

# THE STANDARD BEARER

---

A Reformed  
Semi-Monthly  
Magazine

*I can now sit at the Master's feet to learn from Him the first principles of true prayer, in which I may experience intimate communion of life with Him, Who is the overflowing Fountain of every good and perfect gift, Who fully supplies my every physical and spiritual need for time and for eternity, so that I can confidently conclude my prayers with the doxology: For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen!*

*See: Meditation, p. 338*

# Contents

May 1, 1988

Meditation — Cornelius Hanko	
Praise God From Whom All Blessings Flow .....	338
Editorials —	
Revolution, Not Reformation (2) .....	341
What Is A CRC Conservative? .....	342
Correspondence From Dordt College .....	343
The Day of Shadows — John A. Heys	
Satan And Sin Serve God's Counsel .....	344
Taking Heed To The Doctrine — Ronald H. Hanko	
The Two Natures of Christ: The Humanity of Christ .....	347
Walking In The Light — Herman C. Hanko	
Drunkenness .....	349
From Down Under —	
From Our Sister Church In New Zealand .....	351
Contribution —	
Ichabod! .....	352
All Around Us — Gise J. Van Baren	
Jimmy Swaggart .....	353
Who Must Educate Our Children .....	354
In His Fear — Arie den Hartog	
Distinctive Traits Of True Godliness:	
A Serious Attitude About Our Sin .....	354
Book Review .....	357
News From Our Churches .....	358

## Meditation

Cornelius Hanko

# Praise God From Whom All Blessings Flow

*Ques. 128. How dost thou conclude the prayer?*

*Ans. "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever"; that is, all these we ask of thee, because thou being our King and almighty, art able and willing to give us all good; and all this we pray for, that thereby not we, but thy holy name may be glorified forever.*

*Ques. 129. What doth the word "Amen" signify?*

*Ans. "Amen" signifies, it shall truly and certainly be: for my prayer is more assuredly heard of God, than I feel in my heart that I desire these things from Him. Heidelberg Catechism, Lord's Day 52.*

*Cornelius Hanko is a minister emeritus in the Protestant Reformed Churches.*

## THE STANDARD BEARER

ISSN 0362-4692

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. Ronald Cammenga, Rev. Arie den Hartog, Prof. Robert D. Decker, Rev. Barry Gritters, Rev. Cornelius Hanko, Prof. Herman C. Hanko, Rev. Ronald Hanko, Rev. John A. Heys, Rev. J. Kortering, Rev. George C. Lubbers, Rev. Thomas C. Miersma, Rev. James Slopesma, Rev. Gise J. Van Baren, Mr. Benjamin Wigger.

### EDITORIAL OFFICE

Prof. H.C. Hoeksema  
4975 Ivanrest Ave., S.W.  
Grandville, Michigan 49418

### CHURCH NEWS EDITOR

Mr. Ben Wigger  
6597 - 40th Ave.  
Hudsonville, Michigan 49426

### 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 acknowledgment 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 49516  
PH: (616) 243-2953

### NEW ZEALAND BUSINESS OFFICE

The Standard Bearer  
c/o Protestant Reformed Church  
B. Van Herk, 66 Fraser St.  
Wainuiomata, New Zealand

### SUBSCRIPTION POLICY

Subscription price, \$12.00 per year. Unless a definite request for discontinuance is received, it is assumed that the subscriber wishes the subscription to continue without the formality of a renewal order, and he will be billed for renewal. If you have a change of address, please notify the Business Office as early as possible in order to avoid the inconvenience of delayed delivery. Include your Zip Code.

### ADVERTISING POLICY

The Standard Bearer does not accept commercial advertising of any kind. Announcements of church and school events, anniversaries, obituaries, and sympathy resolutions will be placed for a \$3.00 fee. These should be sent to the Business Office and should be accompanied by the \$3.00 fee. Deadline for announcements is the 1st and 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.

16mm microfilm, 35mm microfilm and 105mm microfiche, and article copies are available through University Microfilms International.



My comfort . . .

My only comfort is that with body and soul, in life and in death, I am not my own, but belong to my faithful Savior Jesus Christ!

He has fully satisfied for all my sins. He delivers me from the power of the devil. He preserves me, so that without the will of my heavenly Father not a hair can fall from my head!

He makes all things subservient to my salvation, and by His Holy Spirit assures me of eternal life, making me sincerely willing and ready to live unto Him!

In one word, according to His sovereign mercy, God has redeemed me by the blood of His dear Son, has translated me from the horrors of sin and death into the glorious liberty of the sons of God, and given me the eternal victory in Christ Jesus!

Thanks be to God for His unspeakable gift!

I can now sit at the Master's feet to learn from Him the first principles of true prayer, in which I may experience intimate communion of life with Him, Who is the overflowing Fountain of every good and perfect gift, Who fully supplies my every physical and spiritual need for time and for eternity, so that I can confidently conclude my prayers with the doxology: For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen!

Our Father in heaven.

We have entered into Thy presence and humbly bow in worship before Thee with the foremost desire in our hearts and upon our lips that Thy Name be hallowed above every name in heaven and on earth!

Our whole being longs for the day when Thy kingdom will be fully realized in the new creation.

Thou hast exalted our Lord Jesus Christ in the highest heavens with all power entrusted to Him in heaven and on earth. He has entered into our hearts by His Spirit, has taken dominion there, making us citizens of that heavenly commonwealth, so that we are now strangers and pilgrims on the earth, eagerly looking forward to the day when every knee must bow and every tongue must confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to Thy glory, O Father.

Daily we see Thy counsel unfold before our eyes, Thy will being carried out in us, by us and round about us, preparing all things for the return of our Lord. Thy moral will is the power unto salvation within us, the Shepherd's rod that comforts us as it leads us to the sheepfold in glory.

We commit ourselves with all our present needs into Thy loving care in the confidence that Thou providest for us as a father for his children. Even as Thou didst feed Israel from day to day in the wilderness, so we also desire to live day by day, expecting all things only from Thy almighty and merciful hand.

At the same time, we are deeply aware of our daily transgressions, which we commit even when we pray, and also of our constantly increasing guilt, arising from our sinful nature. Forgive, Father, all our transgressions committed against Thy holy Name. Regard us always, not as we are in ourselves, but as Thou knowest us, redeemed, cleansed by our Savior's blood, forgiving one another, even as Thou in Christ forgivest us.

Since we are so weak in ourselves, that if left to ourselves in the hour of temptation, we would certainly fall, preserve us, Lord, and keep us safeguarded in Thy care. Wilt Thou daily sanctify us and prepare us for our own place

in Thy kingdom, yea, may the day soon come when we shall see Thee face to face, and know Thee as we are known.

All this we ask that thereby, not we, but Thy holy Name may be glorified forever.

And now we pause before we leave Thy presence in prayer. What shall we say? We are confident that Thou art able and willing to hear us and grant us all that we ask, for Thine is the kingdom, Thine is the power, and Thine is the glory forever and ever!

Thine is the kingdom!

Thou hast set Thy throne in the heavens. All the angels hide their faces in humble praise and adoration, and all the saints proclaim Thy praises.

Thy dominion is an everlasting dominion, and of Thy kingdom there is no end. All nature joins in singing Thy praises, every creature that stirs here upon earth, as well as in heaven, and even in hell, must serve for the full realization of Thy kingdom in the new creation.

Thou hast eternally ordained Thy Son to be the Christ, the Firstborn of every creature, and the Firstborn among many brethren. By way of His atoning death on the cross, Thou hast exalted Him as Head of the church and as Lord over all, to carry out Thy counsel unto the day of His return with the clouds of the heavens. With an eye of faith we now see Christ, crowned with glory and honor, our Lord, who even now intercedes for us, gathers us unto Himself, and prepares a place for us in Thy eternal dwelling, even as He prepares us for that place. Thus we sing:

God is King forever; let the nations tremble;

Throned above the cherubim,  
by all the earth adored.

He is great in Zion, high above all peoples;



Praise Him in fear, for holy  
is the Lord.

Thine is the kingdom, now and  
forever!

Thine is also the everlasting  
power!

