

The Standard Bearer

A REFORMED SEMI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE

IN THIS ISSUE

Meditation:

The Blessing of the Spirit

Editorials:

“Kies Koers!”

A Holy Bible?

The A.A.C.S. and Christian Schools
(see: All Around Us)

Dr. Daane, St. Paul, and the W.C.C.
(see: Examining Ecumenicalism)

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Meditation — | |
| The Blessing of the Spirit | 362 |
| Editorials — | |
| “Kies Koers!” | 365 |
| A Holy Bible? | 366 |
| All Around Us — | |
| Proof for Joshua | 369 |
| The A.A.C.S. and Christian Schools | 370 |
| From Holy Writ — | |
| Exposition of Ezekiel 18 | 372 |
| Examining Ecumenicalism — | |
| Dr. Daane, St. Paul, and the W.C.C. | 374 |
| Contending for the Faith — | |
| The Doctrine of Atonement (First Period) | 376 |
| In His Fear — | |
| First At Last | 378 |
| Studies in Depth — | |
| Billy Graham’s Compromised Crusade Connections | 380 |
| News of our Churches | 383 |

THE STANDARD BEARER

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

Published by the Reformed Free Publishing Association, Inc.
Second Class Postage Paid at Grand Rapids, Mich.

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

Department Editors: Mr. Donald Doezema, Rev. Cornelius Hanks, Prof. Herman Hanks, Rev. Robert C. Harbach, Rev. John A. Heys, Rev. Jay Korterling, 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. Donald Doezema
1904 Plymouth Terrace, S.E.
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506

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 \$3.00 fee. These should be sent to the Business Office and should be accompanied by the \$3.00 fee. Deadline for announcements is the 1st or the 15th 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 Blessing of the Spirit

Prof. H. C. Hoeksema

For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring: And they shall spring up as among the grass, as willows by the water courses. One shall say, I am the Lord's; and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord, and surname himself by the name of Israel.

Isaiah 44:3-5

Water upon the thirsty. . . My Spirit upon thy seed!
Floods upon the dry ground. . . My blessing upon
thine offspring!
A vision of Pentecost!

It was seen by the prophet Isaiah centuries before the time of fulfillment, seen — and for that reason all the more vivid and glorious — against the dark background of Jacob's being given to the curse, and Israel's

being given to reproaches because of their sins.

Who would ever care to belong to that accursed Jacob? Who would care to be named by Jacob's name, or by the name of the God of Israel — Israel in misery, given over to reproaches, the object of revilement and mockery? Who would count it an honor to be inscribed in the register of Israel and to be counted an Israelite?

Yet now hear, O Jacob my servant, and Israel whom I have chosen!

Fear not!

Ye have a future, a glorious future!

For I will pour water upon the thirsty!

I will pour My Spirit upon thy seed!

They shall spring up as willows among the grass!

One shall say, I am the Lord's, and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob. Yet another shall sign his name as belonging to Jehovah. And a fourth man will count it an honor to be surnamed an Israelite!

Could not Peter have said in his Pentecost sermon, even as he did with reference to the prophecy of Joel, — yea, did he not say in principle, "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Isaiah?"

My Spirit I will pour upon thy seed! As water upon the thirsty!

The Spirit — My Spirit — does not mean here God's Being. God is, according to His Being, a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth. God is not material, but spiritual. In this sense God's spirituality applies to all the Three Persons. This is not meant here. But the reference is to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity. God is one in Being, and three in Persons. These Three Persons are distinguished in their personal attributes. And the personal property of the Third Person is expressed precisely in His Name. He is the Spirit! His personal attribute consists exactly in His being the Spirit. He proceeds from the Father to the Son as the Spirit of the Father; and He proceeds from the Son to the Father as the Spirit of the Son. In Him the Father and the Son know and love and seek one another. Hence, in the Spirit is the very life of God!

Him I will pour out, saith the Lord!

It is clear that the text here is full of what is called parallelism. This is true, first of all, of the first and second parts of the third verse. They belong together, and that in such a way that the last part is an explanation of the first part. In the first part of the text there is figurative language: "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty." In the second part there is literal language: "I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed." Here the Lord tells us literally what He will do. Hence, the idea is that the Lord will pour out His Spirit upon the seed of Jacob as water upon the thirsty. The meaning is, therefore, that Jehovah will send forth His Spirit personally, that He will cause His Spirit to dwell in them, and that

therefore they shall receive the overflowing blessing of the life of God Himself!

Water upon the thirsty!

Floods upon the dry ground!

Streams of blessing! He that believeth on me, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water!

This spake He of the Spirit Whom God would pour upon Jacob's seed!

Blessed Spirit! For He is the blessing Spirit!

For thus saith the Lord: I will pour my blessing upon thine offspring, O Jesurun, whom I have chosen!

Also here, you understand, there is a connection between the parts of the text. The Word of God does not intend to refer to two different acts of God, namely, the outpouring of the Spirit *and* the outpouring of God's blessing. No, the two are related. And that relationship we may express by paraphrasing the text as follows: I will pour out My blessing through My Spirit.

The blessing of Jehovah!

It includes all that draws us to and into the fellowship of God's everlasting covenant. It is the very opposite of His curse. God's curse means to be banned from His blessed fellowship. It means to be pursued by the wrath of God. It means to be cast out into outer darkness and desolation. From that point of view it is sheer nonsense, of course, to speak of a certain blessing of God upon those whose end is everlasting destruction and desolation. To be blessed in time, and cursed in eternity is utterly impossible. Blessing can never end in destruction, no more than cursing can ever end in salvation. But blessing is all that draws us unto everlasting salvation, all that draws us to and into the ever blessed fellowship of the covenant God. Apart from that there is no blessing. To live apart from God is death. That salvation shall presently be perfected when the tabernacle of God is with men forever. Then that fellowship of the friendship of God's everlasting covenant shall be perfect. And all that draws us to that blessed state — that is blessing!

I will bless you through My Spirit!

For it is the Spirit, the Spirit of God in Christ, Who bestows upon us that which is of the Father and in the Son, that which has been revealed and realized through our Lord Jesus Christ. In a word, He makes us partakers of the life of God, the life of righteousness and holiness, the life of love and friendship. He pours upon us and in us the streams of abundant grace by which we become partakers of the very life of God Himself. Those streams of grace all come to us through the Spirit of God. Through Him we are filled with the love of God. Through Him we are renewed in true righteousness and holiness. Through Him we are filled with the knowledge of God, Whom to know is life eternal!

Such is the significance of Pentecost!

The blessing Spirit is poured out!

Preview of Pentecost!

It is plain that the prophet here proclaims to God's people such a "preview" of Pentecost. In the old dispensation the Spirit was not yet, because Christ was not yet glorified, John 7:37-39. In the new dispensation Christ is glorified; and as the glorified Christ, He receives the Spirit Who was promised; and that Spirit He pours out upon His church.

Upon Jews and Gentiles?

It is plain — plain especially in the light of what happened on the day of Pentecost and what has been happening ever since that day — that when the Word of God here speaks of Jacob's "seed" and "offspring," the unity of the old and of the new dispensation is maintained. God has not two peoples, but one people — His elect people, the Israel of God, in the old and in the new dispensation. He who would attempt to maintain that in the old dispensation the Jews as such were the people of God has no solution for either the words of our text or the event of Pentecost. For there were also members of the Jewish nation, indeed, who received the blessing of the Spirit. The line of the church runs through from the old dispensation into the new. But beginning with the day of Pentecost the Spirit and His blessings are poured out upon Jew and Gentile. There can be no question about it, therefore, that the "seed" and the "offspring" mentioned in this prophecy are not the Jews as such, not fleshly Israel. No, only when you maintain the unity of the spiritual seed of the people of God is it possible to understand this prophecy. The church, from Jew and Gentile, is one in Christ. God bestows His Spirit upon the exalted Lord Jesus Christ. And through Christ He bestows His Spirit upon that church. The church, elect from Jew and Gentile, is the seed, therefore.

Pictured as dry and thirsty is that seed.

This is, of course, figurative language. Dry ground is ground that lacks water, and that is therefore baked and hard, so that that which grows therein withers and is about to disappear and perish. The term "thirsty" denotes the same reality from a slightly different viewpoint. To be thirsty is to desire, to long for, water. And even as water is absolutely indispensable for life, so to be thirsty denotes a looking for quickening and revival and refreshment.

Thus it was with the church, the seed of Jacob, at the end of the old dispensation. Was not our Lord aware of this when He cried out on the last day of the feast (John 7), "If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink?"

You see, at the end of the old dispensation there was almost nothing left of the glory of the shadows. And remember: God's people in the old dispensation had to live by the shadows. That was all they had! If those shadows disappeared, they had nothing. And everything pointed to the fact that those shadows were

in danger of disappearing. Israel was not really a nation any longer. The throne of David lay in the dust. The temple was empty: the ark of the covenant was gone! There was a legalistic spirit in Israel. The land was indeed a dry and thirsty land. And the people, the seed of Jacob, whom God had planted in that land, were thirsty. "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" That was the question in many a heart. God's people longed for the day of fulfillment. They looked for Him Who was to come, for Him Who would establish the throne of David forever.

Indeed, Israel was fast becoming a dry and thirsty land, where there was no water!

And then it happened! All was fulfilled!

Fulfilled in the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ at Bethlehem! And old Simeon sensed it, so that he could say, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace. . . For mine eyes have seen thy salvation. . . A light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel." But the thirsty seed of Jacob in the dry and thirsty land did not yet understand; they only tasted the reviving showers of blessing by way of *anticipation* as yet.

Fulfilled in the cross and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ! But even so, all remained a mystery as yet. You can sense this when even after the resurrection, at the time of the ascension, His disciples could still ask, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?"

But Pentecost! Ah, that was the fulfillment! Then all began to fit in its place! Then the Spirit was poured out. Then the knowledge of God illumined their hearts as a bright light! The Lord had indeed established His covenant and had raised up the throne of David out of the dust! Then Peter could preach, "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel, It shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh. . ."

Pentecost! Blessed fulfillment!

Jacob's seed springs up as willows by the water courses among the grass!

Figurative language this is, again. The grass is the figure of the ungodly world. Do not the wicked spring as the grass, Ps. 92? And among them the offspring of Jacob, the spiritual Israel, the children of God, grow, through the blessing of the Spirit. As willows by the water courses they grow! Such willows grow luxuriantly, because they grow in fruitful ground. Even so shall the children of God, under the blessing of the Spirit, grow and flourish in the house of our God!

And they confess the name of Jehovah, the God of Jacob, the God of our salvation!

For this, in sum, is the meaning of all those expressions in the text: "One shall say, I am the Lord's; and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord,

and surname himself by the name of Israel."

Through the Spirit of Christ, the spiritual seed of Jacob from among all nations become consciously assured that they belong to the Lord, that they are His peculiar possession. Through the Spirit and by the Word of that same Spirit they learn to know that they are one with God's people. Those two belong together, you see. One shall call himself by the name of Jacob. Another shall say, I am the Lord's. The Spirit of Christ is the Spirit of the church; of God's people. He is poured out upon the church, the seed of Jacob. And therefore, outside of the communion of that seed the blessing of the Spirit is not, cannot be, enjoyed. Only in the church and in the communion of the saints is that Spirit and His blessings.

