

# Standard



## A REFORMED SEMI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE

## IN THIS ISSUE

**Editorial**:

An Unholy Alliance

Feature:

The Crisis Mounts

Beginning:

The Voice of our Fathers

All Around Us:

Creation and Evolution in the Public Schools A Blasphemous Chapel Service

#### CONTENTS:

Meditation – Saved By Grace50
Editorials – Editor's Notes
Question Box — About "Unordained Preachers"
Feature — The Crisis Mounts
All Around Us — Creation and Evolution in the Public Schools
The Day of Shadows — The Paving of Sin's Highway
The Voice of our Fathers – Man Created, Not Evolved
Taking Heed To The Doctrine — A Defense of Calvinism As The Gospel
Book Reviews — They Chose To Live
News From Our Churches72

#### 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. Homer C. Hoeksema

Department Editors: Rev. Robert D. Decker, Mr. Donald Doezema, Rev. David J. Engelsma, Rev. Cornelius Hanko, Prof. Herman Hanko, Rev. Robert C. Harbach, Rev. John A. Heys, Rev. Jay Kortering, Rev. Dale H. Kuiper, 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, Mich. 49506

Church News Editor:

Mr. Donald Doezema 1904 Plymouth Terrace, S.E. Grand Rapids, Mich. 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, and must be signed. Copy deadlines are the first and the fifteenth of the month. All communications relative to the contents should be sent to the editorial office.

Reprint Policy: Permission is hereby granted for the reprinting of articles in our magazine by other publications, provided: a) that such reprinted articles are reproduced in full; b) that proper acknowledgement is made; c) that a copy of the periodical in which such reprint appears is sent to our editorial office.

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

Business Agent for Australasia:

Mr. Wm. van Rij 7 Ryeland Ave. Christchurch 4, New Zealand

Subscription Policy: Subscription price, \$7.00 per year (\$5.00 for Australasia). 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

# Saved By Grace

Rev. M. Schipper

"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works, any man should boast."

Ephesians 2:8, 9.

"And you . . . "

These are the words with which the apostle begins this chapter in which our text is found. The apostle, it appears, is so overwhelmed by the expression that he elaborates upon it. The reference is in the first instance to the congregation at Ephesus; but, as it is true of all his epistles, they refer to the church of all ages, and therefore to you and me.

"And you . . . "

You also were dead in trespasses and sins. Not only is it true that you were ungodly, wicked, as all the rest of mankind, but you were dead. There was no spiritual life in you. You were dead because of your trespasses and sins. Not only were you dead because of Adam's sin, but you actually walked in time past in your sins; and your walk was according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience. You had your pleasure in doing the lusts of your flesh and mind; and were by nature children of wrath, even as others. You were spiritually dead!

"But God . . . "

Note the sharp contrast!

The contrast is so great that the apostle does not

return to his original thought, about our death in trespasses and sins. He is overwhelmed with the greatness of God's mercy and love, according to which He made us, who were dead, to live with Christ.

But God, Who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, hath quickened us together with Christ. God wanted to show in the coming ages the exceeding riches of His grace, the revelation of His kindness upon us in Christ Jesus; and therefore saved by His grace.

For by grace are ye saved!

Not of works, lest any man should boast!

Saved by grace!

Grace! What is it? O, you have heard it many times. But it is not superfluous to call your attention to this Scriptural concept again. Inseparably it is connected with our salvation. Without it there is no salvation possible.

Grace in Scripture is that which is objectively beautiful, and therefore affords joy because of its beauty and pleasantness. Thus it stands opposed to that which is ugly, plain, awkward, harsh, and crude. For example, in Luke 4:22 we read, "And all bare Him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth." In other words, Jesus' contemporaries marvelled at the gracious, i.e., beautiful words which He spoke.

Grace may also be looked at from the point of view of that which is essentially good as bending down to that which is truly beautiful. In this sense it is realized in a relation of friendship and favor. The angel who appeared unto the Virgin Mary said unto her: "Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found grace in the eyes of the Lord."

If this grace is directed to unworthy and sinful objects, it also has two other meanings. In the first place, it is unmerited, forfeited favor; and stands opposed to obligation, reward according to works, earned favor. In this sense Paul speaks of it in Ephesians 1:7, "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." In the second place, it also has the meaning of redemptive power, active favor; that which makes blessed. "And of His fulness have all we received, and grace for grace." John 1:16.

In our text grace, no doubt, has this latter significance. Grace is, then, that redemptive power which is favor in action. Grace is, then, the pouring out over, and working in of God's beauty in the chosen and justified sinner; imparting all spiritual blessings to him, granting him all the blessings of salvation. In one word, grace is the causal means used of God to make the chosen sinner beautiful. Free, sovereign goodness of God bending toward the bound, dependent, wretch; to deliver him. Grace is the unmerited, forfeited favor of God which brings blessedness and spiritual beauty to poor misearable sinners.

Saved by grace!

To be saved is to be delivered from the greatest possible misery, and to be made partaker of the highest possible good. In the light of the context it is not difficult at all to determine what in the mind of the apostle he considered to be the greatest possible evil. Very simply, it is to be dead in trespasses and sins. Nor is it difficult, to understand what the apostle considered to be the highest good. It is to be made beautiful as God is beautiful. It is to be quickened, to be made alive together with Christ. And be sure to notice the tense which the apostle uses here. He says, by grace are ye saved. It is a completed act. He does not say, you will be saved, that is, in some future time. But you are saved by grace now. It is an accomplished fact. All of which was accomplished in the death and resurrection of our Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ.

Saved by grace!

Not of works, lest any man should boast!

O how ugly, how God-dishonoring is the doctrine that men can save themselves! Would that men who preach this doctrine of salvation by works could see how this doctrine robs God of His glory; while it glorifies man instead of God. Would, too, that they who hear this doctrine could see how vain it is. That they could see that God will not have His honor profaned. For God will not allow any man to boast before Him. Any individuals, or any church that professes to stand as a projection of the Reformation. and still purports to be saved by an act of their will, or on the basis of their work, has never understood the basic truth which the Reformation brought forth. Let them be honest, and go back where they came from, namely, to that church which always believed and still believes and preaches that men can be saved by works which they perform. Or, let them repent, and embrace with us the truth of God's Word, that we are saved merely of grace.

How beautiful is the conception, the truth that by the redemptive power of God's grace which bent down to us miserable, lost, hell-bound sinners to make us beautiful as God is beautiful, has saved us by bringing us to the highest good, — to dwell in eternal life in the blessed communion and fellowship with the living God! Such is the meaning of being saved by grace!

But this is not all that the Word of God says here.

We are informed that we are saved by grace through faith.

And faith is the living bond of fellowship which ties us to the Captain of our salvation. As the umbilical cord connects the fetus, the unborn child to its mother, through which cord the child receives of its mother all the food and life-giving energies the fetus needs for normal and healthy growth, so is faith the living connection of the saved sinner to Christ, in Whom is his salvation. The difference to be marked in the above comparison is the fact that the fetus is

totally unaware of the connection to its mother, while the saved sinner is consciously united to Christ.

Faith, as is well-known, contains two elements; that of a certain spiritual knowledge, and that of a hearty confidence. It contains a certain knowledge of God as the God of my salvation and His grace in Christ, in and through Whom all that grace flows to me. According to this knowledge I know my original state and condition of misery and death. Accordingly I also know my need of deliverance, and Him Who delivered me. Faith contains also the hearty confidence or trust that the grace in Christ is sufficient to save me, and to make me to conform to the beauty of my Saviour.

Faith is the divinely ordained means and divinely given grace through which Christ, the God of my salvation conveys consciously to me all the graces of salvation. Never is it a condition dependent on me for its fulfillment before I can be saved. Nor is it the ground of my salvation. Nor is it another work which I perform in order to be saved. But faith is the divinely ordained means, and divinely bestowed gift, whereby I, who am saved by grace, am consciously made aware of my salvation. It is that gift of God through the conscious appropriation of which I become the recipient of all the beauteous grace which is in Christ Jesus.

But we do not have this faith of ourselves! Contrary to the very prevalent view that all men have faith. It is said that if all men did not have faith, why, life in this world would be impossible. If I am to travel, for example, by plane from my home city to another across the country, I must believe that the plane will be able to transport me. I must believe that the pilot will be able to get the plane off the ground, properly navigate it, and be able to set it down at my destination. I must believe that the young lady who put a little slip of paper in my hand in exchange for the proper number of dollars gave me a ticket that will get me entrance into the plane. I must believe that the extra luggage which went into the baggage department of the plane will be where I can pick it up when I arrive at my destination. O, I must have faith! Without it I cannot do business. I cannot live in this world. And so, men apply this also to the matter of our salvation. The faith that is in you when you board a plane, or when you transact your business, is the faith you must also exercise when salvation, be it a salvation of grace,

is offered to you. But this is what men say, — it is not what the Word of God says. Notice what our text says so beautifully, but emphatically: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that NOT OF YOURSELVES: IT IS THE GIFT OF GOD."

All of our salvation, as well as our faith to believe, is not of us: it is the gift of God!

Salvation is of grace!

Faith is of grace!

It is not of us in any sense of the word, but it is the gift of God!

Not of our will! Not of any merit on our part!

It is all of God! It is given to us in His sovereign and free grace. If flows to us from the stream of His eternal and unchangeable love.

Here is indeed a gift with no strings attached. No prerequisites which we must fulfill before we can have it. No conditions with which we must comply before He will give it. No work we must first perform that will make us worthy of it.

Very simply, but O so graciously, He gives us all of our salvation from the beginning to the end.

And you can see why it must needs be so, and not otherwise. The apostle makes this very plain in the last part of the text: "Lest any man should boast." Isn't that precisely what we would do if our salvation in any way was dependent upon us? If you say NO! to this question, you do not know yourself. But God knows us. He knows that if He conditioned our salvation and made it dependent on our will, or our faith, we would certainly conclude that God ought to be very graceful that we accepted His salvation.

Shall God alone be glorified, salvation, grace, faith, and all that pertains to it, must all be of Him!

This is the gospel the Reformers embraced! It is for the preservation of this truth that they took up the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, to fight against the lie. It was for this that they were willing to be castigated, and excommunicated by a fellowship that maintained, and still maintains, that salvation is by works. O, indeed, not the works of the law, but by the work of faith.

It is this gospel which is our precious heritage!

It alone gives us a beautiful and very precious God! And those whom He saves by His sovereign grace through faith shall become beautiful as He is beautiful! Say with me, Amen!