Not as if there are other  
powers, powers of darkness,  
powers of nature, powers of the  
rulers of the earth, powers of all  
sorts, but that Thou art the  
greatest of them all. Thou art the  
Almighty, to whom belongs all  
power in all Thy wide and vast  
creation. Besides Thee there is  
and can be no other.

Thou hast the sun, moon, and  
stars in Thy hand, and dost direct  
them in their courses with un-  
changing accuracy. From Thee  
each creature receives its life and  
its existence. No rational, moral  
creature can think or desire, can  
speak or act, except by Thy  
power. The time of our birth, the  
span of our lives, and the time  
and place of our departure are all  
in Thy power to serve Thy pur-  
pose unto the coming of Thy  
kingdom. Nations may rage  
under the desperate instigations  
of Satan, antichrist may set him-  
self upon Thy throne and be wor-  
shipped by all men, as if he were  
God, yet Thou hast set Thy King,  
our Lord Jesus Christ, upon Thy  
holy mountain.

In God will I trust, though my  
counselors say,

O flee as a bird to your  
mountain away;

The wicked are strong and the  
righteous are weak,

Foundations are shaken, yet  
God will I seek.

The Lord is most righteous, the  
Lord loves the right,

The evil He hates and will  
surely requite;

The wicked His anger will  
drive from their place,

The upright in rapture shall  
gaze on His face.

Thine is the glory forever!

Humbly we worship Thee, our  
God, the infinite fulness of all  
eternal perfections, who livest  
Thine own blessed covenant life  
in intimate fellowship of love as  
Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

From Thee radiates a glory far  
brighter than the dazzling  
brightness of the sun at noonday.  
Angels hide their faces as they  
proclaim their "Holy, holy, holy,  
Lord God Almighty, heaven and  
earth are full of Thy glory." The  
heavens declare Thy praises, and  
the firmament shews Thy handi-  
work. For that Thy Name is near  
Thy wondrous works declare.  
Day unto day utters speech, night  
unto night shows wisdom.

Yet an even greater glory  
shines forth to us from Thy  
Word, in which Thou revealest  
the wondrous mystery of our  
salvation in Christ Jesus. Standing  
before the mirror of Thy Word  
and experiencing the power of  
Thy Spirit in our hearts we are  
changed from glory to ever  
greater glory by Thy grace and  
abundant mercy.

In anticipation of the glory that  
still awaits us we declare: Glory  
be to the Father, and to the Son,  
and to the Holy Spirit, world  
without end! Amen!

Spontaneously this 'Amen'  
arises from our hearts, for "my  
prayer is more assuredly heard of  
God than I feel in my heart that I  
desire these things" from Thee.

Even now we realize our im-  
perfections and sins. All that we  
ask we still ask in the weakness  
of sinful flesh. We do not desire  
with that eagerness and longing  
which should always fill our  
hearts. Sinful desires, ambitions,  
thoughts creep into our prayers.  
Thou who searchest the heart  
knowest also our innermost be-  
ing. Nothing is hidden from Thy  
penetrating eyes.

We confess that we still have  
but a small beginning of the true  
obedience. That there is no merit  
in our prayers, nor any reason in  
us that Thou shouldest grant us  
our heart's desire. But we ap-  
proach Thee through our  
Mediator and High priest, Jesus  
Christ, the Righteous, who  
presents our prayers before Thee,  
whom Thou dost always hear.  
Moreover, we are confident that  
Thou seest us and lovest us as  
righteous in Christ, and in Him  
worthy of Thy blessing. Thou,  
who withholdest no good thing  
from those who fear Thee, wilt  
also bless us far above all that we  
can ask or think. For Thou art  
Almighty God, and also our mer-  
ciful Father, whose is the  
kingdom, the power, and the  
glory forever.

In that confidence we cast our-  
selves upon Thee with an assured  
Amen, and Amen! □

---

*The Standard Bearer makes a  
thoughtful gift for members of your  
family, friends, and neighbors. Give  
a gift of the Standard Bearer.*



---

## Revolution, Not Reformation (2)

### What Is A CRC Conservative?

#### Correspondence From Dordt College

---

#### Revolution, Not Reformation (2)

We must still consider the "concrete suggestions" which the Rev. Jelle Tuininga makes in his article entitled "Obey God Rather Than Men" (*The Outlook*, April '88, pp. 13, 14). These proposals make it very clear that Mr. Tuininga is proposing rebellion. His first suggestion is as follows:

1. *Stop paying quotas to agencies which undermine our confessional integrity. It's an elementary principle of Christian freedom that I may send my money (the Lord's money) to causes which I believe are doing the most for the cause of the truth and the kingdom of God. As Vander Kam put it recently in The Outlook: "I thought in my naivete that it was in (an? HCH) inalienable right of every person to give to the cause he desired!" Exactly. That's what it is, no matter what any synod may say about it. It's time we claim this inalienable right. Even the state is more tolerant on this matter than our own synod.*

Concerning this proposal it ought to be noted: 1) That Tuininga's real objection here is that these (unnamed) agencies "undermine our confessional integrity." Under the presbyterian-synodical form of church government, what then is his duty and his right? It is, of course, to follow the path of protest and appeal concerning this alleged under-

mining of the confessional integrity of his denomination. If he follows this course to the very end, and fails to convince the churches of the validity of his complaint, then ultimately he faces the choice: a) abide by the decision of the churches (synod); or, b) leave the denomination. 2) Tuininga should remember that he and others have agreed to worship together under the rules and usages of the Christian Reformed Church. One of those usages is the quota system, according to which the churches unitedly support the broader denominational causes. It would obviously create utter chaos and make the denominational activities impossible if it were simply left to every individual member or every individual church to pay or not to pay their quotas. But apart from this, the payment of quotas is a moral obligation for everyone within the church-connection. 3) What Tuininga is proposing here is a form of coercion, somewhat in the spirit of "Hit them where it hurts, that is, in the pocketbook." It reminds me somewhat of Absalom instructing his servants to set Joab's field on fire in order to get the latter's attention. 4) Again, this is not reformation, but rebellion. Reformation does not employ the weapon of coercion; it only employs the sword

of the Spirit, which is the Word of God.

The Rev. Tuininga's next proposal is as follows:

2. *Ministers and consistories must stop giving Banner subscriptions to newlyweds. It amazes me that even conservative ministers do this. Let them give a subscription to Reformed papers instead. Let's use every opportunity we can to promote the truth of the Reformed faith.*

Concerning this proposal I have the following brief comments: 1) It is obviously a very weak way of "taking the gloves off" or "fighting fire with fire." How much would this contribute — conceding for the moment that it is morally right — to stopping the firestorm of liberalism in the CRC? Meanwhile, I would certainly encourage people to read the *Banner*; they ought to know what is going on in their denomination. 2) Again, Tuininga's real objection is not to giving the *Banner* to people; it is against the *Banner* itself. This is serious business! After all, the *Banner* is the denominational magazine, and it speaks for the denomination. If the *Banner* is on the wrong track, then it is the bounden duty of Tuininga and others to register their objections by way of protest and appeal to the very end. 3) If Tuininga is truly interested in using "every opportunity we can to promote the truth of the Reformed faith," then I recommend *The Standard Bearer*. I am sure that our Board



would furnish free subscriptions if the Rev. Tuininga will give them to newly-weds in his congregation.

The third proposal of the Rev. Tuininga is as follows:

3. Consistories must stop using their bulletins to announce meetings of the Women's Committee in the CRC (whether that's in Grand Rapids, Edmonton, or anywhere else). This is a revolutionary outfit, and we should give no promotion to that kind of thing.

Comment: 1) I agree that no assistance should be given to such an organization. 2) Again, however, how this constitutes "taking the gloves off" and "fighting fire with fire" is beyond me. 3) But if this Women's Committee is indeed revolutionary, then its leaders and members, it seems to me, should be subject to discipline. Revolution is sin! And the Rev. Tuininga should follow the orderly ecclesiastical way of seeking such discipline.

