should save, and that He should raise them up in the last day.

It is upon the intercessory prayer that He is the surety of our being saved to the end. He ever lives to intercede for us. On the basis of His expiatory sacrifice brought for us he is our advocate with the Father. It is rather difficult to form a conception of this intercessory prayer of Christ. We do not follow him into the Most Holy place of heaven itself to hear Him pray. We do know that He intercedes for us with the Father, even as the Holy Spirit of Christ comforts us in our hearts. Perhaps we may say that the substance of this prayer we have expounded to us in the Sacerdotal prayer of Christ as given in the John 17. There the Savior prays to the Father as our High Priest. This is truly a grand prayer in content and structure. First, the Savior prays for

himself, that the Father may glorify him with his own glory, which he had with God from before the foundation of the earth. The Son has had this glory with God as to His chief place as the King-Priest in God's temple and upon His throne at God's right hand of majesty. Secondly, the Savior prays for the apostles who will go forth and preach the Word – the apostles to whom the Lord has revealed the Name of the Father. Thirdly, Jesus prays for the entire church which shall believe through the preaching of the apostolic Word. And finally we have that amazing "Father, I will" section of this prayer. He wills that the entire church may be with

him in glory, to see the glory which he had with God from before the foundation of the world. Thus this prayer emphasizes the "saving to the uttermost." Beginning in the eternal counsel, this prayer reaches out through the ages, till the perfection of all things.

Such is the intercession of Christ!

He is able to pray such a High-priestly prayer. He ever lives to pray. It is even his "Father I will" which is the basis of the righteousness of the New Jerusalem. He is, indeed, the surety of the better covenant – able to save to the uttermost.

## *Contending for the Faith*

# THE DOCTRINE OF SIN

THE THIRD PERIOD – 730-1517 A.D.

GOTTSCHALK

*Rev. H. Veldman*

Continuing our discussion of the history of doctrine as it involved Gottschalk, we wish to make a few comments upon our preceding article. It is very difficult for us to believe that Gottschalk maintained the doctrine of a conditional predestination, as far as the doctrine of reprobation is concerned. Schaff quotes from Gottschalk, which might conceivably lead one to believe that Gottschalk taught a reprobation upon foreseen sin and unbelief. However, in the first place, the teaching of God's sovereignty and a double predestination go hand in hand. The doctrine of election demands the doctrine of reprobation. We must either maintain both or deny both. To deny the doctrine of sovereign reprobation must lead to the denial of the doctrine of election. This lies in the nature of the case. The doctrine of election certainly means that the Lord, sovereignly, elected some, and this implies that He did not elect others. The doctrine of election is necessarily particular. Besides, that Gottschalk did not teach a doctrine of a conditional reprobation is evident also, it seems to me, from his role in the history of the church and of doctrine. After all, he was opposed by Hincmar who did teach a single predestination and a conditional reprobation. And he was condemned by the synod of Chiersy, and this synod declared in favor of a conditional reprobation and also that Christ died for all men without any exception. Why should Hincmar oppose Gottschalk if the latter taught a conditional reprobation? Hincmar's opposition to Gottschalk was surely because he did not agree with the teachings of this martyr for the Christian faith.

In a preceding article, we remarked that there were

three contending theories on Predestination. We have already called attention to the theory of absolute predestination as advocated and defended by Gottschalk and others. We also called attention to the doctrine of free will and a conditional predestination, in opposition to Gottschalk, and defended by such men as Hincmar, Archbishop Rabanus Maurus, and others. A third theory was set forth by a John Scotus Erigena, which was intended against Gottschalk, but was in fact still more against the orthodox view, and disowned by both parties. Erigena denied the doctrine of an absolute predestination, and he also defended the free will as being the very essence of man.

## DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ROME

Let us now trace the development of the doctrine of sin in the Church of Rome, as culminating in the decrees of the Council of Trent. We will be guided by Hodge as he treats this subject in his Systematic Theology. According to Hodge, it is a very difficult matter to decide the exact nature of this doctrine of Rome on sin. He writes, Vol. II, page 164:

This is a point very difficult to decide. Romanists themselves are as much at variance as to what their Church teaches concerning original sin as those who do not belong to their communion. The sources of this difficulty are, (1) First, the great diversity of opinions on this subject prevailing in the Latin Church before the authoritative decisions of the Council of Trent and of the Romish Catechism. (2) The ambiguity and want of precision or fulness in the decisions of that council. (3) The different interpretations given by prominent theologians of the true meaning of the Tridentine (of the Council of Trent – H.V.) canons.

Hodge writes that the diversity of sentiment in the Latin Church or Romish Church (we must understand that when we speak here of the Roman Church we refer to the Church as it existed prior to the Reformation) is evident from the fact that there were mainly three conflicting elements in the Latin Church before the Reformation, in relation to the whole subject of sin: first, the doctrine of Augustine, secondly, this doctrine as set forth by the Semi-Pelagians, and, thirdly, the doctrine of the schoolmen who endeavoured to find a middle ground between the other systems. We need to emphasize at this time the teachings of Augustine. Augustine taught and defended that original sin does not merely consist in the loss of original righteousness. This original righteousness was purely a supernatural gift that Adam possessed, and, when he sinned, he merely lost this added gift, and Adam, therefore, and his posterity after him, was left exactly in that state in which man had originally been created. Augustine, however, taught that original sin denotes the corruption of our nature, including both guilt and pollution. And this church father also taught that fallen man has no power to effect what is spiritually good; he can neither regenerate himself, prepare himself for regeneration, nor cooperate with the grace of God in that work. And these principles necessarily lead to the doctrines of efficacious and irresistible grace and of sovereign election. Augustine, therefore, championed the truths of utter depravity and corruption and the sovereignty of God's predestination.

A second conflicting element within the Church, besides Augustinianism, was represented by the Semi-Pelagians. The principal leaders of this party were John Cassianus, an Eastern monk and disciple of Chrysostom, and Faustus of Rhegium. Of these two, the abler and more influential was Faustus, who secured the condemnation of Lucidus, an extreme advocate of the Augustinian doctrine, in the Synod of Arles, 475 A.D. This Faustus was born in Brittany in the beginning of the fifth century or toward the close of the fourth. He died in 491. From 462 until his death he was bishop of Rhegium. This explains why he is known as Faustus of Rhegium. However, the Semi-Pelagians were far from agreeing among themselves either as to sin or as to grace.

Concerning Cassian Hodge writes the following, *Systematic Theology*, Vol. II, 166:

Cassian taught that the effects of Adam's sin on his posterity were, (1) That they became mortal, and subject to the physical infirmities of this life. (2) That the knowledge of nature and of the divine law which Adam originally possessed, was in a great measure preserved until the sons of Seth intermarried with the daughters of Cain, when the race became greatly deteriorated. (3) That the moral effects of the fall were to weaken the soul in all its power for

good, so that men constantly need the assistance of divine grace. (4) What that grace was, whether the supernatural influence of the Spirit, the providential efficiency of God, or his various gifts of faculties and of knowledge, he nowhere distinctly explains. He admitted that men could not save themselves, but held that they were not spiritually dead; they became sick, and constantly needed the aid of the Great Physician. He taught that man sometimes began the work of conversion; sometimes God; and sometimes, in a certain sense, God saves the unwilling. Vincent evidently regarded the Augustinian doctrine of original sin as making God the author of evil; for, he says, it assumes that God has created a nature, which acting according to its own laws and under the impulse of an enslaved will, can do nothing but sin. And he pronounces heretical those who teach that grace saves those who do not ask, seek, or knock, in evident allusion to the doctrine of Augustine that is, is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God who sheweth mercy.