## **Editorials**

## **Editor's Notes**

Prof. H. C. Hoeksema

Elsewhere in this issue you will find an article from the pen of Dr. John R. de Witt, of Kingstree, South Carolina. The reader will recall that some months ago Dr. de Witt wrote two articles for our magazine on "The Crisis in the Southern Presbyterian Church." These articles brought a critical response from Dr. James Daane in a recent issue of the Reformed Journal. Upon noticing said response, I invited Dr. de Witt to reply if he saw fit to do so. Our readers will understand, I am sure, that placement of Dr. de Witt's reply does not necessarily imply agreement and endorsement of all of his positions; and Dr. de Witt himself understands this, too. In fact, to enliven the discussion your editor may probably reflect on some matters in the current article. But if I have any disagreements with Dr. de Witt, and he with me, they are the disagreements of friends. The points touched on by Dr. de Witt will, I think, be clear even though the reader does not have access to Dr. Daane's article. And I believe that the thoughts expressed by Dr. de Witt will prove stimulating with respect to the whole subject of church reformation. Incidentally, I recently

had the opportunity to renew acquaintances with friend de Witt and his gracious wife, and to talk over many church matters of mutual interest in an evening's visit which proved to be all too brief.

An old-new rubric appears in this issue, with the Rev. J. Kortering as department editor. In The Voice of our Fathers Rev. Kortering takes up the exposition of our Netherlands Confession of Faith at the point where I dropped it several years ago when the duties of editor were laid upon me. Be sure to follow this instructive series, which will alternate with Rev. Kortering's writings for The Strength of Youth. Watch the November 15 issue for a repeat of the green insert and its attractive combination book-and-subscription offers. This will be the last time before Christmas that these offers will be made. So if you have any ideas about giving someone a most excellent Christmas gift (Think of it! The Standard Bearer and R.F.P.A. books!), be sure to act promptly. And at inflation-fighting prices, too!

# **An Unholy Alliance**

"A historic 'first' in ecumenical adventure took not an ecclesiastical, conference, as a commendable place in Grand Rapids, Michigan, August 28-30 that may hopefully be the beginning of similar ventures throughout the nation." (The Banner, Oct. 6, 1972)

"Ecumenical history was made here this week when that strolling religious troubadour, Archbishop Fulton J. Sheen, paced in front of Catholic, Missouri Synod Lutheran and Christian Reformed educators at the Civic Auditorium." (The Grand Rapids Press, Sept. 2,

To what do these glowing statements refer?

To MANSEC, Michigan Association of Nonpublic Schools Educational Conference. This was a conference of educators from Roman Catholic, Missouri Lutheran, and National Union of Christian Schools personnel, the latter, of course, being chiefly Christian Reformed. Attendance on the part of teachers from at least some National Union schools was compulsory.

As the above quotations indicate, this Conference was hailed in both the secular press and in the Banner as a great thing, and, although it was an educational, venture in ecumenicity. The report in the Banner was accompanied by pictures which obviously purposed to portray the ecumenical spirit - even one of Mr. Ivan Zylstra, an official of the National Union of Christian Schools arm-in-arm with Bishop Sheen!

I call it ecumenism, with the emphasis on the ISM! An unholy alliance!

A shameful reflection on our forefathers who founded our Christian Schools and who sacrificed for the sake of Reformed, covenantal, distinctive, antithetical education!

Something which ought, without much reflection, to offend the sensibilities of any right-minded Christian School man!

How is the gold of the Christian school movement become dim!

My parents gave me a Christian school education. And although even at that time the education was not all that was to be desired from a Protestant Reformed viewpoint, (there were no Protestant Reformed Christian Schools as yet), it was by-and-large a good

Christian education. But neither they nor, I dare say, almost all Christian school supporters ever envisioned that the Christian school movement would arrive at such a sad estate as this, and so swiftly!

I will not comment on the possible motives of a movement like this, though I sometimes wonder if the motive is simply an insatiable desire to be big, to count in this world. I know not; I cannot understand it. I do know that the motive cannot possibly be good. Things like this simply do not arise out of good motives.

I will not comment on the fact that this is the same notorious organization that campaigned so strenuously in Michigan for the almighty dollar of parochiaid, although let it be said that there were strong overtones of this same desire for some form of parochiaid at this conference.

But I do wish to point out some fundamental wrongs, briefly.

In the first place, and from the formal point of view, the organization is wrong, unholy. It is a making of common cause with Roman Catholics and Lutherans on a broad common denominator, and a negative one, besides. This is an organization of non-public schools. Perhaps you ask what is wrong with that. Is it not true? I answer: it is negative, purely negative. This is already bad in itself. How can you properly form an organization on a pure negation? But there is more. This negative is not innocent. It involves the ignoring of and a denial of a fundamental principle of education. Surely, we do not believe in public education, that is, in the principle that it is the government's duty to educate our children. This is not Biblical. But neither do we believe, as do Roman Catholics and Lutherans, in parochial education, that is, that it is the business of the church to educate our children. This also is not Biblical. We believe in parental education, that is, that it is the God-given calling of covenant parents to educate their God-given children in the fear of the Lord. I am afraid that even we tend to forget this too much, and to think that we can palm off the duty of education on a school board or a staff of teachers; the latter kind of thinking is to be classed as a sort of belief in private education, not parental education. We must hold on, in a very real sense, to this sacred principle of the parental calling and the parental responsibility of education; and we must keep our schools answerable to the parents only, and keep our servants, the teachers, and our servants, the school board, wholly and strictly answerable to the parents.

But this is the very Biblical principle which is ignored and denied by MANSEC. One becomes involved with those who want parochial education, which is not Biblical any more than is public education; and one necessarily becomes involved in helping the cause of parochial education.

Someone will say, perhaps: but is it not good to

work for what is called a pluralistic educational arrangement — one in which we have all kinds of schools? My answer is: not at all! I am for Christian, parental education, period. And I am against all other kinds as being contrary to Scripture.

Even as far as its formal, organizational principle is concerned, MANSEC constituted an unholy alliance — an attempted union of right and wrong, of light and darkness, of Biblical and unbiblical principles, which could only be at the expense of the right.

And materially, that is, as far as the substance of the conference was concerned, matters were even worse. In all the reports which I read, I failed to find anything good; and I found much that ought to be an offense to anyone who calls himself Reformed and a son of the Reformation. In fact, one hardly knows where to begin with recounting the evils.

Can you feature "Catholic sisters in a variety of habits and white-collared priests (joining) Christian school teachers and administrators of Protestant persuasion in rousing renditions of 'Faith of Our Fathers, Living Still' "? Is it not ecumenical hypocrisy that cries to the Lord of the church?

Could you give silent assent while a Roman Catholic prelate declaimed, "Our common interest in religious education is not to be penalized for believing in God. It is our common love for the Lord that draws us together"?

Can you feature one who is supposed to be a representative of the Reformed faith (Editor DeKoster of the Banner) blatantly denying man's loss of the image of God, and blandly saying to an audience which included Roman Catholic Semi-Pelagians (who, of course, would accept this with relish) such things as the following? "Whatever race, creed or color has the flesh of Adam, shares the image of God. It is the church (Which one, that of Rome or that of our fathers? HCH) and the church's schools that have stood for this in all centuries of the church's existence. God and man rise or fall together. This first convention, whether we meant it or not, has as its scope the hope of the world."

Can you imagine an audience which includes Reformed educators being enthralled at such oratory as this from the mouth of Bishop Sheen: "Nonpublic education is the savior of this country"?

Can you imagine this mixed body of conventioneers ignoring the past, ignoring their respective positions, ignoring (in the case of Reformed and Lutherans) their blood-bought heritage, and singing as though there were never any Reformation-struggle, "And we'll work with each other, We will work side by side . . . And they'll know we are Christians by our love"?

Can you feature Reformed educators being edified by Roman Catholic liturgical dancers performing an interpretive dance of the story of Ezekiel's Dry Bones? Or a dance group presenting Jesus Christ Superstar for the benefit of Reformed, Christian educators? Or "Jesus Is Just All Right" or "Day by Day" from Godspell? Or fifty excerpts of songs by the Beatles, followed by fifty excerpts of Bob Dylan?

All this in the name of Christian and Reformed education?

One is inclined to ask whether the leaders who prepared all this in the name of Christian education have lost their bearings altogether.

It is appalling.

The very thought of all this is nauseating.

\*\*\*

Permit me an application.

Number 1. Recently the Northwest Iowa Chapter of Reformed Fellowship issued a *Testimony Concerning the Promotion of Christian Education* which has been published by various religious journals. On the whole, it is not a bad testimony. But in the light of the above sample of what the Christian education of the National Union Schools is, the testimony is completely unrealistic. They should instead issue a testimony to start anew, to re-establish a system of Reformed education. There is no sound reason to urge parents to support the kind of Christian education that can go to the extremes manifested by MANSEC and praised so highly by the *Banner*. And I make bold to say that

there is no reason to hope and expect that such a brand of Christian education will survive. It has a built-in self-destruct mechanism — world conformity.

Number 2. Where our people have the opportunity to send their children to our Protestant Reformed Christian Schools, I believe it is a dirty shame and a grave wrong deliberately to reject that opportunity and deliberately to expose their covenant children to the evil influences which they must expect from National Union Schools. And I feel sorry for their children who are the victims.

Number 3. Wherever the Lord makes it possible, we must continue to establish and maintain our own schools even at the cost of great financial sacrifice.

Number 4. We must be constantly on the alert, lest similar levelling, antithesis-denying influences be allowed to creep into our own thinking and our own schools.

Number 5. When I think of tendencies such as those of MANSEC and when I become acquainted, through student witnesses, with the kind of college training that is available to our young people today, I become increasingly convinced that we must begin to think in terms of providing Protestant Reformed higher education. A visionary's dream, you say? I would rather be a visionary than an ostrich. And there is a choice!

## Question Box

## **About "Unordained Preachers"**

Prof. H. C. Hoeksema

From a Western Michigan reader I received the following:

"In the last few years I have noticed, in the Reformed community, an increase in the number of unordained men preaching. This occurs because of various circumstances. Ministers go on vacation; and rather than ask another minister to preach, a consistory asks a lay member to lead the service. Or a church will send one of its members to a nearby camping area to conduct a Sunday service. This seems to me to be a bad practice and, moreover, a violation of the Church Order. Please comment." Reply

My first comment is that this is indeed a violation of the Church Order of Dordrecht, which is very clear on this point, Article 3: "No one, though he be a professor of theology, elder or deacon, shall be permitted to enter upon the ministry of the Word and the sacraments without having been lawfully called

thereunto. And when anyone acts contrary thereto, and after being frequently admonished does not desist, the classis shall judge whether he is to be declared a schismatic or is to be punished in some other way." The seriousness, by the way, with which the Church Order views such lawlessness is very evident from what this article says about a possible punishment: the violation of this principle can even lead to being declared schismatic!