The Rev. Tuininga's fourth suggestion is as follows:

4. It's time consistories and churches take the bull by the horns and call and ordain ministers who have completed their training in Westminster, Reformed (Jackson), Mid-America or any other reliable Reformed seminary. De Koster is right here: we've simply got to call the bluff of our bureaucrats. These men (seminarians) have had a completely adequate and Reformed training — as good or better than they can get at Calvin. There is no reason in the world why they should have to spend an extra year at Calvin. None at all, except that of provincialism (even the Banner editor recognized that), and keeping a tight rein on things for the protection of our "sacred institutions." This is really a form of idolatry and we have to stop it. A consistory has the right to call a man who has had good Reformed training and whom it deems fit for the ministry, and if classis will not ordain the man, then a few individual congregations can do it. They have that right. The present rule lacks all fairness, integrity and credibility, and it's time consistories challenge it. I hope they will do so. We've tried to change it through proper channels, to no avail. We'll have to change it through "improper" channels then.

My comments on this are as follows: . . . Again the Rev. Tuininga openly advocates rebellion, not reformation. The Christian Reformed Church has had the rule in question ever since 1924. Suddenly there has arisen dissatisfaction with this rule. Why now? Because it is impossible to get Mid-America Seminary's graduates declared candidates without their attending Calvin Seminary for a year. What must be done if this rule, which has always been acknowledged as a good rule heretofore, cannot be changed through orderly process? Simply ignore it! And what if classis will not ordain the man? Ignore classis and do it with "a few individual congregations." 2) Again, Tuininga's real dissatisfaction is with Calvin Seminary. He wants to by-pass it. Men can get a better Reformed education elsewhere. Mind you, he is speaking of his own denomination's seminary! And it is really idolatry to maintain this rule and to protect what he calls "our 'sacred institutions.'" The orderly way would be to address whatever ills there are at Calvin Seminary and, if necessary, conduct an ecclesiastical housecleaning there.

In his conclusion the Rev. Tuininga claims that "It's time conservatives challenge some 'synodical regulations.'" And he goes on to say, "Exceptional circumstances call for exceptional rules." However, Tuininga does not want rules; he does not even want "exceptional rules." He does not want the rule of law in the church at all. He advocates rebellion!

And rebellion and reformation are mutually exclusive!

Nor does the blessing of the Lord rest upon rebellion! □ HCH

## What Is A CRC Conservative?

This is the question which I proposed to treat separately in connection with the Rev. Tuininga's statement that everybody knows what is meant by a conservative. I demurred, saying that over the years I have become more and more confused as to what actually constitutes a Christian Reformed conservative. And I proposed to raise some pertinent questions on this score.

My problem is not with the terminology. My dictionary tells me that the word *conservative* means: "1. Conserving; preservative. 2. Disposed to maintain existing institutions or views; opposed to change." And *conserve* means "to keep in a safe or sound state; to preserve." Synonyms are "maintain, sustain, uphold, defend, protect, guard, shield, secure." Hence, I am fair, I think, in saying that a Christian Reformed conservative is one who maintains the Reformed faith, the truth of Scripture and the Three Forms of Unity. For the sake of the discussion I will leave out the fact that the CRC has added the Three Points of 1924 and that I am of the conviction that many, if not all, of the more recent departures of the CRC go back in one way or another to 1924. I propose to go back only some 25 years in this discussion. It was around 1960 that the terms *conservative* and *liberal* began to be heard increasingly. And at that time I think that most people had at least a general idea of what and who were meant, due, perhaps, to the fact that the issues were not so numerous as they have become in the past 25+ years. In asking my questions I do not claim to be touching on *all* the issues during those years; nor do I include any time references. I am merely mentioning various items from memory — items about which



there was some degree of controversy in the CRC. Here are my questions:

1. Is a conservative one who believes that women elders and women preachers are contrary to Scripture and the creeds, and therefore opposes this? Note: the CRC has not yet taken a decision in favor of women elders/ministers.

2. Is a conservative one who disagrees with the Board of Trustees' exoneration of Profs. Menninga, Van Till, and Young?

On the items below the CRC has made decisions, and these decisions are not only settled and binding, but also are accepted as settled and binding by CRC "conservatives," whoever they are.

3. Is a conservative one who objects strenuously to women deacons, but accepts the synodical decision on this as settled and binding?

4. Is a conservative one who objected not only to Dr. Harry Boer's gravamen on reprobation but also to the report and recommendations on that gravamen, but now accepts the decision of synod as settled and binding?

5. Is a conservative one who opposed Report 36/44 and still complains about it occasionally, but accepts it as settled and binding?

6. Is a conservative one who opposed the dance, but accepts the decision on dancing as settled and binding?

7. Is a conservative one who objected to the ordination of the Rev. Allen Verhey because of false doctrine, but accepts the decision upholding him as settled and binding?

8. Is a conservative one who objected to the Film Arts report and recommendations, but now accepts the decision on this as settled and binding?

9. Is a conservative one who complained loudly about Prof. Harold Dekker's heresy of a universal love of God and a general atonement, but now accepts as settled and binding the decision that Dekker was only "ambiguous and abstract?" Incidentally, I remember distinctly that the late Dr. Rutgers said at one of the synodical sessions that if synod did not declare Prof. Dekker's views contrary to the confessions, he and others would be compelled to go up and down the country speaking against it. But when "push came to shove," he and others caved in and voted in favor of the proposal to say that Prof. Dekker's teachings were merely "ambiguous and abstract."

These are only a few examples chosen at random and from memory. But they serve to illustrate the fact that the conservatives have over the years conserved very little and step by step have conceded much. When did they ever, so to speak, draw a line and say, "Cross that line, and we have come to the parting of the ways?"

Perhaps I am reinforcing the Rev. Tuininga's complaint that conservatives are backseat drivers. But when an ecclesiastical backseat driver does nothing more than complain about the driving, the result is that he is no more a conservative. Step by step he loses what he wanted to conserve, and he becomes co-responsible for the loss of the Reformed heritage and for the introduction of error. Though he may have complained long and hard about many things, he has conserved nothing. A true conservative reaches a point — to continue Tuininga's figure of speech — when he not only complains about the driving but says, "Stop the car! I want to get out because both the car and the passengers are in danger of destruction!" □

HCH

## Correspondence From Dordt College

From Dr. John B. Hulst, President of Dordt College, I received the letter below which concerns the matter of Prof. Hodgson's instruction at the college. This letter, of course, is still in connection with our editorial critique of Dr. Hodgson's views. Other than to say that this appears to be a step in the right direction, we will refrain from comment and await further developments. We thank Dr. Hulst for keeping us informed.

The letter follows below. HCH

Dear Editor:

In the June 1, 1987 issue of your publication an article appeared under the title "Evolution at Dordt College."

In that article questions were raised concerning Professor Richard Hodgson's position regarding creation and evolution. By implication questions were also raised as to the position of Dordt College regarding this very important and sensitive issue.

Subsequently it was indicated to you that the Dordt College Board of Trustees had appointed a committee "to study and evaluate . . . Professor Hodgson's position regarding creation and evolution."

On March 10, 1988, the study committee presented its report to a full meeting of the Board of Trustees. The recommendations of the committee were adopted, along with the following statement, which was formulated for the purpose of making the Board's position known to the public:

*The Board of Trustees of Dordt College, in its meeting on March 10, 1988, received a report from a committee appointed to study and evaluate Professor Richard Hodgson's position regarding creation and evolution. The committee reported that Professor Hodgson's personal position fully embraced the biblical doctrine of creation. At the same time the committee identified certain weaknesses in his scientific methodology and manner*



of expression which caused confusion regarding his position.

The Board approved the recommendation of the committee that the Board of Dordt College concur with the administration's actions in which Professor Hodgson will withdraw the syllabus which has caused confusion and, for the present, discontinue his teaching of an introductory geology course. Professor Hodgson was encouraged to deal sensitively and carefully with the issue of creation and evolution and to work closely with the academic community in clarifying his position in this area.

The Board of Trustees declared that it is satisfied that appropriate and sufficient measures are being taken to ensure that the teaching of Professor Hodgson is fully in harmony with the Word of God as interpreted in the Reformed confessions.