But there the Spirit surely is! And by His fruits He is known!

Where the Spirit is, there the saints are enrolled in the register of God's people. And they say it! I am the Lord's! And my name must be on the register of the saints! And they sign their name as belonging to Jehovah!

And where the Spirit is, there the saints count it an honor to be called by the name of Jacob. They want to be counted as God's covenant friends! They want to be called by the name of Jacob-Israel. For by faith they wrestle in the cause of God's covenant with God and with man. And they prevail!

Until Jesus comes again!

Blessed Comforter!

Blessing Spirit of God!

Dwell in me, O blessed Spirit, gracious Teacher, Friend divine!

Editorials

"Kies Koers!"

Prof. H.C. Hoeksema

These two eye-catching Dutch words have been used extensively in the advertisements for a new Dutch weekly. They mean: "Choose *Course!*" *Course* is the striking and rather significant name chosen for this weekly opinion-magazine.

Perhaps most of the readers of *The Standard Bearer* are not interested in information about such a magazine, chiefly for the reason that they are unable to read the Dutch language. But among our readers there is a minority who not only still read Dutch but also have a rather lively curiosity about Dutch current events and opinions. Thus, among some of our older people who were born in the "old country" and also among some of the more recent immigrants from the Netherlands, there are not a few who not only still subscribe to one or two church papers, but who also subscribed to the magazine *De Spiegel* (now defunct) or who subscribe to *Trouw*, another paper of a general nature.

To make a long story short, there has arisen a "Reformed Christian Press Association" in the Netherlands. These are men, generally, of a rather conservative Reformed bent who feel that there is no distinctively Reformed and Christian magazine of a general character, a magazine to reflect on current events in every sphere of life, not merely a church paper or a theological journal. *De Spiegel* has gone out of existence, and besides, was not satisfactory. *Trouw*, which, if memory serves me correctly, had its inception during the German occupation, has become rather liberal and radical. Hence, this new organization pur-

poses to publish a new weekly opinion-magazine which they are calling *Course*. As its name implies, it purposes to set the course, to show the way, for Reformed people. But let *Koers* speak for itself in this regard. The following is quoted from a brief introductory editorial in the first sample issue of the new magazine. It is from the pen of J.H. Velema, Chairman of the Board of *Koers* (I translate):

KOERS came into existence on the initiative of persons from various churches who were all driven by the desire for a paper which would in a responsible manner give leadership for Christian life and thought in these times.

With all our differences, we appeared in the past months to be one in the desire for the absolute domination of God's Word; the desire for a life which is ruled by this Word; the desire for a spiritual revival of which all the churches have need and which might bind together all Christians. . . We only want to live by the light of the prophetic Word and allow that light to shine upon the life of today. The course of this magazine is determined by that. We go to sea with this magazine in the conviction that it is a necessity now. The Kingdom is coming. That is the most significant news. And that news furnishes the course.

Indeed, this new Press Association has set for itself a not unpretentious goal!

At this writing, after having received a considerable amount of advance propaganda, I have received two sample numbers, dated December 15, 1969 and March 1, 1970. Both are attractively published. Both feature

a rather wide variety of articles and a few pictures. Both make a serious effort to look at things from a conservatively Reformed viewpoint. Personally, I am interested chiefly in current events in the Reformed churches in the Netherlands, and only a little in life in the "old country" in general. But even at that, there are interesting reports and interviews. In the second sample copy, for example, there was a very interesting interview with Dr. M.J. Arntzen, one of the conservative leaders in the *Gereformeerde Kerken*.

I get the impression that from now on the magazine

will be published regularly. For the second sample copy was headed "Volume 1, Number 1." For those who are interested, here is the address: Ref. Chr. Persstichting Koers, Parklaan 11, Zeist, The Netherlands. The price is a bit steep — 13 Dutch dollars per quarter — but this is due to the fact that for a magazine like this to be worthwhile for American or Canadian readers it must be sent by airmail. But if you want to keep up on events in the "old country," I suggest that this new magazine would be helpful.

A Holy Bible?

Recently there has come from the Oxford and Cambridge university presses the Old Testament section of the New English Bible. The New Testament was published already in 1961, and 7 million copies of it have already been sold. This allegedly completely new translation is now complete, therefore; and it is being widely hailed both in the secular and the religious press, and, according to reports, is selling at a fast pace.

Not infrequently questions are directed to me, either orally or in writing, as to the value and the trustworthiness of the various new versions, translations, and paraphrases of Holy Scripture which are on the market nowadays. Time was when about the only choices worth mentioning were that old stand-by, the King James Version, and the American Revised Version. But today versions, translations, and paraphrases of all or parts of the Bible have become almost a dime-a-dozen. All of them try to make their claim for the preference of the Bible reader and the student. Because of the popularity of the NEB in particular and of the multiplication of versions in general, a few comments are here offered.

In the first place, what is meant by the various terms, *translation*, *version*, and *paraphrase*?

Briefly, they may be distinguished as follows. A *new translation* goes back to the original manuscripts of the Bible, compares them according to the science of textual criticism, and, in the light of the available knowledge and discoveries in the area of Biblical studies, attempts to reproduce the original texts of Scripture as accurately and understandably as possible in another language — for us, English. A *new version* is essentially a *revision* of an already existent translation. This revision is not a wholly new work. It may include some corrections in the translation from the original texts. It may also consist of clarifications and corrections of the language of the English text itself. Usually both elements are involved. But there is a great deal of emphasis today upon versions which feature modern, or contemporary, English, in distinction from the English

language employed in our King James Version. The contention is made that the Elizabethan English of the KJV is outdated and irrelevant and is difficult to understand for the reader of the twentieth century. A *paraphrase* is different. It does not claim to be an accurate translation of the language of the original. Neither is it a mere casting of the language of another version into contemporary English. A *paraphrase* is a recasting of the thought of the Bible text into language which is supposed to clarify the *meaning*. It is evident, therefore, that a paraphrase is much more in the nature of a commentary. Thus, for example, in the meditation in this issue, I paraphrase the expression of Isaiah 44:3, "I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring," by the words, "I will pour my blessing upon thy seed through my Spirit." This may very well be a legitimate commentary and explanation — as, of course, I believe it is in the above instance — but it is neither a translation nor a version, and, consequently, not the Bible itself.

In the second place, a few general observations may be made with respect to all three — new translations, new versions, and paraphrases.

1. All change is not improvement. We live in an age when change for change's sake has almost become a rule. Besides, it seems to have become the common opinion that the old is inferior and must be discarded, and that in our highly educated and scientific twentieth century we can do everything better than anyone has done it in the past. To begin to combat this conceited notion as far as the world in general is concerned is almost hopeless. The twentieth century world is infatuated with its own greatness, its own advances, its own learning. This spirit has also infected the church. This is true rather generally with respect to things ecclesiastical and theological. The old liturgy and the old confessions are no longer good; they must be discarded and replaced. And this is a serious indictment for the simple reason that it appears frequently to go on the assumption that not the Spirit of God but

the spirit of man guided the church in the past. I am suspicious that in the whole business of multiplying versions of Holy Scripture there is something of this same attitude. This does not mean, of course, that one must *per se* be opposed to all change. But change should come about slowly and cautiously, and, above all, only where there is a solidly founded conviction that the change truly is improvement.

2. It should be kept in mind that there is no such thing as a purely objective, unbiased translation, version, or paraphrase. This is true, first of all, from a formal point of view. Thus, for example, the NEB claims to be a brand new translation. I suppose it is a new translation in as far as that is possible. But anyone will have to admit, for example, that if these translators had any kind of thorough acquaintance with the King James Bible, they could not fail to be influenced (either for good or for ill) even sub-consciously by that knowledge. But what is more serious is the fact that every translator or version-writer has a fundamental *spiritual* bias. He is either a believer or an unbeliever. He is either a higher critic, or he is not a higher critic. He either holds to verbal inspiration and the absolute authority of Scripture, or he does not. And this will make all the difference in the world both as to his approach toward Bible-translation and as to the translation or version which he produces. Thus, for example, it will make a great deal of difference whether a translator or version-writer believes in the deity of Christ or denies it. It will make a large difference whether he holds to the historicity of Old Testament events or whether he conceives of them as myths — sometimes very subtle differences. It is even true of a paraphrase, which is essentially a commentary, that it will make much difference whether the paraphraser is Arminian or Reformed. And, by the way, as far as paraphrases are concerned, they are not for general usage. They belong on the library shelf with the rest of the commentaries — not in family worship, not in any kind of public Scripture reading. They are, if they have any value at all, strictly study books.

3. One should not be easily impressed by the cry for relevance and for a contemporary English version. In the first place, this writer is generally unimpressed by the modern cry for relevance, and finds not infrequently that it is in fact a cry for watering down the gospel and making it palatable to the natural man. In the second place, it always seems to me that the very clamor for a Bible which is written in so-called up-to-date language is in flat contradiction to the vaunted high educational level, the learned character, of our age. Are we indeed so learned that we cannot understand King James English any more? In the third place, this whole matter is extremely relative. How soon, for example does language become outdated? How often must the various versions be discarded and replaced with more up-to-date versions? Every ten years? fifty

years? one hundred years? In the fourth place, I do not believe that in the average Bible-reading and Bible-studying home, that is, a home where the Bible is daily read and studied, there is any great difficulty with the language of the King James Version as such. And when, then, I weigh the disadvantages and dangers of many a new version or translation over against the relatively tiny amount of difficulty with the English language of the King James Version, my vote is in favor of retaining that King James Version for consistent use in the covenant home. And, by the way, do not underestimate the value of consistent use and consistent study and consistent training in the use of *just one version* in the home from childhood up. The same is true of church and of school. When a child grows up, then there is plenty of time to begin to make use of various other translations or versions for *study* purposes.

4. Finally, it must not be overlooked that to an extent the ordinary Bible reader is at the mercy of the translators. He has no way of checking up on the accuracy or inaccuracy of a given version. The most he can do is to compare various English renderings, or consult a commentary; and the result is that frequently he is left in a quandary as to which is the correct rendering. From this point of view, I recommend the King James Version, not only because it is generally speaking a good, accurate version, but especially because it is orthodox and free from some of the open errors and subtle tendencies of many more recent versions.

Now what about the New English Bible specifically?

In the first place, many of the changes are both exercises in trivia (something at which scholars seem to be adept) and utterly unhelpful. Here is an example. In Ruth 3:11 in the KJV Ruth is called a "virtuous woman." In the NEB she is called a "capable woman." But already a well-known scholar, Cyrus H. Gordon, argues that she should be called a "lady," with the connotation of belonging to the "senatorial" or ruling class, (Cf. *Christianity Today*, March 27, 1970, p. 7). Now translators could probably argue *ad nauseam* about the precise nuances of the Hebrew term used here. Quite possibly the term has something in it of all three translations; quite possibly, too, there is no single English term which fully expresses the Hebrew term. Yet, in all probability something is lost which should not be lost (in the light of Proverbs 31) when the rendering "virtuous woman" is rejected. Thus there may be many relatively unimportant points at which the translation is supposed to be improved. Yet not only are points like this so minor as to make it unnecessary to produce a new translation, but it is also questionable whether what is gained actually outweighs what is lost. It is better, in my opinion, to leave questions involving the fine nuances of the language to commentaries and exegetical studies.