In the second place, I would point out that there are not only many such individual "unordained preachers" in our day; but there are whole movements, organizations, which engage in this kind of activity apart from the church and its offices. I refer to the many non-ecclesiastical, so-called "non-denominational," evangelistic associations which presume to do mission work and evangelism in our day—all apart from the church institute. This is in violation of the Scriptural principle that a preacher is

one who is *called* and *sent* by God and by Christ. It is in violation of the principle that Christ has given to His *church* pastors and teachers. And it is in violation of the principle that Christ calls men to the ministry of the gospel in and through His church — never apart from it. Today, it seems, any Tom, Dick, and Harry can be a preacher, or an "evangelist," as they like to call themselves.

In the third place, I want to warn against the idea that such men after all do much good, sometimes even more good than the church and its ordained men accomplishes. This is sometimes used as an argument in favor of such movements. I do not accept this argument whatsoever — even apart now from the fact that the "gospel" which these men and these organizations usually bring is by no means the gospel of the Scriptures. My point is that we have no right to expect the blessing of the Lord in the way of lawlessness. We have no right to try to impose our way

of doing things — even if it seems to be a pious way with pious motives — upon the Lord God, and then to expect that He will bless that wrong way. This is the height of presumption against the living God. If it pleases God to work His work through preachers whom He calls and sends only, are we to tell the Lord God that we have a better way of doing things? God forbid!

In the fourth place, I wish to point to a still greater evil, namely, that churches lend their official sanction to such evangelistic movements and support them, even finding much good sometimes in the work of such wild movements as the Jesus Movement. This is a dirty shame, when the church belittles its own position and its own calling and its own Christ-ordained offices. This can only be self-destructive for any church. And that self-destruction, I believe, is the manifestation of the heavy hand of God's wrath against a church which has been unfaithful to its calling to preach the Word.

## About 1 Corinthians 11: 3-16

From a California reader comes this interesting question:

"I don't really remember which one of your ministers answers the Question Box; but the question has come up about women wearing hats in church, or having their heads covered in church, and also 'if a man have long hair it is a shame unto him.' I am referring to I Corinthians 11, about the first fifteen verses. Could you please explain this to me?" Reply

This is an interesting question, and, let me add immediately, that the passage involved is not one of the easiest to understand. I will not try at this time to give a full and detailed explanation of the entire passage. That would require more space than is available to me for Question Box. Besides, it would lead us afield, I fear, from the question of chief concern to my questioner. Rather, I will try to make a few main points concerning the meaning of this passage and to furnish a few guidelines with respect to the concrete question raised. And then, if my questioner is not satisfied or is left with more questions than answers, she is welcome to call again.

First of all, let us get the passage in question before us. I will quote verses 3-16 from the KJV: "But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God. Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head. But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head: for that is even all one as if she were shaven. For if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn: but if it

be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered. For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man. For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels. Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman; but all things of God. Judge in yourselves: is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered? Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering. But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God."

Negatively, I would point out the following:

1) That it cannot be the intention of this passage to lay down rules and regulations for the dress of women in church as such, i.e., when the congregation is gathered for public worship. Why not? Notice that the apostle is writing here about the conduct of women when they pray or prophesy, vss. 4, 5. Hence, while the passage may indeed say something about the conduct of women in public, it does not address itself as such to conduct in public worship. For with respect to the latter, this same apostle insists, I Cor. 14: 34, 35: "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the

law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." I emphasize this because it has not been uncommon, at least in the past, that this passage has been applied to conduct in public worship, as though this were the apostle's concern here. Moreover, there have been those who sometimes have insisted, with an appeal to this passage, that it is absolutely mandatory for a woman to wear a hat or a kerchief of some kind in the worship services of the church, but who would not insist on the same thing in other public gatherings or meetings of saints other than worship services. Now regardless of the "hat question," this cannot possibly be the proper meaning and application of this passage.

2) We must be careful against interpreting this passage in a legalistic manner, as though the apostle were prescribing all kinds of detailed laws and precepts, and that, too, for saints in all ages and in all places. Do not forget that this same apostle inveighs against legalism in his epistles more than once. The Christian is not under the law, but under grace. Nor is there any principle as such in the wearing of a hat or in the failure to wear a hat by either women or men. If there were, then the high priest and his sons, the priests, would not have been commanded to wear any head-dress, as they were in Ex. 28 and 29. Hence, even as it is not sin as such for a man (even in the service of God, as were the priests) to wear a head-covering, so it cannot be sin as such for a woman not to wear a head-covering. Sin is not in mere things, neither is grace. We ought to avoid such legalism like the plague. It is neither spiritual nor edifying. And practical experience always teaches that such legalism among Christians leads to all kinds of inconsistencies and inanities. Just take the present subject as an example. It is easy to raise all kinds of questions. What constitutes a hat? How big may and must it be to qualify as a hat? Will a kerchief do as a substitute? Must the hat also have a veil - as some ladies' hats used to have? Or will a hat without a veil also do? Or I could insist - to be strictly legal - that women today have to wear the sort of face-veil which, according to some, was in vogue in the apostle's day; and that a mere hat of modern fashion will not qualify whatsoever. The same is true with respect to the hair-question. And perhaps some of our older readers may still remember the hot arguments about "bobbed" hair. Well, how long is long? May a woman cut her hair at all? May she, perhaps, trim the ends evenly? And if she may trim an inch off, how about an inch-and-a-half? Moreover, if she has long hair, may she make it appear as though she has short hair by curling it or by rolling it up in a "bun" or by fixing it in an

upsweep? And how about a man? How short is short? Must he have his hair cropped or shaved? If he has a brushcut, is it permissible to have a flat-top? And if his hair is two inches long, may it also be three or three-and-a-quarter inches? You say, perhaps, that I am engaged in a reductio ad absurdum (a reduction to absurdity). No, I am merely pointing out to what absurdities legalism actually, in experience, leads. And eventually those involved become guilty of straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel, just as did the Pharisees. [If, by the way, anyone wonders whether I hold the same opinion with respect to other legalism. as, for instance, with dress codes, hair-codes, etc., the answer is affirmative. I detest them, and consider them demeaning of Christian liberty and totally unedifying with respect to Christian virtues. By the same token. however, I also detest libertinism!

Positively, I would point out the following:

- 1) The apostle is concerned about a principle. That principle is the one of the proper relation of the woman to the man. The man is the head of the woman, even as Christ is the head of the man, and God is the head of Christ. Authority and subjection are, therefore, involved. I know that in our day of women's liberation movements more properly called women's libertine movements this tends to sound strange, even sometimes in Christian circles. But it is a Biblical principle.
- 2) Evidently there were women in the church of Corinth also who wanted to "kick the traces" and to put themselves on the same level as men in the church. Perhaps they found the *occasion* (not the reason) for this in the truth that in Christ there is neither male nor female. And especially in the matter of praying and prophesying they began to conduct themselves as the equals of men, rather than to manifest their subjection in the Lord.
- 3) And the manner by which they did this was to remove the symbol of their womanhood (virtually, we are told, the one item of clothing which distinguished a woman from a man in Grecian circles), their head-dress, or veil. By doing so they made themselves appear as shameless women, even, according to some, like prostitutes and street women. And this was unseemly. They changed their proper liberty in Christ, as women in relation to men in the Lord, into licentiousness. And, I take it, when in verse 16 the apostle speaks of the fact that "we have no such custom, neither the churches of God," he is referring to the custom suggested in vss. 4 and 5.

\* \* \* \* \*

[Editor's note. I have on hand a question concerning the elder son in the parable of the prodigal son. This will have to wait until the next issue.]

## **Feature**

## **The Crisis Mounts**

Dr. John Richard de Witt

In the July-August number of *The Reformed Journal* notice was taken by Dr. James Daane of the two articles I contributed some months ago to this paper under the title "The Crisis in the Southern Presbyterian Church." And while I am appreciative in some respects for the interest he shows in our situation, yet at the same time I cannot forbear to reply. Certain of the conclusions which Dr. Daane thinks himself able to draw from my articles and certain of the charges which he feels inclined to make leave me with no choice but to impose once again upon the patience of the readers of *The Standard Bearer*, whose editor has generously opened its pages to me.

In the first place, then, I am not aware of having said or implied in any way that "a separation within the PCUS (i.e., the Presbyterian Church in the United States, or Southern Presbyterian Church) has long been justifiable," and that, in my view, "the people in the PCUS who are thinking secession have long had serious and valid reasons for separation." I did indeed speak of the "apostasies" which have characterized the church in recent years, and it may be that that is what Dr. Daane intends. I could not and did not say, however, that separation has long been justifiable, inasmuch as I do not know that, am not able to say that such is the case. I do not doubt that the situation is very grave even at the present time; nor do I question that, whether or not church union with the UPUSA (the Northern Presbyterian Church) takes place. continuance under prevailing conditions would confront those committed to the Reformed faith with great problems. But one of the points I sought to make in my first article was just that conservatives remain in the PCUS because, though it has been guilty of many offences, yet its constitutional and confessional position has continued to be basically sound. And that, it seems to me, is a matter of the utmost importance. So long as the foundation of the church is unaltered, and the constitutional position of the church is essentially unimpaired, conservatives believe they are duty-bound to press on with the struggle for the faith within the denominational framework. Moreover, they are able to do so in good conscience.

It is a mystery to me why Dr. Daane would have me say that "a separation within the PCUS has long been justifiable," and then go on to reproach me for having "made no move to separate," on the ground of my

own conviction. "Given his (my - d.W.) conscience on this matter, his failure to separate," says Daane, "raises serious questions. For if a separation is justifiable it is also demanded," etc. I must protest vehemently against this kind of treatment, and declare publicly that it proceeds on an assumption wholly unwarranted by what I said. Bad as the situation now is, it can be tolerated by conservatives who, because of their high doctrine of the church (a doctrine to which I hold with all my heart), "abhor schism, shun separation, groan for the manifestation of the power of God in the preaching of the gospel of Christ," as I said in my first article.

The prevailing situation is about to be profoundly altered, however, and therein lies the difficulty. We are almost certainly going to see in the next two or three years a radical shifting of the constitutional and confessional position of the church: in fact, a subverting of that position. And as Southern Presbyterians we are having to ask ourselves whether, when the PCUS is no longer a Reformed church in respect of its constitution and its confession, we who are committed to the Reformed faith can in conscience continue any longer in its fellowship. That, in brief, is the issue; and it is quite different from what Dr. Daane has made it out to be.