The Academic Council of the College is now instructed "to pursue an institutional study of the issue of creation and evolution." It is also understood that the Board of Trustees will receive periodic reports concerning the progress and the findings of this communal study.

It is our hope that this statement of the Board of Trustees will answer the questions which have been raised and also make clear the commitment of Dordt College to approach the matter of creation and evolution from an integrated biblical perspective.

Sincerely,  
J.B. Hulst  
President □

## The Day of Shadows

John A. Heys

# Satan and Sin Serve God's Counsel

A truth that gives the child of God boundless comfort, when he takes hold of it and rests upon it, is what we find in Psalm 73:24. There Asaph writes: "Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel and afterward receive me to glory." No matter what happens to us, that truth assures us that all is well; for it speaks of the counsel of the almighty, sovereign, unchangeable and merciful God of our salvation. Nothing will happen that is not in that eternal counsel. He is the I AM, Who never changes His mind and rules every inanimate as well as

animate creature, ordering every step of every angel and man, and using every grain of sand and most minute disease germ to fulfill His counsel. And He has a mercy that assures us that after His counsel is fulfilled, as far as this present creation is concerned, we will most assuredly reach the everlasting glory and blessedness which in that counsel He decreed to give us.

However, there are instances in Scripture which seem, but only seem, to deny this fact. In Proverbs 1:25 we read: "But ye have set at naught all my counsel, and would none of my reproof." But read on and take hold of the next verse where he writes: "I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh." And in Proverbs 19:21 Solomon writes: "There are many devices in a man's heart; nevertheless the counsel of the Lord,

that shall stand."

That truth we had better hold on to tightly, not only in our miseries and afflictions but also when we read God's word and find in it events that seem to deny the fact that before He created the world, God had an unchangeable counsel which is being kept in every detail every moment of time. And that surely must be kept in mind when we consider what happened in the day of shadows.

Yes, the whole creation of heaven and earth and all that they contain came forth exactly as God had eternally decreed it to be. And in Genesis 1:31 we read: "And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good." With that we have no problem. But what do you say about what transpired and is recorded in Genesis 3? Satan tempted Adam and Eve,

John A. Heys is a minister emeritus in the Protestant Reformed Churches.



got them to rebel against God, and bring upon themselves the death God told them would come if they ate of the forbidden fruit.

We already called attention to the first creation in all its beauty as a shadow of the glorious and blessed creation that is coming in the day of Christ. However, there is a work of Satan that seems to have spoiled God's work, and there is man's sin that seems to say that man, as in Proverbs 1:25 quoted above, set at naught God's counsel. Did not Satan and man then throw a monkey wrench into God's work and force Him to begin a new work? Did they not make it necessary for God to send His own Son into our flesh and into hell in order to redeem us and bring forth a new creation which He could call very good? And is He not now fighting Satan, as he is striving to bring forth the antichrist, in order to keep His counsel and to fulfill it?

No, a thousand thousand times, NO! It was in that counsel of God that Satan would fall into sin and take with him a large part of the angel world. It was in God's eternal plan that Adam would listen to Satan, accept his lie as the truth, and bring the curse upon this earth. Things did not slip out of God's hands. Satan tried to set at naught God's counsel and seemed to succeed in making bad what God created and saw as very good at the end of the creation week. Instead, the truth of the matter is that God's unchangeable counsel stood and that Satan's "success" and man's fall took place because God had it all planned exactly the way it took place.

This is plain from the fact that God created only one tree of life and placed it in a relatively small garden of Eden, and that the fall came before Eve conceived, and before a child began to grow within her that would not be born with a sinful nature. One tree of life would not be sufficient for the multitude of people that died in the flood. That relatively small garden of Eden which God brought forth could not hold hundreds of descendants of Adam. And had Eve conceived before that fall of Adam a guiltless, sinless people would have been on this earth. God had no intention to let that take place.

The question here, however, is whether the holy God could plan that unholy thing of Satan's fall and spiritually-sinful attack upon man created in God's image. Are we not accusing God of sinful thoughts when we say that in His eternal, unchangeable counsel He decreed and planned Satan's sin of rebelling against God, and man's sin of rejecting God's word and believing Satan's life? Are we not saying that God had sinful thoughts? If we plan something sinful, are we not sinning?

If we take the position — and we must — that God is almighty and sovereign, we cannot rightfully say that Satan, created as a holy angel, could overpower God and take away some of His sovereignty. God is never overpowered by a creature. Every creature depends completely upon God for every breath of life and existence. He was not by Satan robbed of His right to rule, but always has complete control over every creature, and eternally determined all their actions. He made no mistake when He created Satan, and was not overpowered by him. His counsel was not overthrown by Satan.

We must remember what we considered last time. We must keep before our minds the fact

that our covenant God had eternally in His heart and mind the coming kingdom of heaven of which the first creation was a shadow; and that Adam, created in the image of God, was a shadow of the covenant fellowship that we will have with God in the new creation. Satan's fall and victory over Adam, and man's fall in Adam were designed and necessary for the coming of Christ, for His cross, resurrection, and ascension into heaven, and the realization of His Kingdom of Heaven that will soon be here. This we ought to see, consider, and appreciate to see the blessedness of God's eternal, unchangeable counsel.

Let us be on our guard lest we insult and malign God. He did not sin by decreeing sin in His eternal, holy counsel. Let us first of all take hold of the fact that He is God, and that it is sinful on our part to accuse Him of sin. We may call those who go contrary to His holy will sinners. That we must do. But if we say that He might not decree the sin of Satan, and of mankind through Satan's clever and crafty temptation, we are raising ourselves (in our minds) above Him and telling Him what He may and may not do.

We may decide to submit to some very painful surgery so that we may be healed from a disease that without surgery would give us far more agony and only a few more years of life. A wife may be willing to suffer the discomforts and severe pains of the travail of childbirth in order to have a child of her own from God's hand. Much more the sovereign God may decree that which is against His holy will, but will realize a covenant life with man that is closer than the one in which he was created, and one in which he could not be created without God Himself coming into our flesh and giving us the



spiritual bodies of which we read in I Corinthians 15:42-49.

Remember that this first creation with its glory was a shadow of what is coming when Christ returns. And it was a stepping stone to the more glorious kingdom with a richer covenant fellowship with God. God hates sin, but He may decree it for a richer glory which He intends to realize through Christ and His cross. And His goal is a man, made in His own image, that has the life of which we read in I John 3:9. There John writes: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for His seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God."

Adam God created as one *able not to sin*, a man ethically and morally clean. But sovereignly He decreed that man would become *not able not to sin*, and to send His Son, Who would through His perfect obedience and suffering of the hellish agonies, receive the right to make man *not able to sin*. Deny God the right to do this, malign and insult Him with that idea, and *we* sin. For then we deny Him His sovereignty and take the position that we are above Him as His judge, while actually He is our Judge Who may, as we read in Isaiah 43:21, form (in the way of the fall of man and salvation in Christ) for Himself a people that shall show forth His praises. Do not forget that fact. God's purpose behind Satan's fall and man's spiritual death is that a people may be formed through whom His glory shines more richly in praise concerning His grace in Christ. Perfect Adam could not do that. He was created *able not to sin*; but he could not thank God the way he will do in that new creation of which the things in the first creation were a shadow. And we

with him, in that grace of God, will praise God more richly than righteous Adam could, for the gift of salvation that Adam could not know.

More of this will, the Lord willing, be treated next time, but let us not fail to appreciate the fact that Satan's attack upon Adam and Eve, his vile deed of bringing them to an act that would bring death upon them, was a shadow of the cross of Christ. Satan could not and did not have this in mind yet; but his attempt to get man to sin against God and to hate Him rather than love Him was a shadow of what he would do when God Himself came into our flesh. It was not Satan's shadow. It was God's shadow of things to come. Here again we ought to take hold of that truth in Proverbs 19:21, namely, "There are many devices in a man's heart; nevertheless the counsel of the Lord, that shall stand." We can in this verse substitute the word Satan for the word man. Satan's devices do not keep God from realizing all in His eternal counsel. God uses him for the realization of His counsel. And though he does not know it, he is God's tool for the realization of that kingdom of heaven of which the first creation was a shadow.