The position of the Semi-Pelagian certainly is clearly revealed in the above quotation. Cassian taught that the sinner is not dead but sick, and that he constantly needs the *aid* of the Great Physician. This was also set forth by the later Arminians in their Five Points of the Remonstrance. And imagine declaring heretical those who teach that grace saves those who do not ask, seek, or knock, evidently alluding to the doctrine of Augustine that it is not of him what willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God Who sheweth mercy. Of Faustus Hodge writes as follows:

Faustus admitted a moral corruption of nature as the consequence of the fall of Adam, which he called original sin. In his letter to Lucidus he anathematizes the doctrine of Pelagius that man is born "without sin." From this deteriorated, infirm state, no man can deliver himself. He needs the grace of God. But what grace was is doubtful. From some passages of his writings there would seem to be meant by it only, or principally, the moral influence of the truth as revealed by the Spirit in the Scriptures. Semi-Pelagians agreed, however, in rejecting the Pelagian doctrine that Adam's sin injured only himself; they admitted that the effects of that sin passed on all men, affecting both the soul and the body. It rendered the body mortal, and liable, without divine assistance, of doing anything spiritually good. But as against Augustine they held, at least according to the statements of Prosper and Hilary, the advocates of Augustinianism in the south of France, (1) That the beginning of salvation is with man. Man begins to seek God, and then God aids him. (2) That this incipient turning of the soul towards God is something good, and in one sense meritorious. (3) That the soul, in virtue of its liberty of will or ability for good, cooperates with the grace of God in regeneration as well as in sanctification. That these charges were well founded may be inferred from the decisions of the councils of Orange and Valence, A.D. 529, in which the doctrines of Augustine were again

sanctioned. As the decisions of those councils were ratified by the Pope they were, according to the papal theory, declared to be the faith of the Church. Among the points thus pronounced to be included in the true Scriptural doctrine, are, (1) That the consequence of Adam's sin is not confined to the body, or to the lower faculties of the soul, but involves the loss of ability to spiritual good. (2) That sin derived from Adam is spiritual death. (3) Grace is granted not because men seek it, but the disposition to seek is a work of grace and the gift of God. (4) The beginning of faith and the disposition to believe is not from the human will, but from the grace of God. (5) Believing, willing, desiring, seeking, asking, knocking at the door of mercy, are all to be referred to the work of the Spirit and not to the good which belongs to the nature of fallen man. The two great points, therefore, in dispute between the Augustinians and Semi-Pelagians were decided in favour of the former.

Now it is true that the synod of Orange, 529, is especially known because of its consistent condemna-

tion of Semi-Pelagianism. Many historians leave the impression, therefore, that this synod represents a last victory for the Augustinian conception of predestination and sovereign grace. However, this may be disputed. It is true, on the one hand, that the synod did maintain, rather inconsistently, the total incapability of man to do any good, over against the Semi-Pelagians. But, on the other hand, it denied the infallible and irresistible operation of sovereign grace. As far as predestination is concerned, the synod was satisfied simply to express that a predestination to evil is to be condemned; in other words, it must have nothing of sovereign reprobation. And in the decisions of this Synod of Orange nothing is found concerning sovereign election and reprobation. From this it appears very clearly that they were afraid to maintain the strict doctrine of Augustine. The synod assumed an apologetic attitude. Although it opposed the doctrine of the Semi-Pelagians, it nevertheless was far from maintaining the positive doctrine of predestination and sovereign grace.

## *The Strength of Youth*

# The Basis for Dissent (2)

*Rev. J. Kortering*

Covenant youth, who are sensitive to the American scene, realize a need for expressing dissent. Not many are content to sit in smug complacency and say that America has no public sin. Our northern cities reek with the stench of discrimination against the poor and colored; they don't have to cast a holier-than-thou glance southward. To insulate fiscal security, suburban America erects a wall of paternalistic benevolence in an attempt to contain a seething, rotten ghetto. If any poor or colored try to climb this wall, they are forthwith denominated as aggressors, troublemakers.

The consciences of covenant youth are pricked.

Many attempts are put forth to undo this situation.

We are presently analyzing the basis upon which these attempts are being put forth. This inquiry will help us in determining whether covenant youth may rightly co-operate with these efforts.

Some are moved to help the poor and colored neighbor out of consideration for his humanity. These people are humans and as members of the human race have human rights. Among these human rights we find such things as equal protection of the law, property ownership, employment, adequate food, decent housing, education, etc. This sounds notable, yet the Christian recognizes that this cannot be a *basis* for

concern for the neighbor. Humanism is anti-God, it leaves Christ out of the picture.