In the PCUS two vastly significant questions are now before us: the one is that which I discussed at length in my previous articles, namely, union with the Northern Presbyterian Church (the UPUSA); the other, to which I alluded only briefly, involves confessional revision. The confessional question has become much more current in the intervening months because we now have a "tentative draft" of the "Proposed New Confession of Faith" in hand. One scarcely knows whether to smile at its puerility, or to be incensed and disgusted at its theological poverty, its insinuations of unbelief, its omissions, and its downright corruptions of the truth. But there is worse to follow. The adoption of this radically new confessional statement is to be accompanied with its inclusion in a "Book of Confessions," after the fashion of the UPUSA, which means in fact the deconfessionalization of the church, its creedal statements only marking out the lines along which the thinking of the church has moved in the past, broadly defining its doctrinal tradition, but without binding authority.

The result will be, if this takes place, that the

Presbyterian Church in the United States must become detached from its presently binding commitment to the Westminster Confession of Faith, a commitment which signalizes and gives force to its profession of being Reformed, and grow into a modern, liberal denomination of the type only all too familiar to us, albeit from a Reformed root. What the adoption of both or either of the two proposals will mean - church union and/or confessional revision - is the subversion and overthrow of the constitutional and confessional foundation of the Southern Church. It will, not only in effect, but openly, publicly, in name and in law, no longer be a Reformed church. Just what it will be is perhaps difficult to define. But the outcome cannot be otherwise than that the PCUS will have rid itself of its historic posture as a church of the Reformation and have abandoned itself to the advanced critical views and theological disarray of the age. That is the position as it really is. And that is the situation we face in the PCUS.

Dr. Daane seeks to declare against us that "when an adequate reason cannot be found to justify a contemplated action, multiple reasons are often substituted. Quantity is substituted for quality in the belief that out of the alchemy of compounded inadequate reasons an adequate justification will emerge." Then he goes on afterward to state that I, and others, have long thought a separation justifiable, and to comment adversely on our failure to take the step of withdrawing ourselves from the denomination. But, as I have indicated, there is ground neither in my articles nor in my mind for a grievous and unfair charge of this sort. No doubt it can sometimes be the case that many inadequate reasons are put forward when a single, adequate reason cannot be found for this or that contemplated action. Daane states unequivocally that this occurred when the Christian Reformed Church came out of the Reformed Church in America in 1857. But this does not serve to overthrow the cumulative effect of deviations from the truth - such as those I cited in my initial article -, as though a whole host of objectionable positions and shameful apostasies were not of greater weight than one or two. Of course these things pile up. Of course there is a cumulative working here. Of course the situation is becoming graver with every passing year, as successive general assemblies meet and, under liberal leadership, abandon increasingly large stretches of territory. It is on the face of it absurd to say that ten arguments have no more force than one; or that no difference exists between the adoption of one erroneous position and ten.

It may be that one "adequate reason" for separation has not yet presented itself — I have in fact said as much; but the addition of disturbing and worrisome and distressing factor after factor through the years certainly adds weight to the conservative side of the

argument, when face to face with what, if carried through (as it almost inevitably will be), is surely a most compelling and convincing reason. I listed a series of instances in the recent history of the PCUS which show the doctrinal and moral direction it has been taking, not to give an "adequate reason" for the justification of withdrawal, but to describe conditions as they exist among us.

But the terminal point of that series is what really concerns me and engages all my attention. Loyal Presbyterians have had, all their struggles and efforts notwithstanding, to stand by helplessly and see the PCUS add nail after nail to its own coffin in the past twenty-five or thirty years. Each "nail" may not have been enough to indicate that the coffin was completed and that the denomination was now prepared to make use of it by confessional and constitutional suicide. But the point which must be made - and the fact which must be emphasized – is that the critical phase of deterioration has been drawing closer, perceptibly closer, for years. And the end of the process, signalized in successive annual reports and Minutes of the General Assembly, is now very definitely in sight. The question is whether Reformed Christians are obliged to participate in the act of denominational self-destruction, or whether they are to press on, faithful to the Lord and to his holy gospel, in a continuing Presbyterian church.

Still further, Dr. Daane charges: "It seems that church union, even between Presbyterian churches that once were united, is a far greater evil than the host of alleged apostasies from the Reformed faith. They (i.e., conservatives in the PCUS - d.W.) will separate for the sake of the Reformed faith if the PCUS and the UPC reunite. Such a stance is more born of a schismatic spirit than it is grounded in Reformed theology." But mark well that the issue is not, as Dr. Daane appears to believe, reunion with the UPUSA as such. This matter, too, is not so simple as it looks on the surface, since the Northern Church has undergone two unions of its own since 1861. The nineteenth century controversy between the Old and New School branches of Presbyterianism still continues to exercise influence; and the present Northern Church is quite different in composition, as well as stance, from what it was when the Southern Church went its own way at the outbreak of the Civil War. But that, as I said, is not the issue. The issue here is rather union with a UPUSA which has forsaken its heritage, cast itself into apostasy, virtually surrendered all binding obligation to adhere to any confession of faith, and even ejected some who sought to be consistent and loyal to the doctrines of the Word of God. The issue is whether the PCUS is to be a Reformed church any longer, a Christian church even. in the full and historic and Reformation sense of the word. As I attempted to make plain in my first article, no one can be opposed to the idea of union in itself;

but church union must be union in the truth, and not in the lie or in apostasy or in unbelief or in surrender. It is not that "church union, even between Presbyterian churches that once were united, is a far greater evil than the host of alleged apostasies." That is simply not true. The dividing line is about to be reached; the end result of the cumulative succession of deviations from the faith is within sight; a choice, difficult but inevitable, must be made: a choice between consenting to confessional and constitutional subversion and a continuing Presbyterian church loyal to Scripture and the Reformed faith.

But now Dr. Daane goes so far as to say: "A separation from the church is never legitimate. No amount of sin, weakness, unfaithfulness of the church warrants separation from it. Separation from the church is always separation from Christ, from the Christ who loved and died for the church and therefore never withdraws from the church." I am not completely certain how Dr. Daane wishes us to understand him here, for obviously enough the word "church" is the vital one; and how we interpret that will determine just how far we can go along with him. Does he mean: "A separation from a denomination is never legitimate?" If so, the statement is preposterous, inasmuch as no denomination is "the church" in any absolute or complete sense. What is the church? That question needs answering before we can assess his claim. And so does another, immediately related to it: When does what we call the church cease to be the church? For surely it is clear that "a" church can cease to be that any longer, when it abandons the faith and becomes lukewarm; indeed, "a" church may even be rejected by God: "Because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth." (Rev. 3:16) In the present discussion we are not dealing - alas! - with one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church whose organic and external unity is visible to all, but with denominations, with the proliferation of various forms of the church. And of these it is not possible to speak as though they were "the church" from which all separation is always unlawful because it is separation from Christ.

I grant, of course, that at present the PCUS is the form of the church with which I have to do, just as the Christian Reformed Church is for Dr. Daane. And I grant also that one cannot otherwise contemplate the confused and multiform character of the church than with pain and sorrow, as something not countenanced by the New Testament, which envisions the church as one, and commands it to be one. But to say this does not resolve anything, nor make it clear to me where my duty and obligation lie. For the question confronting me, and others like me in the PCUS, is whether, when the PCUS is no longer confessionally and constitutionally true to the Scriptures and true to itself, it remains and continues to remain "the church"

to me, and indeed whether in that event I am permitted to go on regarding it even as "a" church at all. I do not deny the presence of "churches," that is to say, congregations, in the UPUSA, nor in the united denomination to be produced in the future, any more than Calvin did in the Church of Rome, to which as a whole he refused to ascribe the name of "church." But we have to do here not with the existence of genuine "churches," congregations of true believers who may be faithful and continue to go their own, scriptural, way, in the face of the general apostasy and deterioration, but with a denomination, "a" church. And it is plain that on this score there can be no doubt about the position I have to take. True enough, "separation from the church is always separation from Christ." I am altogether convinced that outside of and apart from the church there is no ordinary possibility of salvation. But separation from an apostate denomination is not at all the same thing. And if one is to cleave to Christ with all his heart and strength, and to be faithful to the truth as it is in the One who himself is Truth, that sometimes means separation, separation, that is, from what persists in calling itself church but has no right to the title.

To be sure, the confused state of the conservative part of the PCUS does greatly complicate the situation. There are many amongst us who are by no means Reformed; and one wonders just what will happen when a continuing church comes into being, whether it will be possible to build upon the foundation of the New Testament and the heritage of the Reformed faith. But I do not see, all my doubts and my criticisms notwithstanding (and I was at pains not to conceal these in my discussion of the state of affairs in our church), how it is possible for me to do anything other, if I am to be obedient to the Lord, than to refuse to have part in the overthrow of the confession and constitution of the church. I can live with the present situation because of its essential soundness. But that absolutely basic consideration will be removed upon union and/or confessional revision, and then I must decide whether I shall work together with my brethren in the faith, whom I regard as defective in their views at some or at many points, or whether I shall drown out the promptings of conscience and the leading of what I believe to be biblical principles and submit myself meekly, not to the Lordship of Christ, but to the hegemony of the liberal establishment. Surely that decision, however painful and difficult it may be in many respects, is in the nature of the case already determined by the situation. There can be no doubt about the choice one has to make.

I must add a single word before I close. It is significant that Dr. Daane's comments found much favor with the editors of *The Presbyterian Outlook*, the leading independent paper of the liberal part of the church, and considerable extracts were included from

what he had to say in the issue of September 25, 1972, without so much as a reference to the occasion which called them forth or to *The Standard Bearer*. How interesting that such strong denunciation of Southern Presbyterian conservatives should come from the pen

of a Christian Reformed minister, and be employed as an instrument with which to flay those seeking to adhere to the gospel in the Southern Church! How interesting, and how sad!

## All Around Us

## Creation and Evolution in the Public Schools

Prof. H. Hanko

Several months ago *The Standard Bearer* published a review of a series of science manuals to be used in the public school system in California which present creationism as a viable alternative to evolutionism. These manuals were prepared by the Creation Research Society. The purpose of these manuals must be clearly understood. The purpose was not to banish the teaching of evolutionism from the public school system. The purpose was not to insist on the teaching of creationism alone as the truth of God's Word. The purpose was rather to gain permission to present creationism as a scientifically acceptable alternate to evolutionism. Both would be taught in the school, and, presumably, the teacher would be required to demonstrate that creationism was as acceptable an explanation for the origin of all things as evolutionism even from a scientific viewpoint.

In a recent issue of Scientific American there was a report on the progress of this campaign. This report noted that the above proposal had been approved by the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission which is responsible for the evaluation of textbooks and workbooks to be used in the public schools and which is responsible to the State Board of Education. This month, the Commission is to meet with the State Board for purposes of discussing the matter, and it is hoped by many that the State Board will approve of the recommendations of its commission. If this would happen, then creationism would be taught in the public schools of California along with evolutionism.