Some like to maintain a covenant of works, insisting that Adam could have reached that Kingdom of Heaven by remaining sinless for a given time. How long that time would be they cannot say, for Scripture nowhere speaks of a covenant of works, and does not set a time during which Adam had to walk a sinless life to reach a higher glory than that in which he was created. It is true that God did tell Adam he would die the day he sinned. It is true that if he walked in love to God, he would continue in that life in the garden of Eden. But it is not true that God promised Adam higher glory

if he continued in a sinless life. No, that glory in the first creation was a shadow of what we are going to receive in Christ.

God made no covenant of works with Adam. He eternally intended as well as unchangeably determined to send His Son into that flesh of Adam in order to bring us to a higher glory than Adam was given. And even then, Adam was created a little lower than the angels and will in Christ be above the angels. Are they not in Hebrews 1:14 called our ministering spirits? And do we not in the preceding verse read, "But to which of the angels said He at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool"? We get above the angels, not through a covenant of works, but through the covenant of grace in Christ. God's covenant is by His almighty power realized. He did not make a covenant of works that was not kept.

Satan, not God, suggested a covenant of works. He presented to Adam and Eve the possibility of reaching a higher level of glory by sinning against God. And the covenant of grace in Christ was no repair work, made

---

*The Standard Bearer makes a thoughtful gift for the sick & shut-in. Give a gift of the Standard Bearer.*



necessary because of Satan's victory over man. Not for one split second did Satan keep God from bringing man where He eternally intended to have him: in a covenant life of far more intimate fellowship and glory.

The covenant relationship Adam enjoyed before he fell was a shadow of the richer fellowship

we will have in Christ. And in His mercy, but also in His inscrutable wisdom and almighty power, God used Satan for the realization of His covenant of grace. Satan did not frustrate God for one split second. God used him to prepare the way for His Son to come in our flesh and bring into being that indescribably wonderful covenant fellow-

ship of which the one in which man was created was but a shadow. God's love for those whom He eternally chose in His Son used Satan so that in Christ He might lift us to a higher, everlasting glory.

Yes, Satan and sin serve God's counsel, and do not in any way delay or disturb the fulfillment of it. □

## Taking Heed To The Doctrine

Ronald H. Hanko

# The Two Natures of Christ: The Humanity of Christ

### 3. The Virgin birth.

The reality and significance of Christ's humanity are inseparably connected with belief in the virgin birth. The church father, Tertullian, saw that long ago:

*Marcion (an early Gnostic heretic, R.H.), in order that he might deny the flesh of Christ, denied also His nativity, or else he denied His flesh in order that he might deny His nativity; because, of course, he was afraid that His nativity and His flesh bore mutual testimony to each other's reality, since there is no nativity without flesh, and no flesh without nativity (On the Flesh of Christ, I).*

This, to be sure, also sheds a new light on the liberal attacks on the church's faith in the virgin birth that developed in the late 1800's and early 1900's.

That calling into question of the doctrine of the virgin birth is still reflected in the Revised Standard Version's translation of Isaiah 7:14. There the Hebrew word *bethulah* is translated "young woman" instead of "virgin," greatly weakening Scripture's testimony to the virgin birth. Now, this in itself is not of any great significance, since most of the more recent versions have followed the translation "virgin." But those who still make use of the RSV, and of the older Revised or American Standard Versions ought to be aware that they have been influenced by liberal, higher criticism at this and at other points.

That Scripture does teach the virgin birth in Isaiah 7:14 is clear from a little study. In the first place, there is the obvious fact that a birth of a child from a young woman would not be a sign, and Isaiah is giving a sign to wicked King Ahaz in the passage. There is also the fact that the word, *bethulah*, is almost always used in the Old Testament not just in the sense of "young woman," but "young unmarried woman" or "virgin." Finally, the Holy Spirit, quoting Isaiah 7:14, in Matthew 1:23 uses a Greek word, the word *parthenos*, which can only mean "virgin." And the evidence of these passages is supported by the statement of Scripture in Matthew 1:25, that Joseph did not know (i.e. know sexually) his wife until after Jesus was born. Thus, both the Old and New Testaments bear clear witness to the virgin birth.

Ronald H. Hanko is pastor of Trinity Protestant Reformed Church, Houston, Texas.



The doctrine of the virgin birth is important for several reasons. First of all, it is important for us to believe that, although Christ did not have a human father, He was nevertheless born as we are. He did not just find His humanity ready made and already existing, as it were, so that the incarnation would be something on the order of a case of demon-possession. Such a conception of His incarnation would call into question the very reality of His humanity, while the virgin birth is God's own testimony to us, that His Son *became* man and was made like us in all things.

Secondly, and with the emphasis on the word virgin, the virgin birth is a confirmation that Christ, though born a man, and of the flesh of the virgin Mary, was nevertheless born not "of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." The miracle of the virgin birth is part of the miracle that is Christ. It is in this connection that Isaiah spoke of the virgin birth as a sign. It is the first and greatest sign that Jesus is indeed the Christ.

Faith in the virgin birth does not, however, require faith in the perpetual virginity of Mary. Such is, as all know, the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. But there have also been a number of Reformed leaders and theologians who held this, among them the Swiss Reformer, Ulrich Zwingli. Probably he and others taught this to defend the purity and holiness of Christ. Perhaps that is also the rationale behind the Roman Catholic teaching, though there it has degenerated into a form of idolatry.

We should realize that it is not Mary's virginity, either before or after Christ's birth, that guarantees His purity, and it is not necessary, therefore, to teach the perpetual virginity of Mary, a doctrine which has, after all, no Biblical foundation whatever.

Rather, the guarantee of Christ's purity and holiness is in the fact that He was conceived by the Holy Spirit. Mary herself, as a daughter of Adam, was subject to depravity and the pollution of sin, and the only power that could and did preserve Christ free from the taint of that inherited depravity was the overshadowing presence of the Holy Spirit. Christ, according to the words of the angel, would be "that *holy thing*" because He would be born through the coming of the *Holy Ghost* (Lk. 1:35).

That, in fact, is part of the wonder of the incarnation: that the coming of God in our flesh swallows up and cleanses away the defilement of sin. There is, therefore, in the holy conception and nativity of Christ, the pledge that we too, united to Him by virtue of His humanity, shall be holy — that our sin and corruption shall be cleansed away.

In speaking of Christ's conception, then, it has been customary among Reformed theologians to speak of a three-fold activity of the Holy Spirit: (1) the formation of Christ's human nature, (2) the sanctification of it, and (3) the assumption of it into the Person of the Son of God. With regard to the first of these things, let it be said that there has been far too much idle speculation as to the manner of this conception of Christ. When even the conception of an ordinary human infant remains a mystery, how shall we explain the conception of Him Who came into the flesh through the secret operations of the Holy Spirit? The only thing that needs to be said is that in the conception of Christ, Mary was indeed the mother of Christ, not a mere surrogate: so that Christ was her flesh and blood, the fruit of her womb.

With regard to the sanctification of Christ's human nature by the Holy Spirit, Calvin says this:

*We do not make Christ immune from all defilement, because he was begotten of his mother only without the co-operation of the male, but because he was hallowed by the Spirit, so that the generation might be pure and upright, as it was meant to be before Adam's fall (Institutes, II, xiii, 4).*

Thus, Calvin too suggests that there is in this sanctifying operation of the Holy Spirit the pledge of our own sanctification.

The last point, the assumption of the human nature into union with the divine, belongs to another discussion.

That Christ was conceived by the operation and overshadowing of the Holy Spirit, also reminds us of the important truth that the incarnation is a work of the triune God, of the Father, through the Son, and by the Holy Spirit. The work of the Holy Spirit especially is forgotten in this connection. The importance of that work of the Spirit we have already seen.

Moreover, that the incarnation is a work of God triune, also means that Christ Himself was actively involved in His own conception and nativity; that "eliminating the will of man . . . the Person of the Son of God prepared His own human nature" (H. Hoeksema, *Reformed Dogmatics*, p. 352). To this Scripture testifies when it speaks of Christ "coming" in the flesh, and "taking upon Himself" the nature of the seed of Abraham (Heb. 2:14-16). This too is significant in that it reminds us of the wonder of the incarnation, and of the fact that though a man, He is also more than a man, the God of heaven and earth.