In our last article, we also intimated that universal Brotherhood cannot serve as a proper basis for concern for our neighbor. The only difference between Brotherhood and Humanism is that Brotherhood adds a religious flavor. It pretends to be Christian, but in reality denies Christ.

The late Dr. Martin Luther King was the most eloquent voice of the civil rights movement. His famous, "Stone of Hope," garnished in local color, pulls at the heart strings and cries for Brotherhood.

Now, I say to you today, my friends, even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It's a dream deeply rooted in the American dream. I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal."

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave-owners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

It is this exponent of Brotherhood who so clearly denies the Christ of the Scriptures. In an article entitled, "The Theology of Martin Luther King"

published in the National Observer, we quote Dr. King as saying, "I don't think anyone else can be Jesus. He was one with God in purpose. He so submitted His will to God's will that God revealed His divine plan to man through Jesus." He brands the account of the virgin birth of Christ as a "mythological story of Jesus' biological uniqueness." This is perfectly all right with him because man is not a sinner, who is judged guilty by the righteous God and therefore requires divine atonement as the way to reconciliation. For Dr. King, sin is, "the estrangement that always develops when man misuses his freedom and revolts against God." Notice man is free and sin is a misuse of that freedom; to him man is not dead in trespass and sin. From the above, it is obvious that this voice of the Brotherhood movement denies Christ.

The World Council of Churches adopted "Ten Commandments" at their 4th Assembly which met in Upsala this past summer. These commandments are shot through with the same Brotherhood of all men. We list a few:

2. You must support actively the principles of human rights and help black people everywhere become in all respects first class citizens with all the rights and opportunities thereof.

3. You must strive for Christian unity in spirit, truth, and action and help strengthen the new bonds between the Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches as well as the enlarged unity within the Council itself.

6. You must take the U N's Universal Declaration of Human Rights seriously and implement its basic principles locally and nationally during the International Year for Human Rights (1968) and thereafter.

7. You must create new forms of individual and corporate worship in order to make Christian social action theologically relevant and seek as a new basis of ecumenical fellowship, to make the Eucharist (Lord's Supper) not a barrier but a bond within the Christian family.

9. You must be realistic in the achievement of moral, social and economic goals, realizing that the use of secular political action by united Christians is essential in the accomplishments of truly Christian ends.

Obviously, the basis for all these action programs is Brotherhood as related to the universal concept of Humanism. Not one of the "Ten Commandments" refers to human depravity, the need for the redemption of the blood of Christ, or the like. Man is basically good; he just needs a good example and a gentle nudge along the right path. This is anti-christian.

Even the Christian Reformed Church in the decision of the Synod of 1959, "Declaration on Race Relations" follows a similar broad basis. We quote this as referred to in the Reformed Journal, September 1968 issue, "The fundamental unity and brotherhood of the whole human race" was affirmed by the Synod. In

addition, "The decisive consideration in all race relations, namely, the command of God that we should love our neighbor as ourselves. The duty of the Christian Church to avoid even a semblance of prejudice and discrimination; indeed to take the leadership in promoting brotherhood. The calling to regard Christians of any race as fellow members of the body of Christ, bound to us by the closest of ties. The duty of the Church to avoid association with racist slogans of any kind, and in every matter of race relations to act, no matter what the cost, in humility and obedience to her Savior and Sovereign Lord."

The perplexing point of this decision is the broad basis for concern for the negro neighbor; it is based upon the fundamental unity and brotherhood of the whole human race. This brotherhood must be promoted. This led Dr. George Stob to write an article, "Where is your brother" and in this article considers any black neighbor as a brother; we must be his keeper. Scripture denies there is any fundamental unity and brotherhood of the *whole* human race. Sin has created a sharp division, and the only unity is that which is realized through the redemption of Christ. The only unity in the world is the unity of the Church of Christ. The only brotherhood in the world is the brotherhood of the Church of Christ. Outside of this Church there is only enmity, confusion, and every evil work.