Quite naturally, opposition has developed. There are those in California not only who strenuously oppose this program, but there is also the threat of a court case. The National Association of Biology is considering filing for an injunction in the event that the State Board approves of this program. The basis for

such an injunction would be the First Amendment of the Constitution which requires the separation of Church and State.

When I wrote the review of the series of books prepared by the Creation Research Society, I mentioned that I was not wholly in agreement with the idea of presenting creationism merely as a viable alternative to evolutionism. After all, the battle between creationism and evolutionism is a battle between God's Word and man's philosophies. It is a battle between faith in the Scriptures and unbelief. It is a battle between light and darkness. It is a spiritual battle.

But what concerns us now is the silly notion advanced by those who oppose this program on the grounds of the First Amendment. If it is true that the teaching of creationism in the public school system is a violation of the principle of the separation of Church and State, this can be only on the grounds that creationism is a "doctrine" while evolutionism is not. This is absurd and folly in the extreme. Creationism is. of course, a doctrine. It is a doctrine which is clearly taught in Scripture and which is the confession of the Church. It is not only a religion, but it is an article of faith in the one and only true religion: "By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God. . . ." (Heb. 11:3). But evolutionism is also a doctrine, a religion if you will. It is a false doctrine, a heresy, an evil religion. But it is that nonetheless. One cannot assume the position then, that to teach creationism is to teach religion and violate the First Amendment; but to teach evolutionism is not to teach religion and is legally within the requirements of the First Amendment. This is the devil's sophistry and is merely a subtle attempt to overthrow the Scriptures and make the heresies of men the "religion" of the public schools. And yet this is precisely what has happened in this country.

# A Blasphemous Chapel Service

From one of our readers I received a copy of a chapel service which was held September 13, 1972 in Illiana Christian High School. As is evident from the program, the service was a responsive reading of the leader and the students attending the chapel. We quote the program in full.

Hymn 360 "Christian, Dost Thou See Them"

People: Our Father, who art in heaven. . . .

Leader: Father.

could we have your undivided attention. There are some matters we must discuss with you today.

People: Hallowed be thy name. . . .

Leader: It's like this.

Your name is mud in some circles.

People laugh when your name is

mentioned.

For some your name is nothing but a cussword.

Dostono como lo

Restore some honor to your name, Lord. And help us to do the same.

People: Thy kingdom come. . . .

Leader: We have some real difficulties here, Lord.

It's so hard to see your hand at work in the world around us.

There are so many wars and evils at large. We want you to take over right now and to straighten out this mess on earth.

Make this the final takeover.

And use us to do it.

People: Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven....

Leader: We'd like to point out, Father, that no one seems to know the plans for heaven and very few seem to care.

Anyway, your sons are very confused about what your will is supposed to be on earth

What kind of change in politics and people will make this world free and good?

Teach us your plan, put it into operation, and speed up your timetable.

People: Give us this day our daily bread. . . .

Leader: Daily bread is one of our foremost needs.

Millions upon millions are starving. The world's population is exploding.

How can we use our resources to develop each man's pride in his own work?

As we tackle this task give us some of the rich bread from that banquet table prepared for men at the end of this age.

People: Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us....

Leader: We are rather sensitive about this, Father. We're talking about a chain reaction of forgiving.

That's not easy. We are proud.

We sometimes feel guilty or miserable

despite your love and acceptance.

Open our hearts to love and give us the power to love others now as we will in that

People: Lead us not into temptation but deliver us

from evil. . . .

Leader: Father, don't let us have to face the ultimate test of obedience.

Christ did that for us.

Father, don't let us have to face the full

force of evil.

Christ did that for us.

Father, don't let us have to face death

without you beside us. Christ did that for us.

People: For thine is the kingdom, and the power,

and the glory, forever and ever.

Leader: You are God, after all.

You have the power, You have the plan

You have the honor.

Take over now and rule forever.

And give us the joy of seeing it happen.

Amen.

Hymn 397 "More Love to Thee, O Christ" "Prayer of Saint Francis"

"Lord, make me an instrument of your peace!

Where there is hatred - let me sow love.

Where there is injury — pardon. Where there is doubt — faith. Where there is despair — hope. Where there is darkness — light.

Where there is sadness – joy.

O divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek

To be consoled – as to console,

To be understood - as to understand.

To be loved - as to love.

For it is in giving – that we receive.

It is in pardoning — that we are pardoned. It is in dying — that we are born to eternal life."

The Nicene Creed sung by\_\_\_\_\_

One has come to expect almost anything nowadays in innovations. Yet this particular chapel service leaves one gasping a bit. There are several comments which ought to be made.

In the first place, one is struck by the blasphemy.

More and more in our day wicked men drag the Most High down to their own human level. It seems a thing almost incredible that the Holy One of Israel does not break forth in fury at such desecration of His adorable name. Is there no fear left any more when men stand in the presence of Him before Whom the angels hide their faces? The whole service is characterized by this familiarity, this contempt of God, this blasphemy which makes one shudder. But particularly revolting is the leader's response to the address. If it is true, as the leader says in response to the first petition, that God's name is mud in some circles, this service has gone a long way to make it such.

In the second place, apparently what the leader says is supposed to be some sort of commentary on the various petitions of the Lord's Prayer. If one would but compare this "commentary" with that given by our Heidelberg Catechism, one could only shake his head in amazement that the beautiful descriptions of the Catechism can be so ruthlessly destroyed by those who make the Catechism a creedal basis.

In the third place, one can only be shocked by the heresy of the "commentary." What about the

statement: "We want you to take over right now and to straighten out this mess on earth"? Is not Jehovah sovereign in all that happens in the world? Why must He take over now if He rules according to His counsel always? Can a school which claims to stand in the Reformed tradition so openly violate its heritage and destroy the truth of God's sovereignty? and no one does anything? And what about: "Make this the final takeover"? Is not this, as well as the whole service, filled with the most blatant post-millennialism? And these are but a few examples.

In the fourth place, there are what can best be called inane statements which no one can possibly interpret in any sensible way. "Anyway, your sons are very confused about what your will is supposed to be on earth." "Teach us your plan, put it into operation, and speed up your timetable." "How can we use our resources to develop each man's pride in his own work?"

Finally, all this is done in a school where young people are gathered to study in preparation for their calling as covenant people in God's heritage. What an irresponsible travesty of covenant instruction.

## The Day of Shadows

# The Paving of Sin's Highway

Rev. John A. Heys

Sin is a one-way street. All its traffic goes in one direction. And that direction is to hell! Always it leads away from God and unto the place where man everlastingly will be aware of God's holy wrath against sin. Only by crossing over to the way of righteousness can one go in the direction of covenant fellowship with God and the joys of His kingdom.

After he had murdered his brother Abel, Cain went out from the presence of God; and the highway of sin was established by man from the place just outside the gate into paradise to the land of Nod, where Cain built himself a city. His descendants widened that way, beat a more definite path of sin. And in due time they paved it for a more convenient walk of sin, and for what they hoped would be a fleshly, pleasure-insuring life

One thing that is quite striking in Scripture's account of the human race, from the time of the fall of man till the days of the flood, is the rapid development of sin. In a relatively few years the sin of eating a piece of forbidden fruit, and the rebellion therein, produced an amazing amount of violence not only, but also a shockingly bold practice of sin!

Cain left the church and took with him all his children; and generations grew up that knew not God, made no attempt to worship Him, and did what they themselves judged to be good and evil. The sad thing is that Satan was lying, and what they judged to be good was evil, and what they judged to be evil was in every instance good.

Scripture passes over this dastardly deed of Cain (consisting in killing his brother, and in his bold, defiant answer to God when he was told of his temporal punishment) to Lamech, a descendant of Cain who grew up outside the sphere of the church of that day. In the lust of the flesh he takes two wives. And in hatred he also commits murder. The names of his wives are significant. Adah means pleasure; and Zillah means protection, coming from a word which means shade, and protection in that sense. Since these names were given in the land away from that gate to paradise and by those who had separated themselves from God and His worship, the pleasure implied in that name is not the delight in serving God, but refers to the lust of the flesh. And the protection is not under the shadow of the Almighty, but some comfort that

man sees and seeks apart from God and His covenant promise.

Lamech is wholly moved by the flesh. He took two wives — and man always does — only for the sake of the flesh. One is enough to raise up covenant seed — which Lamech in no way has in mind — and God gave Adam but one. One is enough for fellowship and companionship, and two will engender jealousy and drive apart. One is an help meet for man, and two at a time do not help the man or one another. But it was lust and nothing less than lust that moved Lamech to want more flesh.

What did he care about God's ordinances? He did not even care about man's wellbeing. He slew a man because he got in his way. And he boasts of it to his wives. Without remorse, but in devilish glee he calls his wives to come and listen to him while he boasts of his murder. And this is only a few generations removed from man's expulsion from paradise and his first sin! He, too, in an almost satanic derision laughs about the vengeance of God. "If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventy and sevenfold." The highway of sin is wide and gives much room for movement and the carnal pleasure of sin! Talk about lawlessness and disorder!

What a vicious society has sprung up here to the east of the garden in the land of Nod! Man lives for his flesh. For all the generations that will follow, Lamech sets the example and teaches that Adam's and Eve's shame of nakedness was a weakness, and that man should feed his sexual lusts and get him the pleasure he craves unbridled by divine ordinances. Truly the good he calls evil, and the evil he now knows as good. And if a man gets in your way, your way is what counts. Murder him. Let violence reign! You are not your brother's keeper. Every man for himself, and no man with thought of God! And in that light we must also see the astounding feats of his three sons. It is significant that here in the world, among the seed of the serpent, in the midst of those who have gone away from the presence of the Lord there at the entrance to paradise, where the cherubim with the flaming sword still stood, we find the men who revolutionized the life of the human race, AND PAVED THE HIGHWAY OF SIN!

They were brothers, but they did not have the same mother. Jabal and Jubal were sons of Adah, the one affording Lamech with carnal sexual pleasure. Tubal-cain was the son of Zillah, the shade and protection Lamech sought for his flesh, the solace, the comfort. She was, perhaps, a woman with a tender, sympathetic nature to whom Lamech could go when the problems of that day weighed heavily upon him. For remember that though life was far more simple in those days, they had their frustrations, their aches and pains, their problems and hardships. The curse was there. It was extremely difficult to get enough food

from the ground. Through the flood - which was a work of God's grace for the saving of His Church – God brought up, by the opening of the fountains of the deep, some rich ocean-bottom soil that made the growing of food in the field far less difficult, without removing the curse upon the world, and without it being some "common grace" for the whole human race. All things work together for good to them that love God. All is done in God's providence for the advantage of the Church. The chaff must have rain and sunshine that the wheat may be garnered in after the chaff had been cast into the fire. But we do well to remember that the curse made life in Lamech's day extremely difficult. Life was hard. And although apparently man was much stronger physically, and the curse did not in that period manifest itself in the sicknesses and diseases, the cancer and respiratory diseases of our day, the arthritic pains and heart attacks, the curse was there, and God made it known in that unproductive soil.