This also means that Christ is the Son of God in a two-fold sense. Certainly every Christian knows and believes that Christ is the Son of God as the Second Person of the Holy Trinity. But many do not realize that He is



also the Son of God as far as His humanity is concerned. In that respect also His Sonship is unique, for even as a man He is not adopted to be God's child as we are, but conceived and born of God. Nevertheless, insofar as He is man, He is God's Son in a different sense than He is as the Second Person of the Trinity, for as a man His Sonship has a beginning, and He is the Son of God by conception and birth, not from eternity and by eternal generation.

This does not mean that we can ever really separate the two, for in both natures He is still but one Christ. Nor does Scripture ever distinguish the two senses in which Christ is the Son of God to the extent that in any particular passage which speaks of Him as Son, only one sense can be detected. A good example is Psalm 2:7; "I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto

me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." Now, insofar as the Sonship of Christ is a matter of God's decree, the reference is obviously to His Sonship in the human nature. As the second Person of the Trinity, in other words, He is not the content of the decree, but the decreeing God. The confirmation of this is found in Acts 13:33 where the passage is used in reference to the resurrection of Christ and, therefore, according to His human nature. Nevertheless, it is impossible to read the passage without also thinking of the eternal Sonship of Christ, so much so, that the passage is most often used as a reference to Christ as the second Person of the Trinity. Nor is this unfounded, for the reference to Him as God's begotten Son is a reference that in other passages of Scripture testifies of His eternal Sonship (e.g. Jn. 1:14, Heb. 1:5, 6).

What is more, this is not just a matter of speculation, nor is it an unimportant theological point, but contains a great deal of promise and comfort for us. In that Christ, also according to His human nature is God's Son, there is for us the assurance that we also, who are but creatures, can be and shall be children of God. Both the possibility and the pledge of our sonship lie, then, in the truth that Christ is the Son of God also according to His human nature. The power of it is in His divine, eternal Sonship.

Our faith in the virgin birth and in the conception of Christ by the Holy Spirit are not just incidental matters, therefore, but part of the essentials of the faith. The Heidelberg Catechism is not wrong when it lists these doctrines among the things which are necessary for a Christian to believe (VII, 22, 23). May our belief be well-instructed. □

## *Walking In The Light*

Herman C. Hanko

## Drunkenness

Item — Nearly 18 million adults in the U.S. are problem drinkers, according to the government's latest report on alcoholism and alcohol abuse. More than 10 million of these drinkers are suffering from alcoholism.

Item — Alcohol is a factor in nearly half of America's murders, suicides and accidental deaths. In all, it claims at least 100,000 lives

per year, 25 times as many as all illegal drugs combined.

Item — Two of every 3 adults drink. But only 10 percent of the nation's drinkers consume half of its beer, wine and liquor.

Item — Two of every 3 high-school seniors have drunk alcohol within the past month. Five percent drink daily. Forty percent of sixth-graders have tasted wine coolers. By age 18, a child will

*Herman C. Hanko is professor of Church History and New Testament at the Protestant Reformed Seminary, Grandville, Michigan.*



have seen 100,000 beer commercials.

Item — The economic costs to society of alcoholism and alcohol abuse are estimated at nearly \$117 billion a year — including \$18 billion from premature deaths, \$66 billion in reduced work effort, \$13 billion for treatments.

Item — One family in 4 has been troubled by alcohol — the highest incidence of problem drinking in a Gallup trend that dates back to 1950. But Gallup finds only 17 percent of Americans in favor of a return to Prohibition.

These staggering and frightening statistics, which were reported in a recent (Nov. 30, 1987) issue of *U.S. News and World Report*, show how widespread and serious the problem of drunkenness is in our country. And everyone knows that the church is not unaffected by the problem: the church has its own problems with drunkenness among its members.

So serious does the world itself consider the problem that the issue of *U.S. News and World Report* mentioned above devoted a feature article to the subject under the heading, "Coming To Grips With Alcoholism." The article was no less than eight full pages long.

A fairly large share of the article was devoted to the question of whether "alcoholism" is a disease or a moral wrong. The subject is important enough that certain parts of the article are worth quoting. This section of the article is introduced by a discussion of a case recently heard by the Supreme Court of our country, a case in which the court will have to decide on this question. It has to do with treatment of alcoholics and the rights of alcoholics to college benefits.

*The question before the Supreme Court: Is most alcoholism simply a result of "willful misconduct," as the VA (Veterans Administration, H.H.) contends, or is it a disease in which the victim is compelled to drink?*

*Not only does the case jeopardize the premise upon which virtually every program in America's \$1 billion alcoholism-treatment industry is based. It also gets to the heart of how society views people in the grip of alcohol. Among the perplexing questions that some see arising: If alcoholism isn't a disease, will employers quit paying treatment costs for alcoholic workers and start firing them? If it is a disease, does it provide an appropriate defense against wrong-doing? Already, some critics of the disease concept are pointing a finger at Michael Deaver, the former White House aide on trial for perjury, who now is telling the world that he's an alcoholic. If Deaver can successfully argue that he should be excused for lying because he was sick, critics worry that alcoholism will be used to condone all sorts of illegal acts.*

A bit later in the article, this subject is again brought up.

*The idea that alcoholism is a sickness isn't new. Benjamin Rush, a Philadelphia physician who signed the Declaration of Independence, concluded that alcohol was a drug and habitual drunkenness involuntary. He saw only one cure: Total abstinence. But the view that alcoholics weren't sick but sinful persisted in American society until well into this century. In 1957, a landmark resolution by the American Medical Association declared alcoholism a disease. Later came this definition from the AMA: "Alcoholism is an illness characterized by preoccupation with alcohol and loss of control over its consumption such as to lead usually to intoxication if drinking is begun, by chronicity, by progression, and by tendency toward relapse."*

*... A recent Gallup Poll found 87 percent of those interviewed endorsing the disease concept ...*

The article goes on to say that many recent medical studies have not only tended to confirm the notion that alcoholism is a disease, but have even given some support for the idea that the disease is hereditary, i.e., that the disease gives evidence of a genetic defect.

Some time ago a rather interesting article appeared in *Christianity Today* in which a medical doctor spoke of his ex-

perience with those who came to him with drinking problems (May 17, 1985). He speaks of the fact that when he first entered the medical profession, he treated those with drinking problems as he would any medical patient; i.e., he treated the physical problems which resulted from overdrinking without giving too much thought about the drinking itself.

However, after several years he was converted and began to consider drunkenness in the light of Scripture. He took the position that drunkenness is a sin which must be confessed and repented of, which confession and repentance would lead (in his judgment) to a complete end to the problem. He tells his readers that, while he witnessed to many of his patients and even was instrumental in bringing some of them to repentance and confession, as well as membership in the church, he had absolutely no success in helping these people cease drinking. He could not even count one person who had stopped drinking as a result of this approach.

Without entering into the controversy itself concerning the question of alcoholism being a disease or a sin, he said that only when he sought the help of professional counsellors and organizations to work with drunks did he see some of these people overcome their habitual drunkenness. The gist of his story seemed to be that he finally learned that, at least in some respects, drunkenness is a sickness which requires professional as well as spiritual care.

The question has many ramifications. To return to the article from *U.S. News and World Report* mentioned above, even unbelievers are concerned about the question.



"The disease concept is a wonderful cop-out for society," says Robin Room, director of the Alcohol Research Group at the Medical Research Institute of San Francisco. "It says that there's normal drinking and there's alcoholic drinking and if you're not an alcoholic you don't have to worry." The disease concept, argues Room, "was the compromise that the alcoholism movement in the 1940s and '50s had to make to get any attention. They were saying, 'Look, we're not trying to dash the cup from your lips. We're just trying to get help for alcoholics.'"