#### LOVE THY NEIGHBOR, A PROPER BASIS

What then is the proper basis for concern for our neighbor, particularly one who is being abused, discriminated against, and even hated?

The basis is given to us in the Word of God, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. This is the first and great commandment and the second is like to this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets," Matt. 22:37-40.

The basis for concern is not that he is a human being, not that he is my brother (at least not in all instances), but he is my *neighbor*!

This love of the neighbor includes basically two things:

1. That the Christian Church brings the Word of God to all those that are round about them. Essentially this consists of the preaching of the Word through the institute church. This love is manifest not in making salvation available to all neighbors, but rather that through the call of the gospel, God will draw out of all our neighbors those whom He is pleased to save and bring into the true brotherhood of the Church. For those who have no place in this brotherhood, the preaching is a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense.

It is exactly at this crucial point that popular dissent, which opens the way for civil rights and social reform, fails. According to the Word of God, man's misery is not

first of all whether he is poor, or cold, or bothered by rats; rather man's misery is that he is a sinner before God. Love that is worthy of true brotherhood directs the sinner to his sins and calls him to repentance and salvation in Jesus Christ. The basic *dissent* according to the Word of God is against sin. God is a righteous God and hates the sinner and his sin. The only hope of escape is by the grace of repentance and forgiveness through the cross. This is accomplished through the preaching of the gospel.

2. The same Word of God directs our attention to a proper attitude and conduct on the part of the Christian to his neighbor. In distinction from the above this applies to the relationship of the organic church toward the neighbor. As members of the Body of Christ, each one of us has a calling to express this love of Christ in very word and deed toward our neighbor. Only then does the preaching of the Word bear fruit in our daily lives.

This love of the neighbor does not overlook his sins and seek a friendship on mere carnal attraction. Rather, it, too, is expressed as a dissent to all evil, whether in our lives or the lives of our neighbors. Christian witness to the neighbor directs him to bow before the law of God.

From this point of view, if we see one of our neighbors hating and abusing another of our neighbors, we rise up in holy indignation. We may not say, it does not concern me; it does, as we must give account before God for all our dealings or lack of dealings with the neighbor. The spirituality of our neighbor, whether believer or unbeliever, may not determine whether we care or not. We are commanded to express love to all our neighbors. Living out of Christ is spelled out for us in Eph. 4:24-32, "And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true

holiness . . . Let him that stole steal no more, but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth . . . Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice, and be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." This must apply to all our neighbors, even our enemies, Matt. 5:44. The reason is both negative, that if the neighbor continues in sin he will heap to himself coals of judgment, ("Therefore if thy enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good" Rom. 12:20,21,) and positive, ("Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven,") and this is salvation. We may be a means to gain others for Christ.

Among the poor and colored are some of our brothers and sisters in Christ Jesus. In expressing dissent against their mis-treatment and seeking to help them, this word of God applies, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you . . . for I was an hungered and ye gave me meat, I was thirsty and ye gave me drink, I was a stranger and ye took me in; naked and ye clothed me . . . Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

The Lord willing in our next article we will consider how this concern should be expressed, particularly as it applies to methods of expressing dissent. To what extent should the church become involved? Is there room for co-operation with others who have a false basis? Does the end justify the means even to the point of violence?

Think about it.

## Contribution

# Protestant Reformed Scholarship Fund

The Committee which is responsible for the administration of the Protestant Reformed Scholarship Fund is making plans for the fourth consecutive year to award scholarships to young people who have determined to enter the ministry of the Gospel or to study for the teaching profession.

The *Beacon Lights* of March, 1960, featured an article by the editor-in-chief at that time, which was entitled "A Proposed Scholarship Program." Since that time the Protestant Reformed Scholarship Fund, which is under the control of the Federation of Protestant Reformed Young People's Societies, has not

only become a reality but also has come of age. In subsequent articles various writers have discussed the development of this most significant project. The origin and early history of this Federation function were stormy, but by God's grace the project has stood. Scholarships have been awarded in less time than the estimated ten or fifteen years suggested in the article of our former editor-in-chief. Ten years have not yet elapsed since the time that this fund began to be collected.