In the second place, — and this is far more serious —

with the translators of the NEB what is called "conjectural emendation" is an accepted principle. What is this? In simple language, it is a changing of the text by a kind of educated guess in instances where it is not clear to the translators. It seems to me that this plays havoc with Holy Scripture. It is not translation, but arbitrary guess-work. Nor, it seems to me, is it consistent with an acceptance of the infallible inspiration of Scripture. There is a very flagrant example of this mentioned in *Christianity Today* (March 27, 1970), p. 13. There we read:

Conjectural emendation is an accepted principle. Where the translators feel that the text does not make good sense as it stands, they alter it to provide a meaningful translation. Thus Genesis 9:26 reads, "Bless, O Lord, the tents of Shem. . .," with a footnote stating that the Hebrew reads, "Blessed is the Lord, the God of Shem."

Now this is sheer and arbitrary wrecklessness with Scripture. There is, moreover, not even the semblance of a good excuse in this instance even to make one of these "conjectural emendations." The text, as does all the text of Scripture, makes perfectly good sense; and what is more, in this instance that perfectly good sense is right on the surface. To this writer, one instance of this kind is sufficient to condemn the entire NEB. This changes it from a Holy Bible to an Unholy Bible.

In the third place, I offer a few instances, by way of comparison, in which this new translation presents some rather radical departures, departures which either deny or leave open for denial cardinal truths, and which, to my mind, betray an unbelieving bias. In each instance the New English Bible is quoted first, and then the King James Bible. The reader may easily notice the significant changes.

NEB — Gen. 1:1, "In the beginning of creation, when God made heaven and earth, the earth was without form and void. . ."

KJV — Gen. 1:1, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void. . ."

NEB — Ps. 23:4, "Even though I walk through a valley dark as death, I fear no evil, for thou art with me, thy staff and thy crook are my comfort."

KJV — Ps. 23:4, "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me, thy rod and thy staff they comfort me."

NEB — Ps. 23:6, "Goodness and love unfailing, these

will follow me all the days of my life, and I shall dwell in the house of the Lord my whole life long."

KJV — Ps. 23:6, "Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever."

NEB — Isaiah 7:14, "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign: A young woman is with child, and she will bear a son, and will call him Immanuel."

KJV — Isaiah 7:14, "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel."

NEB — Isaiah 9:6, "For a boy has been born for us, a son given to us to bear the symbol of dominion on his shoulder; and he shall be called in purpose wonderful, in battle God like, Father for all time, Prince of peace."

KJV — Isaiah 9:6, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace."

NEB — John 1:1-3, "When all things began, the Word already was. The Word dwelt with God, and what God was, the Word was. The Word, then, was with God at the beginning, and through him all things came to be; no single thing was created without him."

KJV — John 1:1-3, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made."

In all of the above instances, I can see no significant improvement in readability. But I can see some very critical departures in the translation — critical enough to make me want to shy away from the use of this New English Bible. I do not recommend it. I warn against it.

But let me end on a positive note. Use your King James Bible. Use it faithfully. Use *all* of it. Use it in family worship. Use it in personal devotions. Steep yourselves in the knowledge of it. Read it. Study it. Sometimes I am suspicious that the fact that we have difficulty in finding a less familiar book when it is announced in our worship services is a dead give away that we are indeed so unfamiliar with the book itself that we do not even know where to find it. Does this come from disuse? Read your Bible, — all of it! Teach your children to read it, — all of it!

Never will a regenerated child of God present the matter of his salvation as having had its initiative in him. Never will he say that anything on his part preceded the operation of God's grace in him, that he first willed to come and God's grace thereupon enabled him to come, that he first accepted Christ and thereupon Christ received him, that he first opened his heart and thereupon Christ entered it. An unmistakable proof of this may be found in the prayer of one that is saved. Here all Arminianism, all boasting of free will in the matter of salvation, is silenced.

H. Hoeksema, *Whosoever Will*, p.120

All Around Us

Proof for Joshua The A.A.C.S. and Christian Schools

Prof. H. Hanko

An article is receiving wide distribution lately which concerns some "scientific" proof of the accuracy of Joshua 10:8. Under the title "The Space Program and the Bible," the article reads:

Did you know that the space program is busy proving that what has been called "myth" in the Bible is true? Mr. Harold Hill, president of the Curtis Engine Company in Baltimore, Md. and a consultant in the space program, relates the following development.

I think one of the most amazing things that God has for us today, happened recently to our astronauts and space scientists at Green Belt, Md. They were checking the position of the sun, moon, and planets out in space, where they would be 100 years and 1000 years from now. We have to know this, so we don't send a satellite up and have it bump into something later on in its orbit. We have to lay out the orbit, in terms of the life of the satellite, and where the planets will be, so the whole thing will not bog down! They ran the computer measurement, back and forth over past and future centuries, and it came to a halt. The computer stopped and put up a red signal! That meant something was wrong, either with the information fed into it, or with the results as compared to the standards. They called in the service department to check it out, and they said, 'It's perfect.' The I.B.M. head of operations said, 'What's wrong?' 'Well, we have found that a day is missing in space, in elapsed time.' They scratched their heads, tore their hair. There was no answer!

One religious fellow in the team said, 'You know, in Sunday School they talked about the sun standing still.' They didn't believe him, but they had no other answer so they said, 'Show us.' So he got a Bible and read from the book of Joshua, 'Fear them not, I have delivered them into thy hand. There shall not a man of them stand before thee' (Joshua 10:8). Joshua was concerned because he was surrounded by the enemy and if darkness fell, the enemy would overpower them. So Joshua asked the Lord to make the sun stand still! That's right! 'The sun stood still and the moon stayed. . . and hasted not to go down about a whole day' (Joshua 10:13). The space men said, 'There is the missing day!' Well, they checked the computers going into Joshua's time and found it was close but not close enough! The elapsed time that was missing back in Joshua's time was 23 hours and 20 minutes — not a whole day. They read the Bible and there it said, 'about (approximately) a day.'

These little words in the Bible are important. But

they were still in trouble, because if you cannot account for 40 minutes, you'll be in trouble 1000 years from now. Forty minutes had to be found, because it can be multiplied as many times as a body passes through its orbit. Well, this religious fellow also remembered that somewhere in the Bible it said the sun went backwards. The space men told him he was out of his mind. But they got out the Book and read in II Kings 20 that Hezekiah, on his death-bed, was visited by the prophet Isaiah, who told him that he was not going to die (II Kings 20:5-6). Hezekiah did not believe him and asked for a sign as proof (20:8). Isaiah said, 'Do you want the sun to go ahead ten degrees?' Hezekiah said, 'It is nothing for the sun to go ahead ten degrees, but let the shadow return backward ten degrees.' Isaiah spoke to the Lord and the Lord brought the shadow ten degrees BACKWARD! (II Kings 20:8-11). Ten degrees is exactly 40 minutes! Twenty three hours and 20 minutes in Joshua, plus 40 minutes in II Kings make the missing 24 hours the space travelers had to log in the logbook as being the missing day in the universe! Isn't it amazing? Our God is rubbing their noses in His Truth."

We have a few comments to make on this rather remarkable story.

In the first place, there are some extremely doubtful elements about the whole thing. For one thing, the documentation is very incomplete — in fact, almost non-existent. No mention is made of those who were involved in this matter. A rather indefinite "they" is all that is mentioned: "They ran the computer . . ."; "They called in the service department. . ."; "They scratched their heads. . ." This always leaves me a bit suspicious. No one knows who the "they" are. For another thing, while I am no scientist and do not understand the intricacies of computer programming — especially in relation to the movement of the heavenly bodies, this sounds gravely suspicious. How are computers able to discover a day missing without knowing the position of the planets prior to the miracle recorded in Joshua? Is not a point of reference needed such as this? Did the fact that God caused the sun to stand still affect also the movement of other planets in our solar system? Is not the length of the day determined by the rotation of the earth on its axis? These questions should be answered before this story is acceptable.

In the second place, there are inaccuracies in the story. Joshua did not pray for the sun and moon to stand still because he was afraid of being overpowered

by an enemy which surrounded him. He prayed for the lengthening of the day in order to complete the destruction of the enemy which had begun already. Nor is it at all certain that ten degrees on the sundial of Ahaz is forty minutes. Most commentators agree that the type of sundial is not even indicated in the text and that it is impossible to determine how much the day was lengthened by this miracle.

In the third place, we are afraid of this sort of thing. It is so extremely tempting to use a story like this as a basis for believing the miracle. But this will never do. We do not believe the miracle because some computer went awry somewhere in some space center. We believe the miracle because the Scriptures say it has happened. Regardless of what computers may or may not find, the miracle stands because of God's infallible revelation. Especially when such a fuzzy story as this is circulated the danger is very real that people will be persuaded that the miracle happened because of the story. But when presently the story is proved to be fictitious (as could easily happen) what then becomes of our faith? Our faith must be firmly rooted in the Word of God itself. If this story (and others like it) should prove to be correct, our faith has not been bolstered in the least.

THE A.A.C.S. AND CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS

We have received a copy of a paper prepared by James H. Olthuis and Bernard Zylstra which is entitled "Schools in the Christian Community." This paper, by men who are closely associated with Association for the Advancement of Christian Studies, outlines what, in the opinion of the authors is the unique place of the school in relation to and as distinct from other spheres of life. We have commented, in an earlier article in *The Standard Bearer*, on the error of an educational creed which is promoted by the A.A.C.S. and also by the authors of this paper. In this paper, however, the authors go more deeply into the whole question. While we cannot quote the entire paper and cannot comment on every part of it with which we disagree, we call attention to some important aspects of the paper to show the wrong direction in which this organization goes.

In a brief discussion of "the internal nature of the school" the authors offer a "definition" of the christian school. The heart of this definition is found in the paragraph which reads:

A school is an educational or instructional community of teachers and pupils or students established to prepare the latter for meaningful participation in society.

By "meaningful participation in society" the authors undoubtedly mean participation in "the coming Kingdom of God through which the Lord Jesus Christ restores the direction of creation in all its fulness through history."

We find this definition wholly inadequate. In the first place, as it stands in the paragraph quoted above, the definition of the school is purely humanistic — as humanistic as anything which any unbelieving pedagogue may compose. When the definition is somewhat circumscribed by a reference to the coming Kingdom of God, the language is so vague and indefinite that it is almost impossible to determine what is meant. The whole definition is intended to give a statement of the *purpose* of christian education. But reading the above, one finds himself at a loss to know precisely what that purpose is supposed to be.