One scholar who thinks this effort is misguided is Herbert Fingarette, an expert on addiction at the University of California at Santa Barbara and author of an upcoming book, *Heavy Drinking: The Myth of Alcoholism as a Disease*. The government's legal brief in the VA case often turns to Fingarette to back the view that alcoholism is a behavior problem. Scientific studies have yet to show, he says, that alcoholics cannot willfully quit drinking. "We have cultural beliefs about alcohol, and one is that if you drink, you become less responsible for what you are doing," Fingarette says. "Alcoholism is a label and it shouldn't be a blanket excuse for anything."

If the issue has to be decided on scientific grounds, the question is obscure and all the evidence is by no means in. A decision will have to be postponed. But the Scriptures have a surprisingly lot to say about drunkenness, and certainly the testimony of the Scriptures on this question will have to be consulted.

We are nearly out of space in this issue, and will reserve a further discussion of this question to next time. But a couple of remarks ought to be made by way of conclusion.

In the first place, I hesitate to use the term alcoholism. It seems to be a loaded term which already presupposes that problem drinking is a disease. The Bible does not use the term and it may be one of those euphemisms which we are so fond of inventing, which are less direct words, which soften the harshness of a more direct term, but which

often have implicit in them some sort of erroneous notion. Alcoholism is probably one such term. It is less direct than drunkenness; it takes some of the sting away when problem drinking is called alcoholism rather than drunkenness and when a person with such a problem is called an alcoholic rather than a drunk; but it also seems to carry the freight of presupposing that the whole problem is medical rather than moral; that it involves a disease rather than a sin.

In the second place, if we must conclude (and on the basis of Scripture no alternative seems possible) that drunkenness is a sin, does this necessarily mean that repentance and confession are sufficient to free one from the sin and to bring one to complete and trouble-free sobriety? We shall have to take a look at that question in so far as we are able. □

From Down  
Under

## From Our Sister Church In New Zealand

"My soul doth magnify the Lord, And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour," Luke 1:46, 47.

Our hearts experienced this blessed doxology of praise when the days of fulfillment of God's promises dawned upon us. The time of waiting for this was long and often frustrating; nevertheless in God's own time doors

were opened so that Rev. Miersma and his family were enabled to settle among us.

As the day of their arrival (January 15, 1988) fell during our summer holidays, most members were able to meet the Miersma family at the point of their arrival, although the time of reaching Wellington was delayed for several hours.



An eagerness to labour among us and also past experience of living in New Zealand soon made the Miersmas feel at home after overcoming initial jet lag.

The highlight of having our own minister came when Rev. Miersma was formally installed among us by Rev. Heys on Sunday, 14 February, 1988. The text chosen for this solemn occasion was taken from 1 Peter 5:2 and 3; and the sermon was entitled "Called To Feed God's Flock." Our small numbers were greatly increased at this occasion, owing to a welcome influx of visitors — some from nearby, but also some from Australia, and several from our sister churches in the United States.

We tremble at the thought of having the truth of God's Word entrusted to us. God's gift comes with His admonition, "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip," Hebrews 2:1. We are reminded here that to attain unto the truth never comes to us in an easy way; rather we see it as running through a battlefield of strife and opposition. Likewise the safeguarding of the truth; also this is so easily lost if we become complacent in our outlook.

We now look forward to a strengthening of the ties of spiritual affinity existing between our churches. With Rev. Miersma in our midst, we trust that this

kinship may further develop. We also trust that his stay among us receives approval from on high as together we strive for the honour and glory of that only Name given whereby we must be saved.

We covet the prayers of like-minded saints and convey Christian greetings to all who supported us as the body of Christ our Saviour in this part of His creation.

On behalf of the session of the Protestant Reformed Church of New Zealand, -B. van Herk. □

[Editor's Note: We rejoice with the little flock in New Zealand, and we wish them and the Rev. Miersma God's richest blessings. Don't forget to let *The Standard Bearer* hear from you from time to time. HCH]

## Contribution

# Ichabod!

Two monkeys sat in a coconut tree. Said one to the other "What think ye we be?"

Did man come from us, or is that a lie? If that's not the case, then I will defy.

Those teachers at Calvin who are making a fool, Not only of us, but of also their School:-

Where God's Word in truth was formerly taught, But now it's debunked; why with error 'tis fraught.

That's what those teachers stand up and say, And drum into their students from day to day."

Where will it all end, like Princeton\* of old? Yes, it just

may be that of their story re-told.

This is so sad — it makes the saints weep To think that the School has taken that leap.

From God's Truth to error, from honor to shame, For the die has been cast, and who is to blame?

The preachers; the teachers; the School Board's wit. But of one thing be sure: — it comes from the pit.

\*Princeton Seminary

Katherine A. Clark  
February 20, 1988 □



---

*All Around Us*  
Gise J. Van Baren

---

# Jimmy Swaggart Who Must Educate Our Children

## Jimmy Swaggart

Much has been written, many news broadcasts have been presented on that charismatic, Jimmy Swaggart. After being caught in immoral activity, he made his emotional confession of sin before the whole world. The *Christian News*, Feb. 29, 1988, takes this event as opportunity to warn against the false views of the charismatics.

*Some good may come out of all the publicity being given to Jimmy Swaggart if tongues speaking charismatics finally wake up and recognize that the modern charismatic movement is contrary to Holy Scripture. Many of them contend that if a person has the "gift of tongues" and "healing" and if God speaks to him directly, then surely he must be proclaiming the truth.*

*Of course, even some clergymen who claim to be orthodox, have been involved in grievous sin. However, charismatics and Pentecostals have long had more than their share of preachers who've been caught in such sins as Bakker's and Swaggart's.*

*Now is the time for charismatics to re-evaluate their movement. The Christian News Encyclopedia has plenty of articles by a good number of theologians in its section on the charismatic movement which show that the modern charismatic movement is anti-scriptural.*

*More should have listened to the American Council of Christian Churches when it declared last year in a convention resolution that "The public needs to be warned that Jim Bakker, Jimmy Swaggart, Oral Roberts, Kenneth Copeland and other-television evangelists, who have claimed to speak in Bible tongues, are false religious leaders who need to be Scripturally exposed by God's people." . . .*

*Swaggart is one of the many charismatics who claim that God speaks to them directly. Swaggart says God told him: "I have appointed this Ministry, as I have appointed no other Ministry, to help gather the harvest. You must do it by television. This is the only way that millions can be reached in a short period of time; and they must be reached . . . This Ministry is the only one I have anointed to reach the whole world —*

*and television is the only way to get it done" (Christian News, March 2, 1987, p. 18).*

*. . . The unscriptural theology of these charismatic TV evangelists is more dangerous than the lifestyle of such charismatics as Swaggart, Bakker, Gorman, "Miss" Kathryn Kuhlmann, Aimie Sempel McPherson, etc. . . .*

The daily papers have reported that the local Assemblies of God body decreed that Swaggart be forbidden the pulpit for a period of three months. After being instructed by the national body controlling the Assemblies of God churches to reconsider this apparently mild sentence, they responded that this decision was dictated by the Spirit to them. However, subsequently the national body has determined that Swaggart must be barred from the pulpit for a year. Swaggart intends to ignore the ruling of the national body. The whole affair threatens to divide the Assemblies of God churches. The *Christian News* rightly points out that the charismatic views themselves are called into question in these sad affairs. When one relies on the "revelation of the Spirit" directly to chosen individuals, then each determines for himself what is the truth. The church, however, is called to know the infallible Scriptures and learn the revelations of the Spirit through those alone.

---

Gise J. Van Baren is pastor of the Protestant Reformed Church of Hudsonville, Michigan.



The Grand Rapids Press, April 8, 1988, reported:

"We believe that to stay out of the public for a year would totally destroy the television ministry and greatly adversely impact the college," Swaggart said.

"Because of the nature of this situation, we are forced to take a position that does not answer all of the questions nor solve all of the problems. But we feel we have no alternative or choice," he said.

"Therefore, I must regretfully withdraw from the Assemblies of God, understanding that they will have no choice except to dismiss me from the fellowship, since I am presently not in good standing with the fellowship."

This raises another serious problem. There is here evidently a personality cult. When the ministry of the Word stands or falls with a man, one can question whether this is *proper* and *true* ministry of the Word. Jimmy Swaggart appears to believe that he is indispensable to that ministry — and perhaps he is. But then, is not this ministry one which is of man, and not of God?