Students who are now seniors in high school and are on the "home stretch of this first leg of their

secondary school training" were at the time of the inception of this idea students in the third or fourth grade of the elementary school. Now these students are eligible for a scholarship from the Protestant Reformed Scholarship Fund. Young people today owe a debt of gratitude to young people of a decade ago who by God's grace were concerned that there be teachers in the schools and preachers in the churches.

The Scholarship Fund Committee hereby wishes to remind all young people who are attending college or plan to attend a college that the Committee is anxious to have you apply for one of the scholarships that will be awarded this year.

The Committee reminds you of the following simple rules:

1. All applicants must be prospective ministers or teachers.
2. All applications for the following school year must be submitted to the committee by May 1.
3. Each applicant must fill out an application blank. . .

4. Applicants shall be judged on the basis of sincerity, ability, and need.
5. Applicants must be either a baptized or confessing member of a Protestant Reformed Church.
6. Applicants shall promise in writing to repay in full should they *refuse* to teach or preach in our Protestant Reformed schools or churches.
7. The scholarship shall be applicable to tuition only.

College aspirants are urged to contact their society secretary, who will have the application blanks needed to apply for this fund.

The prayer of the Committee is that God will continue to supply those who feel called to the ministry of the Gospel or to the teaching profession and that this Scholarship Fund may be a God-ordained means to that end.

Agatha Lubbers

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Prof. H. Hanko*

*THE ENCOUNTER BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND SCIENCE*, by Richard Bube; Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968; 318pp., \$5.95.

The purpose of this book is described in the Foreword and is at the same time an early indication of what the contents of the book will be:

This book is an attempt by several scientists, working in different scientific fields, to relate their scientific work to their Christian faith. For them the encounter between faith and science is not a subject of academic interest, but they live it in their daily lives.

The authors show that their science and their faith do not battle against each other, but that they mutually enrich and complement each other. The harmony thus achieved is not attained by rejecting major parts of the Christian doctrine or the scientific endeavor, but by accepting the basic tenets of Christianity and by keeping an open attitude to *all* aspects of science.

Perhaps somewhat unwittingly the editor of the book tips his hand in the first chapter on "The Nature of Science" when he writes:

Put in a negative way, it is not the purpose of science to provide an explanation of the phenomena of the natural world, i.e., to answer the question "Why?", in any other categories than those of natural phenomena. The supernatural is not excluded from science because of a bias on the part of scientists; the supernatural is excluded from science *by definition*.

In other words, science is neutral. And this neutrality of science is developed in terms of an autonomy of science in a certain sense, an autonomy which gives to science an independent place along side of Scripture. It is not difficult to envision what consequences this position has.

Scientifically the various authors set themselves squarely in the stream of evolutionism, although they adopt a certain "theistic evolution." Theologically, the book is far from satisfactory. The death of Christ is defined as being an evidence of God's willingness for reconciliation. The whole concept of satisfaction is rejected. A basically materialistic view of man pervades the book. (cf. e.g., p. 80.) A "Sitz im leben" view of inspiration is adopted with respect to the Scriptures: "revelational content" is the only thing which counts. (pp. 95ff.)

The book contains chapters on "Natural Revelation, Biblical Revelation, Astronomy, Geology, Physical Science, Biological Science, Psychology, Social Science."

It would be well for ministers and teachers to purchase this book and study it carefully. Not because it of its positive value in the field of the relation between science and Scripture. But because it represents the latest in the thinking of "theistic evolutionists" and it gives the philosophical and theological basis for "theistic evolution." An examination of this basis will show how wrong the basis is and on what false grounds the whole system of theistic evolution is built.

*ISRAEL AND THE BIBLE*, by William Hendriksen, Baker Book House, 1968; 63 pp., \$1.50 (paper).

In this short book Rev. Hendriksen develops proof for the Jews' responsibility of crucifying Jesus; he includes a refutation of premillennialism in relation to modern-day Israel; he discusses briefly the place of the Jews in the New Dispensation especially as this problem is discussed in Romans 9-11. While the answers which Hendriksen gives are generally sound, the book is too brief to be of much value. This important subject and the exegesis of Romans 9-11 are too detailed to be encompassed within the scope of 63 short pages. Far better it would have been to develop the ideas of the book more extensively before the material was rushed into print. The book gives evidence of having been hastily thrown together.