On that background we must view the achievements of Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal-cain. They were talented men and each had his own individual nature. But they had one common thought and goal. And that goal was to get rid of the curse without the cross. No, they did not say it that way. They did not say it at all. They just worked at it and went their separate ways in folly to seek to achieve it. With them it was simply a matter of getting from under the curse by their own works so that they could enjoy a life of doing their own thing.

To understand Jabal's ambitious undertaking we must bear in mind that at this point in history man did not eat the flesh of animals for food. This we read of later, after the flood, in Genesis 9:3, "Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things." And there is no record that these unbelievers living in Cain's city defied this ordinance of God. Bear also in mind, then, that they had moved away from the presence of God, and that Cain was wroth that God would not accept his offering of the fruits of his toil in the sin-cursed ground. This simply means that there was no more sacrificing at all in that community living east of the entrance to paradise. They did not need to gather cattle and raise them for sacrifices to God, and Jabal did not have to be one that had cattle for that reason. He was on that one-way street of sin and was going away from God in this act of having cattle and dwelling in tents. He was in no way trying to be a steward of God's goods. The thought of being God's royal priesthood was far from his mind.

No, Jabal represents the natural man as he denies that this is God's creation and strikes out to get his hands on as much of it as he can, to enjoy this world with its possessions while he can, to be like God in that he is the owner and controller of this earth.

Jubal in the midst of the tears and woes of this life

introduces music to try to turn man's thoughts away from the curse, to quicken his step with a lively dance, to make laughter and to manufacture some joy in the valley where the shadow of death is cast. He is the father of such who strive to make it possible for man to live it up and forget what man cannot live down, namely that curse that is in all things.

Tubal-cain either found how to start a fire — Adam had no matches in the pockets of his coat of skin — or certainly learned its power to melt iron and other metals and thereby learned to mold and shape them to fashion "labour-saving" devices and show God that man will not eat in the sweat of his brow.

And all the industry, the arts, and the world of finances and business have their beginning in the works of these three sons of Lamech. All the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye (and ear) and the pride of life of which John speaks and declares to be in the world which we are not to love, received one tremendous impetus, one powerful thrust forward by the works of these of the viper's brood, the seed of the serpent who had moved away from the Church as it was represented in Adam, and Seth, and their children who lived by the entrance to paradise.

The seed of the woman looked toward that paradise, and toward the God Who formerly met man at the tree of life, for relief from the curse. They continued to pray to God through a sacrifice of a lamb with shed blood, in the belief that God would keep His promise and give them a Seed that would bring victory to His Church. The seed of the serpent moved away from all this, and on the one-way street of sin went constantly in that one direction, and pressed everything they saw and every natural talent they had in the way of trying to flee from the curse by fleeing from the cross. The believers in the Old Testament day went to that cross in their sacrificial lambs for salvation and escape from

the curse. The unbelievers went away from that cross, despised it, strove by their own ingenuity to make a heaven on earth by their prowess, and by their physical and mental achievements. Both want escape from the curse. The one rushes along the paved one-way street whereon their backs are turned to the living God to obtain it. The other by faith, and facing God, waits for Him to realize His promise in the cross of Christ, even though at that time they were not able to declare it in such terminology.

Does that mean that we may not have cattle and possessions, may not use organs and stringed instruments, must shun and flee from all labour saving devices and inventions of the world? Of course not! Noah used what Tubal-cain made to build the ark. The psalmist over and over tells us to praise God with the organ and harp. God gave Solomon not only much cattle, but peacocks and apes as symbols of material wealth. The point is that we must use them in our worship of God and that when they stand in the way of our act of faith of expecting all our deliverance from the curse to be the cross of Christ, we get rid of them! For it is better to lose them and escape the curse, than to hold on to them for a few brief years and end with Jabal, Jubal, Tubal-cain and Lamech in the hottest place of the curse.

Receive this earth's goods with thanksgiving. But never deceive yourself into thinking that these remove the curse, even though they mean a few less aching muscles. The psalmist says it so beautifully in Psalm 103:3, "Who forgiveth thine iniquities, who healeth thy diseases." THAT is the way it comes to pass. The cross removes our guilt; and on that basis we enter presently in the realm where all disease is gone, all the evidence of the curse is gone, all trace and scars of it are erased, and where we are in The Paradise by God's work in Christ and His cross.

## The Voice of our Fathers

# Man Created, Not Evolved

Rev. J. Kortering

"We believe that God created man out of the dust of the earth, and made and formed him after his own image and likeness, good, righteous, and holy, capable in all things to will, agreeably to the will of God. But being in honor, he understood it not, neither knew his excellency, but willfully subjected himself to sin, and consequently to death, and the curse, giving ear to the words of the devil. For the commandment of life, which he had received, he transgressed; and by sin separated himself from God, who was his true life, having corrupted his whole nature; whereby he made himself liable to corporal and spiritual death. And being thus become wicked, perverse, and corrupt in all his ways, he hath lost all his excellent gifts, which he had received from God and only retained a few remains thereof,

which, however are sufficient to leave man without excuse; for all the light which is in us is changed into darkness, as the Scriptures teach us, saying: The light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehendeth it not: where St. John calleth men darkness. Therefore we reject all that is taught repugnant to this, concerning the free will of man, since man is but a slave to sin; and has nothing of himself, unless it is given from heaven. For who may presume to boast, that he of himself can do any good, since Christ saith, No man can come to me, except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him? Who will glory in his own will, who understands, that to be carnally minded is enmity against God? Who can speak of his knowledge, since the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God? In short, who dare suggest any thought, since he knows that we are not sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves, but that our sufficiency is of God? And therefore what the apostle saith ought justly to be held sure and firm, that God worketh in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure. For there is no will nor understanding, conformable to the divine will and understanding, but what Christ hath wrought in man; which he teaches us, when he saith, Without me ye can do nothing."

This 14th article of our Confession deals with the origin of man, his fall into sin, and the resultant incapacity to perform what is truly good.

In distinction from the 12th article which explains the origin of all things through the creative Word of God, this article deals exclusively with the creation of man. There is, however, a close relationship. Only after having expressed our faith in the truth of the creation of the heavens and the earth are we ready to confess our faith in the creation of Adam and Eve. We now make the transition from the general to the particular. The creation of man is a special instance of the total creative work of God.

It is refreshing to read this bold and uncompromising statement of faith concerning the origin of man, "We believe that God created man out of the dust of the earth, and made and formed him after his own image and likeness, good, righteous, and holy, capable in all things to will, agreeably to the will of God."

## THE NAKED APE

Our emotions may swing from holy indignation to uproarious amusement as we deal with man's attempt to explain his origin. One can peruse a textbook on biology or delve into a learned exposition of Darwin's Origin of Species to taste a little of this bitter-sweet. Encyclopedias unveil before the reader's eye colorful charts detailing man's animal past. If we will do justice to this backward glance, we have to consult two such charts, the first — the classification of animals, the second — prehistoric man.

It is an insult to our God, yet it remains true that man thinks that he belongs on the chart which classifies animals. On the very top we find the protozoa (one celled animals) followed by parazoa all the way down to the chordata (animals with a notachord). Some chordata are vertebrates, having back bones. Of these vertebrates, some are mammals (give milk to their young). Of the mammals, some are primates (apes, chimpanzees, and man). Homo sapiens is listed among the primates, yes he is called the most

advanced, but he is still classified - animal.

Evolutionists believe that man came from lower forms of animal life. To demonstrate this, they compose another chart, one that depicts man as arising from the ape. You have seen those horrible pictures of creatures half-man and half-ape, supposedly our forebears. They give them nice long names which seem scientifically impressive: Australopithecus Man, who supposedly roamed about a million years before Christ. Yes, there is the Heidelberg Man, 800,000 B.C.; the Neanderthal Man, 30,000 B.C.; CroMagnon Man, 25,000 B.C. At long last we find just plain man!

A representative of this kind of thinking is Desmond Morris, who wrote the popular book, *The Naked Ape*. He writes on page 17, ff.

The primate group, to which our naked ape belongs, arose originally from primitive insectivore stock. Those early mammals were small, insignificant creatures, scuttling nervously around in the safety of the forests, while the reptile overlords were dominating the animal scene. Between eighty and fifty million years ago, following the collapse of the great age of reptiles, these little insect-eaters began to venture out into new territories. There they spread and grew into many strange shapes. Some became plant-eaters and burrowed under the ground for safety, or grew long, stilt like legs with which to flee from their enemies. Others became long-clawed, sharp toothed killers. Although the major reptiles had abdicated and left the scene, the open country was once again a battlefield. . . .

Somewhere between twenty-five and thirty-five million years ago, these pre-monkeys had already started to evolve into monkeys proper.... As time passed, some of these monkey-like creatures became bigger and heavier... their tails became obsolete.

This brings us to the last million or so years of the naked ape's ancestral history, and to a series of shattering and increasingly dramatic developments ... So the hunting ape became a territorial ape. His whole sexual, parental, and social pattern began to be affected. His old wandering, fruit-plucking way of life was fading rapidly. He had now really left his forest

of Eden. He was an ape with responsibilities. . . .

Only by taking a hard look at the way in which we have originated and then by studying the biological aspects of the way we behave as a species today, can we really acquire a balanced, objective understanding of our extraordinary existence.

By conducting such a search, Zoologist Morris believes that he has the key to understanding man as a social creature with all his wonderfully strange behavior. If we only study our monkey ancestry, we can find the explanation as to our present actions as social creatures.

Such a book demonstrates that the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God. If we truly believe Article 14 of the Belgic Confession, we will dismiss all these attempts to understand our present in the light of past evolution as insulting. One who believes in the creation of man has nothing in common with such unbelief. The line of the antithesis is sharply drawn.