Next the paper turns to a discussion of the basis for christian education. One would expect here some reference to the covenant. But this is not so. In fact, later in the paper, this whole concept is expressly excluded. Here we read:

The Word of God, as it comes to man in the Order of Creation, in the Scriptures, and in Jesus Christ (cf. John 1), gives the foundational direction to the life of Christ-followers in its entirety, and thus also to education.

I confess that I cannot find any *basis* for Christian education in this statement. I do not know what the authors mean by their remarks in this connection. When this is spelled out in some detail the authors speak of the need for an educational creed in distinction from ecclesiastical creeds, but one is left in the dark as to the basis for Christian education.

3. Educational creeds and ecclesiastical creeds:

a. The confessions of a (denominational) institutional church should not take the place of a Christian educational creed in the constitution of a school society since:

(1) A school is a school and an institutional church is an institutional church; each of these societal structures requires a confession relevant to that structure.

(2) These church confessions were not intended to be and should not be looked upon as school creeds; they do not *specifically* express the directives of the Word of God for an educational enterprise.

(3) To act as if a church creed can be a school creed is to confuse and mislead. It is, in fact, to set up (a form of) church-schools in the Roman Catholic tradition.

(4) To employ church creeds as school creeds is to take the easy way — as if our fore-fathers had worked it all out correctly and in detail for later centuries. It is to take the way of fear — as if the spirit no longer leads His people so that they grow in the grace and knowledge of Jesus Christ attuned to the written word. Finally, it is the way of little faith — refusing to heed the admonition of Phil. 2:12, 13.

(5) These church confessions were written at a time when schools as we envisage them today were largely absent. They thus do not deal with the modern educational problems and anti-christian views of education;

(6) Placing these confessions in the school constitution in a North American context — where the in-

stitutional church is tragically fragmented in hundreds of denominational pieces — would obstruct the desired development toward a genuinely scriptural-ecumenical (inter) national system of Christian schools. . . .

d. In this context the following points are all important:

(1) We reject the view that all Christian activity and witness must be channeled directly or indirectly through the institutional church. . . .

(2) Reliance upon ecclesiastical confessions as a sufficient basis for Christian education leads to spiritual sterility and principal bankruptcy in the Christian educational movement since the educational relevance of the Word of God is not explicitly brought to the fore.

It is, of course, true that the creeds of the Church were not written with Christian schools in mind — which seems to be a major point in the article. But this is irrelevant. The creeds are what the Church believes to be the truth of the Word of God. And it is precisely the Word of God which teaches the Church all about the principles of Christian education. It teaches what the basis for Christian education is. It defines the goal of Christian education. It gives the principles of the truth in the light of which all the revelation of God in creation must be interpreted. This is why we fear so strongly the statement quoted earlier in which a distinction is made between the Word of God in Scripture, in creation, and in Jesus Christ — as if there are three distinct and disconnected Words of God. But because the creeds contain the truth of Scripture, they can (and must) function as the creedal basis of Christian schools. Certainly this leaves room for developing these principles explicitly (on the basis of Scripture and the Confessions) which pertain directly to Christian education. One gains the strong impression that the A.A.C.S. does not want anything to do with the creeds. And, it seems sometimes as if these men want the principles of education to be developed on the basis of something other than scripture itself.

In discussing “the school and the family” the article says:

In reformed circles it is often argued that the school is a ‘parental’ institution, that it is an extension of the Christian family. Two arguments for this position can be noted: 1) and 2) *infra*.

1. The doctrine of the covenant

a. In the light of such passages as Gen. 12 ff. and Deut. 6, it is argued that the Lord has given a special *covenantal* responsibility to parents for the education of their children.

b. This view is subject to several misconceptions:

(1) In the first place, the ‘covenant’ is not made with parents-as-parents, but with Abraham, the father of all *believers*, and with the entire people of God. . . .

(2) The covenant of God with His people cannot on a Scriptural basis be narrowed down to the triangle of church, family and school; for the covenant

embraces the *entire* life of God’s people. . . .

(3) When the people of God are specifically instructed to teach the words of the Lord diligently to their children, we are not in the first place dealing with Christian education as we know it today but with the continuity of the covenant-community in history. Here indeed the parents occupy a special place, in the Old Testament context and also today. But this special place, and the special responsibility that goes with it, is not taken over by the Christian school. . . .

After defining the general responsibility of parents towards their children, which includes the choice of a school which their children will attend, the article goes on to say:

3. Parental “responsibility” and educational “authority.”

a. As long as a child is a minor, its parents have the specific *responsibility* to care for its proper development.

b. But this *responsibility* of the parents before God, in a differentiated society such as ours, is generally executed via institutions that lie outside of the home, that are of a non-parental character, that — therefore — lie outside the parents’ range of *authority*. We therefore make a fundamental distinction between the broad *responsibility* of parents for their children and the specific *authority* of the parents in the home. And it is our conviction that the school as we envisage it today lies outside the parents’ authority in the home. . . .

The article then goes on to spell this out in considerable detail.

But this is serious business. Basically, the error is a flat denial of the covenant — especially of the truth that the covenant is continued in the line of generations. This is surprising, for the A.A.C.S. always speaks of its “reformational” character. Here it cuts the heart out of Reformed truth.

Because the covenant is denied, the schools are not founded upon the truth of the covenant, are not a fulfilment of covenant responsibilities, and are not an extension of the home. The schools are not to be parental schools. Christian education occupies a distinct sphere of its own along side of the home, the state, the church, etc. And within the schools there is an authority which is not parental, but which is the authority of professional pedagogues who are placed in special and unique offices by God to exercise an authority of their own. In the schools, the children do not belong to the parents who have nothing at all to say about their education in the schools, but to a professional elite — a cadre of teachers who take over the responsibility of the children’s education.

We cannot go into a criticism of this in any kind of detail. Let it be clearly understood that this is the destruction of all christian education. And the view so clearly defined here, is a very real danger into which we also could, almost without noticing, fall.

From Holy Writ

Exposition of Ezekiel 18

Rev. G. Lubbers

"The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge."

Ezekiel 18:2

"Behold all souls are mine: as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine. The soul that sinneth it shall die."

Ezekiel 18:4

"The soul that sinneth it shall die."

Ezekiel 18:20

"... for I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me."

Exodus 20:5b

When one reads these various quotations which appear above this essay he is struck with the fact that there is a seeming contradiction between the teaching of the Word of God in Exodus 20:5b and the main theme and principle here in Ezekiel 18. In the one case it seems that children are to die for the sins of their fathers, and in the other case we hear the oath-bound Word of the same God that such is not the case at all. And God will see to it that the lie of the proposition and accusation that children die for the sins of their fathers will never again be uttered in Israel.

Meanwhile we do have a "difficult passage" here which this rubric in the *Standard Bearer* will try to study exegetically!

THE EVIL ALLEGORICAL PROVERB IN THE LAND OF ISRAEL. (Ezekiel 18:2) (Jeremiah 31:29)

The people of Israel who had been carried away into Babylon as well as those who still were left in the pleasant land of Israel were using a very evil proverb; it was evidently used in mockery and jest, as well as in sober reflection upon the lot of God's people as they hung their harps upon the willows. This proverb was "the fathers have eaten sour (unripe) grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge."

We do well to analyze this saying a bit. It is called by the LORD a proverb. The Hebrew has "*marshal*," a saying, an allegorical proverb with a hidden meaning. That this is an allegory with such a hidden meaning, one which was meant to convey a certain judgment depicting the lot of Israel and the dealings of God with His people, is evident from the fact that this proverb does not say "*our fathers*" and "*we, the children*." Yes, this was the implication and meaning of the proverb. But the form of the saying is not a direct accusation, even though it is an implied accusation against the ways and the dealings of Israel's God. The insinua-

tion is that those who are in Babylon and who die for sin, do not die for their own sins but for the sins of their fathers! God is visiting the sins of the fathers upon their heads, notably the sin of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat who caused Israel to sin. And He does this according to the rule of Exodus 20:5b. "... visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me!"

This is, according to the Word of God, not a correct interpretation of the Scriptures which cannot be broken. We must never judge according to appearances. To form a just judgment we must interpret the Scriptures in the light of the Scriptures. Now the Word of God was clear enough in Exodus 20:5b. We do not read there that God simply makes the children of evil fathers die for the sins of their fathers, but that such is the case in the third and fourth generation of them who *hate* me! This is only true of the haters of the LORD! His mercy, on the other hand, is upon those who love Him! We may not simply say: your father was a wicked man, and, therefore, the Lord will put the blood of your father upon you and you shall die in your father's sins!

That was the error and wickedness of the proverb used in the land of Israel.

Such is not the manner of God's just judgment!

It seems that this "proverb" was rather generally used in Israel both in Babylon and in the land of Canaan. According to Jeremiah 31:29 the LORD will cause this proverb never again to be used rather by removing all sin, making a new covenant and putting the laws in their hearts, and remembering their sins no more. Christ will come and He will bring the perfect sacrifice. Then never more shall anyone complain about the sins of the fathers and the dull teeth in the children. However, here in Ezekiel 18 the LORD will put an end to this saying by so clearly and explicitly

refuting this error that none shall ever be able again to use that proverb about the "sour grapes" in good conscience.

THE CLEAR AND JUST RULE OF GOD'S DEALING WITH EVERY SOUL (Ezekiel 18:4, 20)

There is no respect of persons with God. "As the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine." God deals with each man according to his spiritual worth, according to his works. The rule for each soul is: fear God and keep His commandments! Although there is a corporal guilt in Adam this is not the rule between father and son. There is but one representative "head" of the human race, Adam. And he is the "type" of Christ who is to come. (Romans 5:14) But that is not the rule between other fathers and their sons. Such is not God's dispensation in the dealings with the fathers and sons in Israel. They are all alike. All stand in relationship to the law of God in both tables, each in their own way.

And then the *rule* is: the soul that sinneth, it shall die! The term in the Hebrew for "sinneth" is a participial form of the verb indicating that the sinner is an unrepentant sinner. He is one who sins constantly and without ceasing, due to lack of heartfelt sorrow before the face of God at the altar. Such a sinner shall surely die! If merely being a sinner constituted the reason for dying, then there would not be any "he shall surely live" for anyone. For we all have sinned and come short of the glory of the Lord. That we are correct in thus interpreting this form of the verb is evident from the expressed testimony of the Lord in verse 21, where we read "But if the wicked will turn from all his sins . . . he shall surely live, he shall not die." Hence, the unrepentant sinner shall die, that is, the sinner who does not put off the old man of sin in heartfelt sorrow, and who does not put on the new man with true joy in God, tasting the wonder of forgiving love and grace.

Such is the rule, the canon of God's dealing with man in Israel! Thanks be to God for this rule! This gives hope to the man who cries unto the LORD. The penitent sinner is surely heard. He shall not die. To this rule there are no exceptions. Those who will not preach or comfort according to this "rule" dare not enter the kingdom themselves, and they refuse to let enter those who would. These place the intolerable burden upon the necks of God's people, causing them to despair of life and hope. Here we have the basic guide-line for all soul-care in the church. Here is Christian psychiatry at its best. These are sound, hygienic words!