*THE CANONS OF DORT*, A Study Guide; by Henry Petersen; Baker Book House; 1968; 115 pp.; \$1.50 (paper).

The contents of this paperback were originally presented as a series of articles in *The Banner*. The book is a brief discussion of the contents of the historic Canons of Dort. While usually our own ministers prepare their material if the Canons are being discussed in Society or in Catechism, this book could serve as a compendium. However, one will have to be prepared for an introduction into the discussion of the author's total commitment to the theory of common grace. There is much space given to a defense of common grace, untotat total depravity and the well-meant offer of grace. In connection with the latter, it is too bad that the author quotes more extensively from John Murray, Ned

Stonehouse, Alexander De Jong and others than he does from the Canons themselves.

One serious weakness of the construction of the book is that other writers are often quoted without any reference to the work being quoted from.

---

WHOSOEVER WILL - by Rev. Herman Hoeksema - price, only \$1.50. This book is intended to set forth the inseparable connection between the certainty that "Whosoever will may come," and the truth of God's sovereign grace: the former is based upon and rooted in the latter. (from preface)

Order from: The Reformed Witness Hour  
P.O. Box 1230  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501

LENTEN BOOKS - by Rev. Herman Hoeksema  
THE POWER OF THE CROSS - \$1.50  
REJECTED OF MEN - \$1.50

Order from: The Reformed Witness Hour  
P.O. Box 1230  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT

Classis West of the Protestant Reformed Churches will meet on March 5, 1969, in South Holland, Illinois, at 9:00 A.M. Delegates in need of lodging should inform the clerk of the South Holland consistory of their need.

Rev. David Engelsma  
Stated Clerk  
Classis West

---

#### IN MEMORIAM

On January 27, 1969, it pleased the Lord to take unto Himself our beloved mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother

MRS. J.R. VANDER WAL  
at the age of ninety years.

"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." (Eph. 2:8).

Mr. & Mrs. Meindert Gastra

Redlands, Cal. 4 grandchildren  
15 great-grandchildren

---

#### RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Radio Committee of the Reformed Witness Hour expresses their sympathy to their fellow member, Dale Bartelds, in the passing to glory of his father,

MR. JOHN BARTELDs.

May he, and the bereaved family be comforted with that greatest assurance, that in life or in death, we are not our own, but belong to our faithful Saviour, Jesus Christ.

Don Faber, Chairman  
Sharon Prince, Sec'y.

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT

Needed for the 1969 - 1970 school year at the Northwest Iowa Protestant Reformed Christian School, two teachers. One for Grades 1 through 4, and one for Grades 5 through 8. Anyone interested please contact Mr. George Hoekstra, Hull, Iowa, 51239.

---

#### RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Priscilla Society of the First Protestant Reformed Church expresses its sympathy to one of its members:

MRS. J. BARTELDs

in the loss of her husband,

MR. JOHN BARTELDs

May the bereaved family be comforted with the Word of God found in Psalm 116:15, "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints".

Mrs. P. Decker, Pres.  
Mrs. W. Corson, Sec'y.

## News From Our Churches

### REPORT OF CLASSIS EAST

January 8, 1969

#### At Southeast Church

Rev. G.C. Lubbers led in the opening devotions.

All the churches of Classis East were represented by two delegates each.

Rev. G. Van Baren, following the order of rotation, presided over this session, while the Rev. Lubbers recorded the minutes.

The brethren J. Boone and R. Teitsma were appointed to the finance committee, and brother J. King was appointed to thank the ladies of Southeast for their excellent catering.

The Stated Clerk read the transcribed minutes of the October meeting which Classis approved.

He also read his report re correspondence which was filed for information.

The Classical Committee read its report which also gave advice concerning the duplication of protests and appeals. Classis adopted the advice: that henceforward the Stated Clerk may use a copy machine to duplicate classical material at the expense of Classis.