#### PROGRESSIVE CREATIONISM

The trend within the Christian church today is to find a balance between evolution and creation. Impressed by the seeming proof of man's evolution and convinced that to remain "scholarly" one has to agree to some extent with the conclusions of modern science, the temptation is to synthesize these two positions into one. Such an attempt is put forth by Bernard Ramm, who likes to be called a progressive creationist. His position is set forth in his book, *The Christian View of Scripture and Science*. In the section of the book which deals with biology, he writes concerning evolution:

However, evolution is not always set in a materialistic or atheistic or naturalistic or positivistic setting. That evolution has aided antichristian systems of thought no informed person can doubt; but that it has also been turned to other purposes, no informed person can doubt either. There are several forms of a spiritualistic interpretation of evolution. The mistake of Straton (J. R. Straton in his book Evolution, j.k.) is that he bases his entire attack on the antichristian and anti-spiritual interpretation of evolution, or else tries to force all spiritual interpretations into the anti-spiritual mold. This greatly detracts from the cogency of his position. Even more distracting is his high regard for Price's geology and the adoption of the universal flood as the cause of all geological phenomena. (pages 262, 263)

His point is that if we are going to be honest in dealing with a criticism of evolution, we have to recognize that some good has come from evolution and it is not all *bad*. Little wonder then, that he quotes favorably from the *Notes on Genesis* by Albertus Pieters, when Pieters says:

If a Christian believer is inclined to yield as far as possible to the theory of organic evolution, he can hold that man's body was prepared by God through such a natural process, and that, when this process had reached a certain state, God took one of the

man-like brutes so produced, and made him the first human being, by endowing him with a human soul and a morally responsible nature.... In such a conception there is nothing contrary to the Bible. (page 288)

This should enlighten us to understand that progressive creationists certainly do not wholeheartedly condemn evolution, they qualify it repeatedly. They do not say that evolution and creation are incompatible and cannot be reconciled. Ramm makes this plain in his book, pages 290, ff.

What is the real issue in evolution? It is this, is it in its essence antichristian? But this question is based upon a prior one of greater importance: when is any scientific theory antichristian? We cannot answer the former till we have worked out the details of the second. We must not so concentrate on evolution as to miss the essential structure of the relationship between any theory of science and Christianity. Evolution is contrary to Christianity only when it can be shown to be antichristian in essence, and that can only be shown when we can set forth the pattern by which any theory conflicts with Christianity. In order to do this intelligently we must pay some attention to the historical features of this problem.

To do this, Ramm sets forth the following observations: (1) Many theories of science, once declared antichristian are now held by millions of Christians with no evil effects on Christianity. (2) Further, many scientific theories of every kind are held today by evangelicals and that without controversy. (3) The date of history drives us to the conclusion that a theory is antichristian when it denies something in Christian metaphysics, i.e., when it attacks the very roots of the Christian faith. (4) To which class does theistic evolution belong? Is it a theory that is violently antichristian because it is contrary to the metaphysics of Christianity? Or have we just made a monster out of a balloon? Should we deflate the monster and go our way?

To this he adds:

We have already noted that orthodox thinkers have affirmed that evolution, properly defined, can be assimilated into Christianity. This is a strong evidence that evolution is not metaphysically incompatible with Christianity.

The writer is not a theistic evolutionist. He is a progressive creationist for he feels that in progressive creationism there is the best accounting for all the facts — biological, geological, and Biblical. He has friends who are fiat creationists, and theistic evolutionists. Their respect for the Bible and loyalty to Christ he admires. But, progressive creation is the theory of the relationship of God's works and God's Holy Word which makes the most sense to the author — and upon what other basis can he make up his mind?

This has a direct bearing upon his view of Adam and whether there was any form of man before Adam existed. We shall look into this, D.V., next time.

## Taking Heed To The Doctrine

# A Defense of Calvinism As The Gospel

Rev. David Engelsma (continued)

Another of the five points of Calvinism is the truth of limited atonement. There is deliverance for fallen men only in Jesus Christ, God's eternal Son in our flesh. This deliverance occurred in the death of Christ on the cross. His death was atonement for sins, inasmuch as He satisfied the righteousness of God, suffering the penalty of God's wrath in our stead who deserved that wrath because of our sins. Jesus' death was efficacious; it saved! It saved everyone for whom He died. It removed, in full, the punishment of everyone in whose stead Jesus died. He atoned for some, particular men, not all. His atonement was limited as regards the number of men for whom He died and whom He redeemed. They are "His people" (Matthew 1:21), His "sheep" (John 10:15: "I lay down my life for the sheep"), and "as many as (the Father) hast given (Jesus)" (John 17:2). It is not Calvinism, that some, even one, who seek salvation will be denied, but that the death of Jesus saved, was efficacious, was not in vain.

Irresistible grace, or efficacious grace, is a third of the five points of Calvinism. This doctrine refers to the actual saving of fallen men by the Holy Spirit, to the application to them of the redemption which Christ accomplished on the cross. This work of salvation is entirely God's work; it takes place by grace alone. Negatively, this means two things. First, the salvation of a man is not something that any man deserves or makes himself worthy of in any way. Secondly, salvation is not a work that man accomplishes, in whole or in part. Man does not co-operate with God in bringing about his salvation. Positively, that salvation takes place by grace alone means that salvation is freely given to men by God, merely out of His love and goodness. Also, it means that this salvation is accomplished by God's power, the Holy Spirit. He regenerates; He calls; He gives faith; He sanctifies; He glorifies. This work of saving and the power of grace by which the Holy Spirit performs this work are efficacious. This work of grace does not make a man's salvation possible, but it saves. It is not on the order of an attempt by God that depends, ultimately, on the man whom God tries to save and that may, therefore, be frustrated, but it is on the order of a work of creation (cf. Ephesians 2:10) that sovereignly and unfailingly makes the man whom God is pleased to save a new creature in Jesus Christ. It is not Calvinism, that God forces men, kicking and screaming, into heaven, but that God makes a man willing, who before was unwilling, and that God keeps him willing. In the Canons of Dordt, the Reformed believer describes the saving work of irresistible grace this way:

"But when God accomplishes His good pleasure in the elect, or works in them true conversion, He not only causes the gospel to be externally preached to them, and powerfully illuminates their minds by His Holy Spirit, that they may rightly understand and discern the things of the Spirit of God; but by the efficacy of the same regenerating Spirit, pervades the inmost recesses of the man; He opens the closed, and softens the hardened heart, and circumcises that which was uncircumcised, infuses new qualities into the will, which though heretofore dead, He quickens; from being evil, disobedient and refractory, He renders it good, obedient, and pliable; actuates and strengthens it, that like a good tree, it may bring forth the fruits of good actions." (III, IV, Art. 11)

The doctrine of the perseverance of saints, or "eternal security," as some call it, follows from the truth of irresistible grace. Not one person to whom God gives the grace of the Holy Spirit will perish, because that grace and that Spirit preserve him unto the perfect salvation of the Day of Christ. It is not Calvinism that one may do as he pleases and still be saved, or that a saint can never fall into sin. As the lives of the saints recorded in Scripture show, saints do sometimes fall into sin, even deeply, but the Holy Spirit brings them to repentance. Over against the charge that the doctrine of perseverance implies that one may do as he pleases and still be saved, the truth is that the Holy Spirit preserves us by sanctifying us, by strengthening our faith, and by giving us the gift of endurance to the very end.

All of the salvation described above has its source in God's eternal election. The truth of election is another of the characteristic Calvinistic doctrines. God has from eternity elected, or chosen, in Christ, some of the fallen human race unto salvation. This choice was unconditional, gracious, and free, not due to anything in those who were chosen. Reprobation is implied. God did not choose all men, but He rejected some men. It makes no essential difference whether one views reprobation as God's passing by some men with His decree of election in eternity (which is, in fact, a Divine decision about their eternal destiny!) or

whether one views it as a positive decree that some men perish in their sin, their unbelief and disobedience. Election and reprobation make up predestination, the doctrine that God has determined the destiny of all men from eternity. This truth is regarded, not inaccurately, as the hallmark of Calvinism. But the main element, according to Scripture, is election, God's gracious choice of some men, guilty and depraved, worthy only of damnation, unto salvation. Election is the foundation of all salvation! As such, it is the ultimate proof and guarantee that salvation is gracious, that salvation does not depend upon man but upon God, that salvation is not man's idea but God's, that salvation is not man's work but God's, that salvation is not due to man's decision but to God's eternal will. This is how Calvin himself viewed predestination - as the final, conclusive, incontrovertible testimony to and guarantee of gracious salvation. Therefore, in his definitive edition of the Institutes (1559), Calvin treated predestination at the end of Book III, after his treatment of redemption in Christ and his treatment of the application of redemption by the Holy Spirit. Calvin wrote: "We shall never feel persuaded as we ought that our salvation flows from the free mercy of God as its fountain, until we are made acquainted with His eternal election, the grace of God being illustrated by the contrast - viz. that He does not adopt promiscuously to the hope of salvation, but gives to some what He denies to others" (*Institutes*, III, XXI, 1).

This is Calvinism!

This is the gospel!

The gospel proclaims man's misery as total depravity, including the bondage of his will. Ephesians 2:1 describes the spiritual condition of man apart from the quickening of the Spirit of Christ thus: "dead in trespasses and sins." Man is spiritually dead, that is, without any good, without any ability to do good, and without any capacity to effect a change in this condition. Romans 8:7, 8 teaches the same: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." The carnal mind is simply human nature as it is by virtue of natural birth. Its condition is such that it is incapable of being in subjection to God's law. Those that are in the flesh are those that are not born again by the Spirit of Christ, those that are outside of Christ. Their spiritual condition is such that they are incapable of pleasing God. All that they are able to do is sin. Philippians 2:13 teaches that the only man who wills or chooses the good is the saint in Jesus Christ and that he wills the good only because God works this in him: "For it is God which worketh in you both to will and

to do of his good pleasure."

The gospel proclaims the death of Christ as a death that effectively redeems some men, rather than as a death that merely makes salvation possible for all men. Scripture teaches limited atonement. Christ Himself taught this in John 10:15: "... and I lay down my life for the sheep." A little further in this same chapter, the Lord specifically states that some men are not included in "the sheep." In verse 26, He says: "But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you." He died for some men, "the sheep," in distinction from other men, who are not of His sheep. Jesus spoke of His death in Matthew 20:28: "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." It is not so much the point here that He called those for whom He died "many," not "all," as it is that He described His death as a giving of a ransom in the stead of others. By dying, He paid the ransom-price to God on behalf of all for whom He died, so that every one for whom He died is freed from sin, death, and hell. Not one for whom Jesus died will perish. He may not, for Jesus has paid the ransom for him. The whole of Isaiah 53 in the Old Testament teaches the same truth. Christ's suffering was His bearing the iniquities of other men; He suffered effectively, so that He actually took away their sins; He did this, not for everybody, but for some men, those whom Isaiah calls "us," that is, God's chosen people.