Peace be upon every one that walketh according to this rule (canon) and upon the Israel of God. (Galatians 6:16)

On the other hand there is a reverse side to the rule: the soul that sinneth shall surely die. It is: the soul that repenteth shall not die, but shall surely live! Such is

the medicine which the Great Physician gives, and there is healing in His wings. Not always do God's people take this to heart and then they come to the cross-roads of their life. Many there be who stumble at this word. But the sheep hear the voice of the great Shepherd of Israel, who dwells between the Cherubim.

Every soul belongs to the LORD.

Thus he deals with and speaks to every soul in Israel.

THE CONCRETE CASE STUDIES GIVEN BY THE LORD (Ezekiel 18:5-18)

The first case is that in which we are told what a righteous man is, and that such a righteous man shall live. This is the basic "case" which we must study first. It is the plumbline of God, giving us the basic rule of God, in which every soul is judged by God according to His law.

To know who a righteous man is, we must listen to what God says about what constitutes a righteous man. And then we must not say "Yes, but . . ." Yes, but is this a rule for all cases? God did not make every soul alike, did he? No, he did not make every soul alike, but in their differences every soul falls under this rule. So let us not try to make ourselves an exceptional "case" which does not fit under this rule, in which, at bottom, the "sin-problem" is ruled out, the hard fact of our need of repentance from sin to serve the living God with a purified conscience!

What a beautiful down-to-earth description of a righteous man. Here a mirror is held before us: the royal law of liberty! One who sins misses the mark. He misses the mark of true worship of God and love for the saints. And he that doeth righteousness is righteous. Notice, that the text in verse 5 says as a fundamental rule: "But if a man be just, *do* that which is lawful and right . . .!" Yes, that makes this very practical and concrete. This is instruction for the simple. A child can understand it.

What is a *truly* just man? He is one who is not simply "just" in appearances, in a little outward washing of the cup, but who is one in sincerity and truth. A righteous man is one whom God declares righteous because he finds his work perfect before God. God has examined his heart and life, correct, guiltless and just, answering to the divine rule. And what is in his heart comes out as fruit in his "doing." Well done thou good and faithful servant will be said to him. For he is one who in "judgment" between man and man makes a fair decision, and in his behavior asks after the will of God; the good, the perfect and acceptable will of God!

You can also see that a just man is righteous in what he does *not* do. He separates himself from sinners and from the ways of the ungodly. He worships God alone. He will not have idols, and will not eat in the feasts of the gods, nor participate in their orgies. He worships God in spirit and in truth. Furthermore, a righteous man can be seen in his practical service-of-thanks-giving

toward his neighbor. You can see that he is delivered from hatred toward his neighbor. He lives in moral cleanliness toward his wife and refrains from polluting his neighbor's wife. He refrains from all that would entice him to sin. He does not seek the company of the wicked, the dances, all promiscuity. He honors the marriage ordinance of God. He calls the "new morality" by its true name: unrepentant godlessness and ungodliness! Because a just man has true "worship" he also has sound love for his neighbor. He keeps both tables of the law, and that, too, in their proper order and relationship.

What will happen to such a man? Shall he die? No, he shall surely live. He walks in his "part" of the covenant of God. He crucifies the flesh and walks in a new and holy life. And it makes no particle of difference how his father has lived. The soul that sins shall die; but the children shall not die for the sins of the fathers.

That is the basic rules laid down in Case No. 1.

There is here no room for the "sour grapes" theory of those who do not apply the simple teachings of the Scriptures.

Examining Ecumenicalism

Dr. Daane, St. Paul, and the W.C.C.

Rev. G. VanBaren

Dr. James Daane, minister in the Christian Reformed Church, professor at Fuller Theological Seminary, one of the editors of the *Reformed Journal*, is a well-known advocate for membership in the World Council of Churches. He continues to encourage membership for his denomination even though several Synodical decisions have strongly condemned such union. He and others, I predict, will continue this agitation for union with the W.C.C. until they succeed in their desires — and this success will be seen within a few years, if the Lord tarry.

Dr. Daane has written a series of three articles for the *Reformed Journal* in which he advanced three propositions which, to his mind, proves that the C.R.C. ought to join the W.C.C. He suggested, first, that there "is nothing in the nature of a Reformed Church that prohibits the Christian Reformed Church from belonging to the Word Council of Churches." Secondly, he "urged that nowhere better than in the W.C.C. can the C.R.C. pursue its acknowledged and long-neglected obligation to contact all the churches that belong to the Church of Christ." In his third article (*Reformed Journal* of March, 1970) he presents a far more sobering and disturbing argument. He contends that the nature and purpose of the Church, as taught by Paul in Ephesians and Colossians, compels union with the W.C.C. In fact, Daane suggests more: that the nature and purpose of the Church compels union of denominations.

The reasoning of Dr. Daane is very disturbing and seriously heretical. First, he presents an utterly false view of the Church. He considers the origin of the Church to be the "reconciliation of Jew and Gentile by the Cross." The Church began, therefore, after the death of Christ and consists of that "new humanity":

Jew and Gentile. In the Old Dispensation, then, there was no Church — there was only God's people: the Jews. This conception of the church is contrary to the instruction of Scripture (Rom. 4:11-16; Rom. 2:28, 29; Gal. 3:7-19; Hosea 1:10,11 compared with Rom. 9:24-26; etc.), and it is contrary to the instruction of our confessions (H.C. Lord's Day 21; Belgic Confession, article 27; etc.).

Secondly, Daane falsely presents the unity of the church. He suggests that "unity is inherent in the Church's birth. . . ." His idea seems to be that the unity of the church is the combining of Jew and Gentile into one "new humanity." In the Old Dispensation, then, that unity could not have existed. Then there was division. Now there is oneness in the Church. However, Daane confuses the oneness or unity of the church with its universality or catholicity. In the Old Testament the church was not universal; it was limited. In the New Testament, after Pentecost, this changed. Then God broke down, through the cross of Christ, that "middle wall" of partition. Now Gentiles were also brought into the one body of Christ. But the Church, both in the Old and New Dispensation, was always one in Christ. The passages of Scripture and the confessions to which I made reference above clearly show this.

But in making the "unity" of the Church a unity of Jew and Gentile, Daane apparently ignores that Scripture teaches that the unity of the Church is a unity of truth and doctrine. Christ insists that the oneness of His people must reflect that oneness which exists between Himself and His Father (John 17:21). Paul, in Ephesians, emphasizes a oneness which is doctrinal ("There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling: one Lord, one faith,

one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." 4:4-6). When Daane nevertheless insists that the oneness of the Church consists of the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile by the Cross, he opens the way for his idea that doctrinal difference and oneness can exist simultaneously within the Church. He states, "Even the differences that obtain within the Church, doctrinal and otherwise, obtain *within* the Church, sustained by the unity of the Church, and unable to create a second Church." And Daane here evidently refers not only to the unity of the Body of Christ, but also to its manifestation now on the earth. Even doctrinal differences must not cause separation in the Church, nor be the basis for continued separation of denominations, but can exist *within* the unified church. He pleads in this way, "In the light of Paul's doctrine of the Church, its nature and task, the matter of church *union* must face the question whether the doctrinal differences are of such magnitude as to warrant a separation that obscures the meaning of Christ's Cross and God's eternal purpose." Daane is somewhat vague — but I would conclude that in Daane's view there is no church union which he would regard as impossible. The *principle* of union he advocates; he questions whether there are *any* doctrinal differences of such magnitude as to warrant separation. This man is not merely interested in seeing the C.R.C. in the World Council of Churches — this is only the first step towards something wider: the union of all churches.

In the third place, Daane suggests what seems to me to be a strange and unscriptural idea of election. He does not speak of election in any detail — that was not the purpose of his article. He does speak of that deepest possible of all divisions cut by election between Jew and Gentile in the Old Testament. Daane's idea seems to be that all of Israel, or all of the Jews, were the elect. That gulf had to be broken down — that gulf of election which cuts between Jew and Gentile. Christ does this. And one can logically conclude from Daane's description, that now in the New Testament age all Jews and Gentiles are elect. The wall, however, which divided Jew and Gentile was not election. Election cut right through the heart of Israel itself. Israel was not itself the elect, but it had in it the elect remnant. The wall which divided Jew and Gentile was the law and ordinances given by God through Moses. These laws set Israel apart from all other nations of the earth. Christ, in His death on the cross, broke down this middle wall, thus establishing a universal Church. But election is of a particular people chosen by God in Christ from before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1:4). Even in Isaiah where we read of "elect Israel," the reference is undoubtedly to spiritual Israel, to the spiritual seed of Abraham (Romans 9:6-8). Daane's idea of election appears to be contrary to that description of it in the Belgic Confession, arti-

cle 16; or the Canons of Dordt, First Head, article 7. Election does indeed create a division among mankind — but that division is never broken down nor bridged. Only because of the cross does this division continue to exist.

In the fourth place, Daane speaks of "God's eternal purpose." I hope I do misunderstand him in his article, for I receive the definite impression that Daane believes that God's eternal purpose is to reconcile all men ultimately to Himself, and, in fact, to heal the breach which exists between Satan and God. He appears to teach a universalism for which a united church on this earth must serve as sign. "The Church," says Daane, "as that new, unified, and reconciled humanity achieved by the Cross is a unique window on the nature of God's eternal purpose and that unique, one and only concrete historical reality whose very existence is an initial realization of God's purpose and the sign that the unity that now constitutes the Church will one day unite all things." The universalism which Daane's article suggests, I find in the following statements (the italics are mine):

What, according to Paul, is the greatest unreconciled division within reality, whether earthly or heavenly, visible or invisible? Not that between God and the devil, between slave and free man, White and Black, communist and capitalist, elect and reprobate, nor that between democratic and totalitarian societies. Nor in Pauline thought does the deepest unreconciled division lie between the Church and the world. The deepest division is rather that between Jew and Gentile, a division that stems not from human sin, but from that free divine act which made the Jews the choice of God's election.

You will note in the above quotation that Daane emphasizes that the *greatest* unreconciled division is that between Jew and Gentile; all the others, including that between God and the devil, between elect and reprobate, are *lesser* unreconciled divisions. Then Daane continues later in the article:

The Church is the historical actuality and substantive proof that all the remaining lesser disunities and enmities *can and will be reconciled* in peace and harmony.

As a community of the reconciled in which there is not only neither Jew nor Gentile, but also neither rich nor poor, Black or White, slave or free man, male or female, the Church as the new humanity in which all these differences are discounted, accepted, and harmonized is a sign to all the world that there is *no division in all the reaches of cosmic reality that cannot and will not be healed*.

Note that Daane does not state that division will finally be gone — for the devil and all workers of iniquity will be cast into hell. Rather he insists that all division will be *healed*. On the basis of this purpose of God, Daane wants a unified church on this earth to serve as a sign and seal, as an "evidence of God's purpose and of his power to attain it, that monument in history

of the final unity and reconciliation of all things.”

I hardly need point out that the above teaching would be a violation of that which is clearly taught in Scripture and our confessions — and is surely not Reformed. If Daane does maintain the above, he flagrantly violates that formula of subscription which he signed when he was ordained into the ministry of the Christian Reformed church. But surely this unreformed presentation must not be used as basis for advocating union with the World Council of Churches.