Kalamazoo presented its annual subsidy request which Classis approved. Holland was granted the privilege of presenting its subsidy request to the April Classis.

Hudsonville and Southwest consistories requested pulpit supply while their respective ministers labor for six weeks each in Pella, Iowa. This was granted, though it required a revision of the original classical appointment schedule for South Holland. The committee: Rev. J. Kortering, Rev. R. Harbach, and Elder G. Stadt prepared the following schedule which was adopted:

**SOUTH HOLLAND:** Jan. 12- M. Schipper; Jan. 19- J. Heys; Jan. 26- G. Van Baren; Feb. 2- J. Kortering; Feb. 9- M. Schipper; Feb. 16- J. Kortering; Feb. 23- G. Van Baren; Mar. 2- B. Woudenberg; Mar. 9- B. Woudenberg; Mar. 16- J. Heys; Mar. 23- J. Kortering; Mar. 30- M. Schipper.

**SOUTHWEST:** Jan. 12-Seminary; Jan. 19-J. Kortering; Jan. 26-Seminary; Feb. 2-J. Heys; Feb. 9-G. Van Baren; Feb. 16-R. Harbach.

**HUDSONVILLE:** Feb. 23-Seminary; Mar. 2-M. Schipper; Mar. 9-Seminary; Mar. 16-R. Harbach; Mar. 23-G. Van Baren; Mar. 30-J. Heys.

The Church Visitors gave their annual report which Classis received for information.

First Church requested Classis to send their overture to Synod re adjustment of number of families and assessments. Classis sent this letter with classical approval.

A member of one of our churches presented material of an appeal to Synod which was given to a committee of Rev. M. Schipper, Rev. J. Heys, and Elder G. Holstege for study and advice and to report to the April Classis.

Classis voted for Synodical Delegates and the following were chosen:

**MINISTERS:** Primi: J. Heys, G. Lubbers, M. Schipper, and G. Van Baren.

Secundi: R. Harbach, J. Kortering, and H. Veldman.

**ELDERS:** Primi: J. King, J. H. Kortering, H. Meulenberg, and G. Pipe.

Secundi: P. Cnossen, D. Dykstra, D. Kooienga, and H. G. Kuiper.

Voting for Delegates Ad Examina resulted in the following being chosen: Primus for 3 years Rev. J. Kortering; Secundi: Rev. H. Veldman for 3 years, and Rev. R. Harbach for one year.

It was decided to meet next time the first Wednesday of April in our Hudsonville Church.

Questions of Article 41 of the Church Order were asked and answered satisfactorily.

After the minutes were approved, classis adjourned. Rev. J. Kortering offered the closing prayer.

M. Schipper, S.C.

\* \* \* \* \*

Rev. G. Van Baren has received a call from our church at Hull, Iowa. The trio included the Revs. R. C. Harbach and B. Woudenberg.

\* \* \* \* \*

Rev. J. Kortering, of Hope Church, lectured to a large and attentive audience in First Church of Grand Rapids on Thursday, Jan. 23. The topic, "The Mystery of Lawlessness" as depicted in 2 Thes. 2:7, was masterfully evaluated with copious quotations from Holy Writ to authenticate his interpretation of that horrible threat to our young people and children who may be living in the last days. The speaker maintained that lawlessness is principally rebellion against God's authority; is found in children, parents, rulers, judges, kings and principalities. Further, that this spirit develops in history, climaxing in the Anti-Christ who will attempt to destroy the church but will only serve to prepare her for her place in glory. The audience left with these comforting words, "Now our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and God, even our Father which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts and stablish you in every good word and work". 2 Thes. 2:16,17.

\* \* \* \* \*

A belated "Season's Greetings" is extended to all our people from Rev. C. J. Elliott and his group of churches in Jamaica. His letter closed with, "May the peace of our Covenant God that passeth all understanding ever keep our hearts and minds perfect in His Will 'till He comes."

\* \* \* \* \*

The Northwest P.R. School Society is advertising their need for a Kindergarten teacher. Any takers?

..... see you in church

J.M.F.