The gospel proclaims an irresistible grace, a sovereign work of salvation by the Holy Spirit. This is the message of Ephesians 2:4, 5: "But God, Who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved)." In verse 10 of the same chapter, Paul likens the work by which we were saved to the work of creation, thus making very clear that this work is exclusively the work of God the Creator and not at all the work of the creature that is created: "For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works. . . . " Jesus explained how salvation takes place in John 6:44: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day." God draws a man by His Almighty power, the Holy Spirit in his heart, and, therefore, that man comes to Jesus, in true faith. The act of saving a man is an act of raising the dead, according to Scripture, comparable to Jesus' acts of raising the physically dead. This is accomplished in every case, and can only be accomplished, by the sovereign power of the efficacious grace of God.

(to be continued)

## **Book Reviews**

# They Chose To Live

THEY CHOSE TO LIVE: The Racial Agony of an American Church, by J. Herbert Gilmore, Jr.; Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972; 206 pp., \$2.95 (paper). [Reviewed by Prof. H. Hanko]

Perhaps our readers will recall that about two years ago the news media in this country gave extensive coverage to an event in the First Baptist Church of Birmingham, Alabama. At that time the church refused to receive two blacks — a black woman and her daughter. This resulted in the resignation of the pastor and the formation of a new congregation.

This book, written by the pastor involved, details the events which preceded the split in the congregation which came at the time of the pastor's resignation, led up to the split and culminated in the split. It contains the whole history of the controversy, a detailed description of the many meetings and the parliamentary maneuverings of both groups along with appendices which give verbatim some of the important speeches which were made by speakers on both sides of the issue.

The book, quite obviously, is intended to support Gilmore's position in the controversy; but more importantly, it is intended to serve as a vivid illustration of what, in the author's opinion, is the Church's calling with respect to the race issue. Quite

obviously the race issue lay at the heart of the controversy. This was the pastor's contention, and this cannot be denied. However, many of his opponents insisted that the issue was also doctrinal unsoundness on the part of the pastor. While Gilmore denies this vehemently, the documents prove quite clearly that Gilmore was a theological "liberal" and denied key doctrines of Scripture, particularly the truth concerning the inspiration and authority of God's Word.

It is for this reason also that the plea of the book that the Church become more deeply involved in the racial issues of the day is not sound. It is made from a liberal basis which teaches that God is the Father of all men and loves all, that Christ redeemed all and wills to save all.

I am not a segregationist and have little sympathy for some of the statements made by those who opposed Gilmore. But the solution to the race problem is not to be found in this book — though admittedly, this is the position taken by almost the entire church world.

The book makes for interesting reading, however, and gives insight into the bitter struggle which is going on over the race question in the American church world.

# **Labor Problems In Christian Perspective**

LABOR PROBLEMS IN CHRISTIAN PERSPECTIVE, edited by John H. Redenkop; Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, 1972; \$6.95. [reviewed by Prof. H. Hanko]

There are twenty-six different essays in this book written by almost as many different men and addressed to the problem of the Christian's relation to labor unions.

It is but inevitable that, with such a large number of authors, there is wide variety both as to the quality of the essays and the particular viewpoint which the authors take as to the union problems which are discussed. Nevertheless, almost all the authors are, at least, united on this one point: secular unionism is good. The possible exceptions may be the essays by Gerald Vandezande, Executive secretary of the CLAC;

Hendrik Hart from the AACS; Joel Nederhoed and Harry Antonides. These men favor strongly Christian Labor Organizations.

There is in the book a great deal of criticism of existing labor unions, though always within the context of their basic propriety. There are some essays which have almost nothing to do with Christian perspectives. If one is looking for a book which will give a basic and principal critique of secular labor unions, he will not find it here. The value of the book is in the fact that it presents a rather thorough description of the present status of the labor movement. One who wishes to acquaint himself with this situation can learn a great deal from the book. For basic Christian perspectives one will have to go elsewhere.

#### RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Martha Ladies Aid Society of the Hull Protestant Reformed Church expresses its sincere sympathy to one of our members, Mrs. Floyd Jansma, and to her husband and children in the loss of their infant granddaughter

## JULIA ANN.

May the bereaved be comforted in The Word of God found in Job 1:21, "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord."

Rev. Jason Kortering, Pres. Mrs. H.J.Blankespoor, Sec'y.

## RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Mr. and Mrs. Society of Hull Protestant Reformed Church expresses its sympathy to their fellow members, Mr. and Mrs. Tunis L. Jansma in the death of their infant daughter,

#### JULIE ANN

May our Covenant God comfort the bereaved in their sorrow by the words of Psalm 29:11, "The Lord will give strength unto His people; the Lord will bless His people with peace."

Rev. J. Kortering, Pres. Mrs. G. L. De Jong, Sec'y.

## IN MEMORIAM

On September 16, 1972 our covenant God reached out His Almighty Hand to take unto Himself our beloved son and brother,

#### ROBERT ALAN MARING

at the age of 23 years.

Through God's inscrutable wisdom he suffered many infirmities as long as he was entrusted to us, whereby we were taught to look in eager expectation to the day when the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped, when the lame man shall leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing. Isaiah 35:5,6.

Mr. and Mrs. Bert Maring and Ruth Ann.

## RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Ladies Society of Southwest Protestant Reformed Church expresses its sincere sympathy to one of its members, Mrs. Albert Talsma, in the passing of her husband

#### MR. ALBERT TALSMA.

May our Covenant God comfort her with His Word. "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them." (Rev.14:13).

Rev. Herman Veldman, Pres. Mrs. John Buiter, Sec'y

#### IN MEMORIAM

On Sunday morning, October 1, our Heavenly Father called to Himself our beloved Husband, Father and Grandfather.

#### ALBERT TALSMA

at the age of 80 years.

"The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him, and he will show them his covenant." Psalm 25:14

Mrs. Albert Talsma

Mr. & Mrs. Nick Talsma

Mr. & Mrs. Earl DeGood

Mr. & Mrs. Gerrit Mulder

Mrs. Josephine Senko

Mr. & Mrs. C. P. Arnold

Mr. & Mrs. Peter Talsma

Mr. & Mrs. Albert Talsma

Mr. & Mrs. Tony Talsma

Mrs. Senetta Bergman

Mr. & Mrs. Gerald Talsma

35 grandchildren, 16 great-grandchildren

#### RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Mr. and Mrs. Society of The Southeast Protestant Reformed Church expresses its sincere sympathy to our members, Mr. and Mrs. Gary Moelker, in the loss of their father

## MR. JOHN G.MOELKER.

"For this God is our God forever and ever: He will be our Guide even unto death." (Psalm 48:14)

Rev. M. Schipper, Pres.

Mrs. Ted Pipe, Sec'y.

#### RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The Ladies Society of the Hudsonville Protestant Reformed Church wishes to extend its Christian sympathy to Mrs. Bert Maring in the sudden passing of her son

#### ROBERT.

May our Heavenly Father comfort and sustain His own as he gathers his saints.

Pres. – Rev. C. Hanko Sec'y – Mrs. Jay Lubbers

SECOND CLASS POSTAGE PAID AT GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

## News From Our Churches

As is plain from the report which follows this news column, Classis East met on October 4. From Hope's bulletin we read that this session of Classis was of "Particular significance to us as congregation, as our pastor-elect will be examined." The announcement concluded with the fitting prayer "that our faithful God may sustain him and continue to bless him as he nears his long sought-after goal of undershepherd of the King of the Church." At a worship service, led by Rev. H. Veldman, in Hope on October 5, pastor-elect Ronald J. Van Overloop was ordained into the ministry.

Classis West met in Hull during the week of October 8. Isabel's bulletin noted that this particular Classis "is an occasion for joy, since two young men will be examined as candidates for the ministry." Reading further in that bulletin, we learn that "Candidate Bekkering will preach before Classis at worship services on Tuesday evening, and Candidate Kamps will preach before Classis on Wednesday morning." The installation and ordination of Candidate Bekkering was held in Randolph on Friday evening of that same week. We can echo the words of the writer of Southeast's bulletin, "may the Lord strengthen (them) for the awesome task He has laid upon (them)."

In further news, we learn that Rev. D. Kuiper declined the call to serve as home missionary.

\* \* \* \* \*

A couple of items from our western bulletins may be of interest. During the second week of September, the men of Doon's congregation assembled, not in the church, but on it — to reshingle the roof. And from Isabel's bulletin we learn that "the ladies of the church officially organized themselves into a new study group. They chose to call themselves The Dorcas Society of the Hope Protestant Reformed Church of Isabel. During the course of the year they will be studying the parables which the Lord spake and taught the people."

D.D

## REPORT OF CLASSIS EAST October 4, 1972 Southwest Prot. Ref. Church

Classis East met in a most enjoyable and fruitful session on the 4th of October in Southwest Church. After the opening devotions by Rev. C. Hanko and the opening remarks of the chairman for the day, Rev. R.C. Harbach, Classis concerned itself with the main

item of business: the examination of minister-elect Ronald Van Overloop. After all the evidence was in — his ability to preach and exegete, his knowledge of scripture and the confessions, his knowledge of the six loci of dogmatics, his knowledge of the controversies of the church, together with a fitting conclusion of the practica — classis gave its unanimous approval of the examination and announced with joy to the consistory of Hope that they might proceed with his ordination.

Classis was enjoyable as well because of the fellowship which was had not only with the delegates ad examina of Classis West but also with the Rev. Dorman of the Cornville, Maine Orthodox Presbyterian Church. Rev. Dorman was given opportunity to speak to the classis at day's end and the words of encouragement which he gave to the Protestant Reformed Churches were received with a silent "Amen!"

The report of the Stated Clerk and the Classical Committee were received and the usual committees were appointed and reported. Elders D. Langeland and G. Scholten served on the Finance Committee and Elder J. Dykstra, Jr. thanked the ladies for their catering services.

Noticeably absent was the appointment and report of the Classical Appointment Committee since, for the first time in many years, there were no vacant pulpits in Classis East. This situation gave rise to a request from the seminary professors that they and their students be given opportunity to preach. Classis took advisory action in this regard and asked the consistories of Classis East to consider releasing their ministers every seventh Sunday.

There was much joy in this day but there was a reminder that the kingdom of God upon earth is not without sorrow. Classis gave its consent to the increase of censure for a member of one of our churches.

To close the session of classis, the questions of Article 41 of the Church Order were answered satisfactorily, the chairman expressed his thanks for the cooperation of the classis, and Rev. G. Van Baren raised a prayer of thanksgiving for God's faithfulness to his church.

Classis is adjourned until January 3,1973 which session will be held in Hope Church.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Huisken Stated Clerk

72