If Daane would want a good ground for advocating the proposition that the C.R.C. ought to join the W.C.C. and even the Consultation on Church Union (COCU), he could point to himself. If the Christian Reformed Church can allow Daane to remain a minister in good standing within their denomination in spite of what he teaches, in spite of his violation of the formula of subscription — then there is no principal reason why they should refuse fellowship with and membership in the W.C.C. or even in C.O.C.U.

Contending for the Faith

The Doctrine of Atonement

FIRST PERIOD — 80-254 A.D.

Rev. H. Veldman

The doctrine of the atonement, to which we will now call your attention, the Lord willing, is, of course, of the utmost importance. It is certainly of the greatest significance as following upon the doctrine of sin. Sin is guilt and it is also the power of corruption. And the extent of the guilt and power of sin is of such a nature that the sinner is helplessly and hopelessly lost in sin and evil. He can never save himself. He can never pay his guilt, and this payment of his debt is absolutely necessary if he is to return into the favour of God. The justice of the Lord must be satisfied. And this implies that a sinner's salvation is utterly impossible unless and until this satisfaction be brought in full harmony with the righteousness of Him Whose Name is Jehovah, the unchangeable God, with Whom there is no change or shadow of turning. Too much emphasis can never be laid upon this Scriptural truth, also and particularly in our present day and age which has such little understanding of the righteousness of the alone living God. How important, therefore, is the Scriptural doctrine of the atonement, the doctrine which sets forth the vicarious and atoning sufferings and death of Him Who alone is and can be the Mediator of our salvation.

However, the doctrine of the atonement is also of the greatest significance because of the doctrine itself. It is surely *the* emblem and symbol of Christianity. Of the cross of Jesus Christ the apostle Paul exclaims in Gal. 6:14: “But God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.” In I Cor. 2:2 the same apostle writes to the Corinthians: “For I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified.” And in I Cor. 1:17-18 we read: “For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none

effect. For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.” And throughout the ages the child of God and the church of the living God glories in the cross of Calvary as the only ground of its salvation, the only ray of hope and beam of light in the midst of a world which otherwise lies in unfathomable darkness and despair. Indeed, in the cross of Christ we shall glory.

Finally, another reason why the doctrine of the atonement is of the greatest significance is its gross distortion and denial in our present day. We hear much nowadays of the conservatives and the liberals. The liberals in the church are those who attack the inspirational character of Holy Writ, the historicity of Genesis 1-3, the miracles of the Word of God, the virgin birth of our Lord, His resurrection from the dead and return, bodily, upon the clouds of heaven. That these liberals attack the Scriptural truth of the atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ need not surprise us. But, the Scriptural doctrine of the atonement is also corrupted and distorted by many conservatives. They generalize this work of Christ upon the cross of Calvary. They present the death of Christ as having occurred for all men, head for head. And, if we generalize the atonement of Calvary, the result will inevitably be that we lose that atonement. A Christ for all is really a Christ for none. The choice is not between a Christ for all and a Christ for some, but between a Christ for all and a Christ for none. And, the presentation of a general atonement, a Christ for all, must inevitably lead to modernism. The teaching of a general atonement is surely a denial of the holiness and righteousness of the alone living God.

Writing now on the doctrine of the atonement and directing attention, first of all, to the development of

this doctrine in the period, 80-254 A.D., we would first quote the following from the notes of Rev. H. Hoeksema:

Concerning the conception of the early fathers in regard to the suffering and death of Christ, the following general remarks may suffice:

a). All without exception taught that Christ died for our sins and that His death is a sacrifice for sin; not only through His incarnation or by His doctrine and example, but through His death redemption and salvation are accomplished.

b). The doctrine of the "satisfactio vicare" was not completely developed or defined in this first period. Irenaeus does indeed speak of reconciliation through satisfaction but it is not quite clear just what this church father meant even by this phrase. Justin Martyr also teaches the principle of reconciliation through satisfaction. Origen presents the suffering of Christ as an offering for sin but with equal ease and readiness he speaks of the death of Christ as the death of a hero and, besides, just as Clement of Alexandria, he ascribes purifying power also to the blood of the martyrs. The peculiar view is found with Origen that Christ was offered to the devil as a ransom for the redemption of His people and that the devil not understanding that he could do nothing with the pure nature of Christ accepted this ransom and was thus deceived.

c). The application of Christ's redemption was generally presented by the early fathers as taking place through faith. Faith, however, was not clearly defined.

d). The fathers did, however, understand that the sinner did not possess this faith of himself, that it was a gift of Divine grace. This led them to the contemplation of the truth of eternal predestination. A clear conception of this truth, however, was not developed. It seemed that, in as far as the fathers speak of this doctrine, they present it as being grounded in the fore-known deeds of men.

e). Incidentally, it may be remarked that the early fathers on the basis of some expressions in Scripture taught that Christ literally and locally descended into Hades and there had contact with the departed spirits.

Now it lies in the very nature of the case that the doctrine of the atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ has been developed and set forth by the Church of the New Dispensation in distinction from the Old Dispensation. This is true of all the truths in the Word of God. This is due to the distinction between the Old and New Dispensations. The beginning of the New Dispensation, we know, is marked by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ into our flesh and blood. This means that the manifestation of the living God as the God of our salvation is much clearer in the New Testament than in the Old Testament. In the coming of Jesus Christ into the flesh we have historically the fulfillment and revelation of the promise of salvation as set forth throughout the ages of the Old Dispensation. In

the New Dispensation we have historically the fulfillment and manifestation of the love of God in Jesus Christ, God's Son and our Lord. It lies, therefore, in the very nature of the case that this salvation of the Lord is more clearly set forth in all its implications in the New Testament than in the days of the shadows and types and symbols.

However, there is another reason why the New Dispensation should be characterized by this development of the doctrines of Holy Writ. The Old Testament is not only characterized by the fact that God's revelation of Himself as the God of our salvation was confined to one people, but also by the fact that the Lord revealed Himself directly and by infallible inspiration to His Church in the midst of the world. In the Old Dispensation of the shadows the Word of the Lord came by infallible inspiration to a few, His prophets, who communicated this word of the Lord to the people of the Lord. How different things are in the New Dispensation! The time of infallible inspiration terminated with the apostles. They were the last to be personally inspired by the Lord, so that they wrote, unerringly, the word of the Lord. They completed the written word of God. And although it is true that the Church of God received from its risen and glorified Lord that He would lead them into all the truth, it is also true that this promise was given to the Church as it was confronted by the wicked world and constantly threatened by the forces of darkness as they attempt to distort and destroy the Scriptures. With the passing of the apostles these enemies of the truth assert themselves as never before. The church of the living God is now called upon to defend the truth once delivered to the saints and to answer these attacks upon the Word of God with the Word of God and to glean from the Scriptures its answer to these fiery darts of the forces of darkness to deny us the truths of God, which alone are a lamp upon our path and a light before our feet. One can easily understand, therefore, why the new dispensation would be characterized by the history of the development of doctrine, also of the doctrine of the atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ.

To one more thing we would call attention in this connection. How difficult it would be to generalize the doctrine of the atonement of Christ in the light of the Old Dispensation! Fact is, the revelation of the living God as the God of our salvation was limited then to a single people, that of Israel. The sacraments, the passover and circumcision, were limited to one people! Let us apply this to the institution of the passover in the land of Egypt. How strictly particular this was! After the Lord had devastated the land of Egypt with nine mighty plagues, He was about to deliver that final plague, the slaying of the firstborn of man and beast. Surely, if we may use the expression, Egypt "never had a chance." The revelation of the institution of the passover, the slaying of the lamb and subsequent sprinkling

of its blood upon the doorposts was given exclusively to Moses and to the children of Israel. Egypt was never informed of this. They were never instructed to slay a lamb and to escape and ward off the avenging angel of the Lord. Only Israel received this Divine revelation! Why? This is stated by Moses in Deuteronomy 7:7-8, and we quote: "The Lord did not set His love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people: But because the Lord loved you, and because He would keep the oath which He had sworn unto your fathers, hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt." God loved Israel, sovereignly, and not because they were in any sense worthy of this love of God. But the fact that the

institution of the Passover was revealed exclusively to Moses and to the children of Israel surely establishes the truth that the atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ is exclusively particular. It would be very difficult to conclude from this institution of the Passover that the blood of Christ is to be viewed in the universal and common sense of the word. However, with the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and His glorification at the right hand of God, the devil rages furiously against the cause of Christ in the midst of the world. With all his ingenuity he seeks to undermine and to destroy the truths of the Word of God. And, of course, one of these truths is the atonement of the Christ of God. And the Church is called to defend also this pillar of the Word of God. It is to the history of this dogma that we now would call your attention.

In His Fear

First At Last

Rev. John A. Heys

On different occasions Jesus said that "the first shall be last, and the last shall be first."

He said it in that unqualified form in Matthew 29:16: "So the last shall be first, and the first last: for many be called, but few chosen."

In Mark 9:35 the unqualified form again appears, but now as good counsel, "If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last of all, and servant of all."

But in Matthew 19:30; Mark 10:31 and Luke 13:30 He qualifies the statement by the word "many." Not all that are first will become last, but many that are now first shall be last. And Paul in I Corinthians 4:9 states, "For I think that God hath set forth us the apostles last, as it were appointed to death: for we are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels and to men." Therein he also speaks of only some being last; and he speaks of being last in this life, believing that they shall be first at last in the day of Christ.

The unqualified statement surely will stand. The last shall be first; and the first shall be last. When you are speaking of the judgment of mere man, of fallen man, of man apart from the regenerating grace of God, this certainly is absolutely true. For such always, that is, such men, the unregenerated, fallen sinners, always judge differently from God. What they judge to be first always is last; and what they judge to be last always is first. The judgment of the unregenerated never agrees with God, even when they declare the mathematical fact that two added to two makes four. For the unregenerated always leave God out of their reckoning and judgment. And this important element left out

always means that the resultant judgment is not only short of God's judgment but contrary to it. The natural man never calls first in importance what God calls important. And his end is never the glory of God but the satisfaction of man's flesh. In the light of that satisfaction of the flesh the natural man judges whether objects and persons are first or last. These, then, that God calls first, because their end is the glory of God, the world calls the offscouring and scum of humanity.

However, we purpose to deal here with the qualified phrase that *many* that are first shall be last, and many that are last shall be first. There is, of course, also the truth that many shall not be in the kingdom at all. Many are called, but few are chosen. And this does not mean that many are invited, offered salvation, presented with a conditional promise; but few are wise enough to accept. That many are called means that *all* who hear the preaching are *commanded* by the living God to believe it; but few are chosen by Him to receive the spiritual strength and grace to believe it. We concern ourselves at the moment not with these that are considered first but do not at last find themselves, and are not found by others, to be in the kingdom at all. Jesus says that many *in the kingdom* that are last shall in the kingdom be first; and many that are first in the kingdom according to man's judgement shall still be in the kingdom in the day of Christ, but shall be last in that kingdom in comparison with others.

There are various reasons why those who are first in the kingdom today will be last in the day of Christ.

There is certainly that obvious fact that men fall from their high estate in later life. Men who are respected for their spiritual stand and manifestations of spiritual courage do under stress and severe temptations fall. We sometimes say, "the bigger the man, the harder the fall!" And we see this temporarily in Peter, who boasted of being in the front line of the battle, but fell to last place before a mere damsel. We see the latter end of Solomon to be far less glorious than the beginning, even as the last days of David were not characterized by the power of faith that his early days revealed. There is not a falling from grace. Once a believer; always a believer. That is God's promise. On its basis Paul can say that "He Who hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." Philippians 1:6. And John can say that "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." That verse in I John 3:9 certainly does not allow the idea of a falling away from grace. But one can in later life fall from his steadfastness, as Peter declares in II Peter 3:17.

There is also the fact that we cannot read the heart. We, therefore, place first, and acknowledge as first, those who make an outward display that is not the true manifestation of the spiritual condition of their hearts. Once again, we are not thinking of the Ananiases and Sapphiras, who for a time — short as it might be — are given big places in the church, only to fall away completely. We mean these who are in the kingdom and will be found at the last day in the kingdom, but will not be seen to be in the first position that we ascribed to them.

We so quickly judge a man to be first because of his knowledge and natural abilities. Because he can pray so easily in public; because of natural abilities of speaking, arguing, teaching and the like, we assume that such has a big and first place in the kingdom. He does in our church or congregation; and we readily concede the same as far as the kingdom of God is concerned. And since we are not able to read the heart, we judge them to be first because of external deeds. God knows them to be less than many humble folk who have less of these natural abilities but have been gifted with spiritual graces.

There is, therefore, that great danger of hero worship instead of divine worship. And then it often proves not to be hero worship for mighty deeds of spiritual valour, but of earthly achievement and success. There are those who "love a good fight" and are ready to match their mental and oratorical abilities with others. There are likewise those who lack this ability and courage, but love to witness a good fight. And the man who is so quick of wit and sharp of tongue becomes their hero. Indeed, the battlefield is the doctrine of the church and the truths of Scripture. But just because a man fights on that battlefield and

with such natural skill does not mean yet that he is in the kingdom in front of others without that ability. If he does it merely because he loves a good fight and to exercise his natural abilities, or let us say, in the measure that he does this because he loves a good fight and to exercise his abilities, the spiritual value of his work lessens, and he does not have that foremost place that men may readily grant to him. Being unable to read the heart, we are not able to determine which it is. And the words of Jesus have their power and warning that many that are first shall be last; and many that are last shall be first.

Then, too, there is that Laodicean tendency of the day, when men are lukewarm and neither hot nor cold, to leave it all to those who are officially first in the church. This is one of the crying evils of the day. In the presence of apostasy, in the eyes of change, definite doctrinal and practical change, one hears so often today the excuse that our minister, our professors, our elders and deacons, the men first in the church, know more than we and whatever they decide and do is agreeable and best. It is so easy for convenience of the flesh's sake to assume the lukewarm attitude, of doing no study, lifting no finger, raising no objection, putting up no opposition at all, and of letting the "first" in the church lead that church to a position of last in rank, as far as loyalty to the truth of God's Word is concerned and to the practical way of life which the Scriptures demand. This is all in line with the old convenient slogan, "My Church — right or wrong."

Let us open our eyes and beware and see that we are in the Laodicean age of lukewarmness. People simply do not care. They do not care to get involved. They wash their hands of the whole business and leave it all to the "leaders," even though it is apparent that they are misleaders. Men boast of having a friendly church and loathe the very idea of being *soldiers* of the cross of Christ. A fatal desire prevails for peace also in the church at the expense of the truth and God's glory. And men who will stand and fight for the truth are considered to be rebels in the church rather than "heroes of faith." Jesus is pictured as the Prince of Peace Who also seeks peace at the expense of justice and truth, a Prince Who seeks peace at any cost, a Prince Who seeks peace by compromise and agreement with the evil doer and false prophet.

All this is despising the very King of the Church. All this is putting first that which ought to be last. All this is being concerned with the material rather than the spiritual. And Jesus says, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and its righteousness, and all these (material things) shall be added unto you." In a wrong desire for the material they have changed it all to, "Seek ye first the material well being of your church; and all these spiritual things, somehow, will be added." But the folly of it all will become plain in the day of Christ. And the churches first in numbers, and power and

prestige and earthly riches, will at last be shown to be last, and some indeed even outside of the kingdom. For Jesus gives His warning that He will spew her out of His mouth. And He counsels her to buy of Him gold tried in the fire, that they may truly be rich. Revelation 3:14-22.

And let us also beware lest we despise the Spirit of God and thus God Himself. These "little folk" have that Spirit; and often in greater abundance than those "big" men in the church. Their simple childlike faith that humbles them to turn the other cheek, to suffer injury, to be the peacemakers, to fail to return an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, that in their own quiet way worship God and walk in love to Him are not to be shoved aside as nobodies in the church. At the last they may well be first, ahead of those who were so highly esteemed and respected by men. Despise not the Spirit of God in them that makes them walk as Jesus Himself walked, and to manifest a Christ-like walk.

These, too, when the time comes may well, after protest after protest, and rebuke after rebuke, with frustration after frustration at the ecclesiastical levels hear the call of Christ and open the door of the church by coming out and establishing a new congregation

where Christ will be preached and where He will come in to bless the preaching. And they will be first, because the rest Christ spews out of His mouth as distasteful to Him because of its political harangues, social "gospel" philosophical "sermons" instead of the gospel of Christ *crucified* and salvation by His *blood* and *Spirit*.

It is not a question as to whether we travel first class here below on plane and train, stay in first class hotels and the like, but as to what comes first in your life: God and His glory, or you and your comfort and ease and honour. Seek these earthly things first, and you will land up last in the kingdom. Have concern for that which is first in God's estimation, namely, His glory and praise, and you will find yourself first in His kingdom. For He declared Himself through Isaiah, "This people have I formed for myself. They shall show forth My praises." Isaiah 43:21. And Peter declares, "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a peculiar people that ye should show forth the praises of Him Who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light. I Peter 2:9. Our calling is plain: God and His glory and praises must be first in our lives. Then, though now we are despised, we shall at last be first in His kingdom.

Studies in Depth

Billy Graham's Compromised Crusade Connections

Rev. Robt. C. Harbach

Billy Graham, now *the* evangelist of the liberal ecumenical movement, is, as might be expected, as thick as thieves with the modernists. Some would say he has, as a great star, declined a long way. Back in 1949, when he was editor of *The Pilot*, magazine of Northwestern Schools, an ad appeared in the publication, offering for sale a book by the unitarianized Harry Emerson Fosdick. This is the man who said, "I do not believe in the virgin birth, or in that old fashioned substitutionary doctrine of the atonement; and I do not know any intelligent minister who does." Was Fosdick unaware of Graham's existence then, or did he regard him as unintelligent? But the next issue of the magazine carried the editor's apology in the words, "I am sorry for this advertisement having appeared, because we do not condone nor have fellowship with any form of modernism . . . Dr. Fosdick's position is well known as that of an extreme modernist." In 1951, Billy said in a letter, "I have never been nor will I ever be in favor of a modernist being on the (Graham crusade) committee, or in any way having fellowship in these meetings." In 1952, Billy wrote "fundamentalist"

Dr. John R. Rice, ". . . we have never had a modernist on our Executive Committee." In 1955, Billy told Rice in Scotland, "I have promised God that I will never have on my committee working in an active way in any of my campaigns men who do not believe in the verbal inspiration of the Bible — these men will never be on my committee. I have promised God."

Now all the world is witness to Billy's "I have promised God." In 1948 Billy had been asked, "What do you expect the World Council of Churches to do this August when you visit Copenhagen?" He answered as though knowing which way the wind was blowing, "I believe they are going to nominate the Antichrist." But in the light of that promise it is interesting to note that in 1961, himself at the World Council of Churches in New Delhi, he said of it, "This assembly could be another Pentecost." Was this not also uttered with eye upon the wind direction?

It was only a year, at the most, after that promise that men were on his committee like Henry Van Dusen of Union Theological Seminary, and John Sutherland Bonnell. The latter had said, in *Look* magazine, 1954,

"We do not think it is any longer necessary for Presbyterian ministers to confirm their faith in the virgin birth." In 1957 Billy's leading committee members of the New York crusade were Robert J. McCracken and none other than Harry Emerson Fosdick. For the San Francisco crusade, Billy had Bishop James A. Pike, surplised atheist turned spiritist. The 1963 Los Angeles campaign was headed by Bishop Gerald Kennedy of the Methodist Church. Other National Council of Churches liberals worked on the committee under Bishop Kennedy, men with communist-front connections who marched in Washington, such as Martin Luther King and Bayard Rustin. Bishop Kennedy has belonged to ten communist-front organizations. He, not surprisingly, has repudiated every doctrine of the Christian faith. Yet, surprisingly, Billy said of him, "Bishop Kennedy is one of the ten greatest Christian preachers in America." By whose or what standard of judgment, we ask? Apparently this Kennedy has gone through many "conversion" experiences, for he said, "My christian experience has led me from fundamentalism to liberalism, through neo-orthodoxy, and home again to what for want of a better term, I shall call Wesleyanism." The latter term is a modern euphemism for semi-Pelagianism. Men of this stripe Billy does not hesitate to use to front him in his campaigns, and, it goes without saying, they use him. In 1957 a representative of the modernist Protestant Council of Churches said, "The (modern ecumenical) church will be greatly strengthened as a result of the Graham crusade." Later, this same speaker reported that the Council of Churches increased from some 1700 local churches to some 3000, the liberals nearly doubling as a result of the Graham crusade. Billy at his crusades has the most prominent modernists to lead in prayer, men such as Norman Vincent Peale, Martin Luther King and James A. Pike. He eulogized E. Stanley Jones as "my good friend and trusted adviser." These men are all enemies to the Reformed faith, evolutionists, denying the triune God, the infallible scripture and the particular atonement.

In South America, "a Roman Catholic bishop in a benighted country stood on the platform and made the sign of the cross over the converts as they came forward." Cardinal Cushing of Boston said to Billy, "I am glad to have Catholics go to hear you preach because you make better Catholics out of them." In 1967 Graham received an honorary degree from a Romanist college, Belmont Abbey. Responding to the "honor" (bait!) Graham said, "I'm not sure but what this could start me being called 'Father Graham'." This reveals a slight sign of vanity. In a more serious vein he also said, "... The gospel that built this school and the gospel that brings me here is still the way to salvation." We cannot believe that either "gospel" comes close to salvation. At the Abbey he also said, "that the ecumenical council and the reforms started by the late Pope

John have brought a new dialogue, and a new understanding that might bring a great Christian revolution." Over 450 years ago it was reformation *from* Rome *to* the truth of Scripture. Now it is revolution *with* Rome *against* misunderstanding. Conclusion: the Reformation came about as the result of the Reformers' misunderstanding. His inclusivistic ecumenical spirit is revealed when he added, "What is happening in the ecumenical revolution is of interest to people all around the world — to Catholics, Protestants, Jews and Buddhists." It is also known that when the cardinals of the Roman hierarchy were convening to choose a new pope, that Billy prayed that the cardinals might be guided by the Holy Spirit in the choice they would make. So Graham has widened his crusade platform to take in Rome; and, it would seem, also Buddhism and Jewry. In US News and World Report, Sept. 27, 1957, Billy was asked if he received financial support from all three groups — Protestants, Catholics and Jews. He replied, "Yes, we did. In fact, one of the largest checks that we received came from a Jewish businessman in New York City." After all, wealthy industrialists have been on his committees. But then let true Christians put their money only to the cause of the true church. Let the Catholics, modernists, Jews and Buddhists support Billy Graham. Let the dead bury their own dead.

Though we keep calling him Billy, we must remember he is not merely "Rev." Billy, but Dr. Billy Graham. Bob Jones University (where any and all documentation for this article may be obtained) claims to have conferred, not an earned degree, but an honorary degree on Billy. The newspapers have come out with many shocking things about *Dr.* Graham, one report stating that non-Protestant converts "are referred to the church of their choice." This has been confirmed by some who "went forward" and found it to be so by experience. However, Walter Smyth of the Graham staff denied the above newspaper statement. "False," he said, "Billy Graham has never at any time in history given cards to the Catholics." Call attention to certain strange newspaper reports and ask why they have not been later corrected in the press and Billy's staff members will often reply with as feeble a defense as Walt Smyth's. "If we answered our critics we would have no time for anything." There are times when critics *must* be answered, for the honor of God is at times at stake. Jesus alone is proof of that. But the newspapers have quoted Graham as replying, "Anyone who makes a decision at our meetings is seen later and referred to a local clergyman, Protestant, Catholic or Jewish." Billy is still busy building the Babel tower of the false ecumenical church. If not a red carpet, then a sawdust trail he lays to Rome, toward which the ecumenical mob is moving. Says he, "Many of the people who reach a decision on Christ at our meetings have joined the Catholic Church and we have received recommendations from Catholic publications for the revived in-

terest in their church following our campaigns. This happened both in Boston and in Washington. After all, one of our prime purposes is to help the churches in a community. If after we move on, the local churches do not feel the effects of these meetings in increased membership and attendance, then our crusade would have to be considered a failure." So Graham regards the Romish church as the true church. He is simply an indirect agent and servant of the Roman Catholic Church. But undoubtedly Billy has made little or no impression on the Jews as far as "decisions" are concerned, for in the most Jewish city in the world, New York City, the boost he gave the religious bodies was not to the synagogues (which do not need it, if you listen to the rabbis at the Congress on Evangelism), but to the churches of the modernist councils.

It is too bad, but people do not think. If they did, we could expect them to see that the religion of Jesus, of the apostles, of the early church fathers, of Augustine and of the Reformers do form but one line of divine truth, and that what Graham and his followers hold is but a cheap, crooked counterfeit of that line. His pathetic apologists will say that Billy does not preach the *whole* counsel of God, that there are many doctrinal themes of the Christian faith he never men-

tions "because he does not believe that they are the duty and responsibility of the evangelist." Pastors have the duty of taking up the fundamentals and the essentials of the faith. Evangelists, however, are to present the rudiments of the faith "to get people saved." Continually you hear Billy say, as he waves a Bible in the air, "the Bible says," a now hackneyed expression with him. But there are many rock-bottom bits of the Gospel drill lacking in Billy's grind — the Atonement, for example. The reason for this is, as a counsellor of his association will tell you, that "Mr. Graham believes that we are saved through the blood of Christ, however, this aspect of Christian doctrine he does not emphasize in his messages." That is left to the pastors! Billy Graham *believes* we are saved by the blood of Christ, but he doesn't preach it! At least, he doesn't emphasize it. Billy's emphasis is not on the Cross! The offence of the Cross is made to cease! Imagine! an evangelist without emphasis on the blood of Christ. There you have a preacher who has nothing to preach. But so it is with the false prophets of this century. Their emphasis is on the scarlet-carpeted road to Rome, on the social gospel, a perverted gospel, which is no gospel. The axe is laid to the roots!

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Board of the Adams Street Protestant Reformed Christian School wishes to express its heartfelt sympathy to one of our teachers, Miss Ruth Dykstra and her family in the recent death of her father,

MR. JOHN DYKSTRA.

May the bereaved find comfort in the words of Psalm 34:22, "Jehovah redeemeth in the soul of His servants: and none of them that take refuge in Him shall be condemned."

Kenneth Bylsma, Pres.
Robert W. Pastoor, Sec'y.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Mary Martha Society of the Southeast Protestant Reformed Church expresses its sincere sympathy to one of its members, Mrs. Sidney Vander Wal and family, in the loss of her father-in-law,

MR. WATSON VANDER WAL.

"Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints." (Psalm 116:15).

Mrs. Charles Westra, Pres.
Miss Audrey Reitsma, Sec'y.

ATTENTION STAFF MEMBERS

The Standard Bearer Staff will hold its annual meeting the Lord willing on Monday, June 8, 1970 at 8:00 p.m. at the First Protestant Reformed Church of Grand Rapids, Mich. All department editors please take note of this meeting and reserve this evening. Included in the agendum will be the report of the survey committee. If unable to attend, please contact the undersigned.

Rev. J. Kortering, Secretary

NOTICE !!!

According to the decision of the Synod of 1969, the Consistory of The First Protestant Reformed Church of Grand Rapids, Michigan, hereby notifies the churches that the 1970 Synod of the Protestant Reformed Churches will convene, the Lord willing, on Wednesday, June 3, at 9 A.M. in the above mentioned church. The pre-synodical service will be held Tuesday evening, June 2, at 8 P.M., at First Church. Rev. C. Hanko, president of the 1969 Synod, will preach the sermon. Synodical delegates are requested to meet with the consistory before the service. Delegates in need of lodging should contact J.M. Faber, 1123 Cooper Ave., S.E., Grand Rapids, Mich., 49507.

J.M. Faber, Clerk



News From Our Churches

Report of Classis East, April 1, 1970, Hudsonville, Michigan.

Rev. J. Kortering led in the opening devotions, and declared the Classis properly constituted when the credentials were accepted.

All the churches were represented by two delegates except Holland which had one. The Rev. J.A. Heys and the Rev. M. Schipper were absent; the former working in Jamaica, and the latter recuperating from surgery.

The Rev. G.C. Lubbers presided over this session, while the Rev. J. Kortering recorded the minutes.

Elders J. Flikkema and F. Ondersma served on the Finance Committee, and Elder J. Heys was appointed to thank the ladies of Hudsonville for their excellent catering.

The reports of the Stated Clerk and of the Classical Committee were filed for information.

Classis acceded to the requests of Classis West and Holland to give them classical appointments. The Revs. Harbach and Veldman and Elder M. Klop were appointed to prepare the schedule which was adopted as follows:

RANDOLPH: April 12 — Van Baren April 19 — Kortering May 3 — Veldman May 10 — Harbach May 17 — Lubbers May 24 — Heys May 31 — Van Baren June 7 — Kortering Sept. 6 — Harbach Sept. 13 — Schipper. HOLLAND: Apr. 12 — Lubbers Apr. 19 — Veldman.

The Consistory of Pella addressed a letter to Classis expressing gratitude for the supply given during their vacancy.

First Church requested Classis to approve and forward to Synod their recommendation that Synod set January 15 as the date for determining the number of families to be assessed.

Some material from an appellant which appeared on the agenda was returned to the appellant upon request.

Two other cases of appeal were treated. Classis also granted the request of a Consistory to increase censure on one of its members, and to erase a baptized member.

Classis elected the Revs. Heys and Lubbers to serve as Church Visitors with Rev. Van Baren as alternate for both.

Classis decided to meet next time in Holland on July 1.

The questions of Article 41 of the Church Order were asked of each Consistory and answered satisfactorily.

After a few appropriate remarks by the chairman, Classis adjourned. Rev. R.C. Harbach led in the closing devotions.

M. Schipper, S.C.

A couple of our churches have recently made trios from which they have called ministers. The information we have at the time of this writing is limited to the trios. Hull's Consistory has one consisting of Rev. D. Engelsma, Rev. R. Harbach, and Rev. G. Lubbers. Doon has called one from the following: Rev. C. Hanko, Rev. J. Kortering, and Rev. M. Schipper.

It's obvious that catechism and society seasons are drawing to a close. According to the church bulletins there's no end of banquets and pot-lucks, league meetings and mass meetings. A couple of topics of speeches at those meetings: "As the Twig is Bent," by Rev. Lanting at a Ladies League meeting in Edgerton;

"Satan as an Angel of Light in the Latter Days," by Rev. Veldman at a Ladies League meeting in Hudsonville; and "The Mission Program According to the Full Counsel of God," by Rev. Lubbers at a Men's League meeting in Southwest Church.

Rev. Lubbers, the last missionary our churches have had, is currently, as you know, considering a call to act as missionary to Jamaica. If we can judge by his speaking engagements recently, we can only conclude that his heart is in this work. Besides the above mentioned speech, he also, on April 24, spoke about, and showed his slides on, his work in Jamaica at a Young Peoples' Society sponsored program in Southwest; and he has given a public lecture in Oak Lawn on "The Purpose of Mission Work in the Protestant Reformed Churches."

Because of the "seasonal rash of scheduled events relating to school and society activities," one event had to be cancelled. A Seminary Appreciation Night was scheduled, then rescheduled, and finally dropped. Plans are to hold it at the beginning of next season.

* * *

From bulletin announcements we notice that a

couple of our churches rejoice in the return of the pastor to the pulpit. One of those is Southeast, whose pastor, Rev. Schipper has been absent for some time because of illness. In their April 26 bulletin their consistory expressed gratitude to the Seminary which helped out during their emergency, and informed the congregation that Rev. Schipper planned to attend services that Sunday, and return to the pulpit for at least one service the following Sunday.

The other one is our church in Holland. It is, of course, getting Rev. Heys back after his work in Jamaica. To welcome him back, there was a program and social hour planned by the consistory for April 24, a "Welcome Home" singspiration planned by the Young People's Society for April 26, and, last but not least, a clean yard. It seems that members of the congregation came equipped with garden tools and gave the church yard and parsonage lawn a good cleaning. There's unmistakable warmth in all this that hardly needs to be pointed out.

D.R.D.



Let no man, then, glory in himself!

For if you do not thirst for the living Christ, it is only because you are blind, and dead, and naked and miserable, an enemy of God, hating righteousness though boasting of your goodness, loving the darkness rather than the light, glorying in your shame. And boast not against the Christ of God, as if you had the power to decide to come to Him whenever you please. Christ is the Lord. No one can come to Him unless the Father draw him!

On the other hand, ye that thirst, and come unto Him to drink, exalt not yourselves. Ye came not of yourselves. It was His grace that made you thirst for the living water. It was He that called: Come! and you came. It was He that imparted Himself to you, and you drank, and continue to drink unto everlasting life! He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord!

H. Hoeksema, *Whosoever Will*, p. 55