### Who Must Educate Our Children?

A reader recently submitted an article from *Today's Banner* which points to the continuing debate concerning the instruction of the children. The article begins:

The decision of Judge Brevard Hand in the "Alabama Textbook Case" resulted in a great deal of public attention on religion and education . . . .

Informed observers who have followed the church/state/education controversy for the last 50 years must concede that we are at a crossroads. For instance, the theory of the Jaffree case asserted that if the Court was going to keep religion out of the schools, then it had a duty to keep all religions out of the school. By forcing the issue of secular humanism as a religion, it was thought that the courts would recognize the absurdity of barring religion from the public schools.

It was hoped that the courts would permit public schools to teach at least the role of religion in this country's history and balance a Judeo-Christian world view with that of a humanistic world view in other non-historical textbooks.

The idea was to change the system itself by giving Christians equal time in the textbooks. It was not an individualistic approach.

Mozert, on the other hand, in the Tennessee textbook case, voiced the opposite strategy. It attempted to find a right by which an individual parent could object to a given textbook and suggest a substitute reader. The school system would not be required to change its entire curriculum, nor to discard all of its textbooks, but merely make an accommodation to an individual parent who happened to object.

The basis for both of these strategies lay in the First Amendment and both of these cases were filed in federal courts. Jaffree was an established-clause case, while Mozert was a free-exercise case.

Like a moth is drawn to the candle flame, so the courts are drawn in these cases to assert their first and foremost controlling proposition. That controlling proposition, without fail, is that the state has the responsibility to direct the education of children . . . .

The article presents the author's own opinion to which, for the most part, we could subscribe:

A new strategy to rise above this confusion and judicial bickering is required. A strategy which challenges the fundamental assertion that the state has authority to direct the education of children, and that it has authority over their minds and the manner in which they are to think.

The wholesale rejection of the original authority of parents to direct the education and upbringing of their children must be protested and challenged.

It is parents, not the state, who are endowed by their Creator with the unalienable right to direct the education and upbringing of their children free from state interference, regulation or control. This is among the most fundamental of our liberties.

Be aware that the state, whether this is our nation or individual state itself, is seeking increasing control over the instruction of all children — including our own. One sees little prospect of this changing. We will face growing problems, too, in this regard. All this represents one more sign of the nearness of the end of time. □

## Distinctive Traits Of True Godliness: A Serious Attitude About Our Sin

*In His Fear*  
Arie den Hartog

Arie den Hartog is pastor of the Protestant Reformed Church of Randolph, Wisconsin.

In a series of articles, we are considering some of the distinctive traits of true godliness. These traits must be evident in every

true child of God. If we call ourselves children of God, we must be very concerned that we manifest in our whole life these



marks. We must adorn the doctrine of God which we confess with a life of true godliness. Only then will our life bring praise and glory to the name of our God. Many today who call themselves Christians lack the marks of true godliness. Our land is full of professing Christians. At least some churches are growing by the thousands. We see today in our land larger churches than perhaps ever before in our history. Large and beautiful buildings are being built, with the most modern and elaborate facilities imaginable. But in spite of all of this, there is a grievous decline in true godliness in our land, and even in our own churches. There is a growing toleration of all kinds of evil and wickedness. Few churches are today still faithful in the exercise of Christian discipline. There is much which has the form of godliness but denies the power thereof. Lest we judge only those who are without, we must begin by examining our own selves, whether we manifest the marks of true godliness. If this is not true, then we will put to shame the blessed and glorious doctrine of salvation which the Lord in His grace has given us.

A serious attitude about sin is certainly one of the chief marks of the truly godly man. No one who knows anything at all about the Bible and real Christianity will deny this. The profound knowledge and conviction of sin is the first evidence of the work of the grace and Spirit of God in the hearts of His people. As the child of God grows in His faith and knowledge of the Word of God, he does not become less, but rather more conscious of the awfulness of sin. How many who call themselves Christians today lack this great mark of true godliness. Ours is a day of shallowness and superficiality.

Though there is very much preaching, even through the means of radio, television, and tape recordings, there is still a grievous lack of knowledge. Little is known of the great doctrines of God and of the doctrines of sin and grace. There is little knowledge of how awful sin really is in the sight of God. Consequently, there is little genuine repentance and conversion to God which leads to true godliness. Many Christians imagine that their sins are largely a matter of a past life which can be left behind and forgotten. These imagine that after they became Christians they ceased to be sinners. There is therefore little need for dwelling on the matter of sin. Christians who do this are judged to be unnecessarily morose and morbid. Christ had died for all our sins on the cross, and that means we no longer need at all to be concerned about our sins. The Christian life is to be one only of joy and happiness, of success and prosperity. When the so-called Christian of our day does fall into sin, he need not be overly troubled. Forgiveness is cheap and easily obtained again. Many imagine that their sins are actually very few. Some imagine that they are so close to perfection that they can actually go for days and weeks without any known sin. The common notion is that all men are basically good. God loves us all and has a wonderful plan for us all. He only feels sorry for us if we fall into sin, and easily overlooks that sin. Let no man judge anyone else. Since we are all sinners and all fall now and then, it is not so serious, really. The Christian who does fall into sin should by no means be judged or even admonished. He should only be pitied and told of God's free forgiveness. The world we live in is a wonderful place. It is getting better all the time. We are here

to enjoy the world and all of its pleasures. We can join hands together to serve the Lord and accomplish great things for God. Who would deny that this is the current mentality of the modern day world of Christendom? How very far this all is from true godliness.

The modernists have done a lot to do away with the seriousness of sin. These have attempted to wed a semblance of Christianity with modern day humanistic philosophy and worldly psychology. Man is no longer a sinner, but rather he is sick and must be healed through counseling and rehabilitation by some professional doctor. Some of these modernists even scoff at the idea of sin and the judgment of God. These are all old fashioned and irrelevant concepts that we must get rid of especially when they contradict our modern thinking. Every man has the freedom and right to live as he pleases. Who are we to condemn another? As far as what the Bible says about sin and evil and judgment, all of that is considered to be from a bygone age. Besides the Bible is subject to thousands of different interpretations. Everyone is free to interpret it as he pleases and to live his life as he sees fit. The highest of all moral principles for many modernists is the principle that everyone has the right to do what is good in his own eyes. But this is the very lie of the devil by which he brought the whole world into sin. The modern Christian imagines that he can continue in the grossest immorality and still be the object of the favor and love of God. His conscience is so hardened to sin that he knows very little about its seriousness.

The true child of God evidences the mark of godliness with a grave and serious attitude about sin. He is profoundly conscious of how dreadful sin is, not



only the sin that he sees in the world in which he lives, but also his own continuing sinfulness before God. The true child of God is ashamed of his sin. He deeply humbles himself before God, he weeps and laments over his sin. He loathes and abhors himself continually before God. He smites his breast every time he comes into the presence of his God and cries out: "God be merciful to me, the sinner." When he considers the awful holiness of God he says with great fear and trembling: "Woe is me, for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of the people of unclean lips," Isaiah 6:5. When he falls into great sin, he says in shame and amazement: "Behold I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me," Psalm 51:5. As the Christian struggles against his sinful nature and finds that he is so very weak to overcome the great power of sin within himself, he cries out: "Oh wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" (Romans 7:24) How terribly foreign and strange all this kind of language is to many who today call themselves Christians.

The knowledge of the seriousness of sin begins with a right knowledge of God and a true love for Him. Godliness, we must remember, involves first of all our attitude and relationship to God. This is suggested by the very English word itself. We will only have a serious attitude concerning our sin if first we have a profound knowledge of the awesome, perfect, infinite holiness and righteousness of God. We will be serious about our sin if we love that God and hate our sin as much as He hates our sin. Sin is an abomination unto the Lord. That word means

that he strongly hates sin. He hates sin with all of the infinite fury of His holy being. If He did not hate sin, then He would not be God at all. Because He hates sin He will judge the sinner with a most terrible judgment. Our sins are so very serious because they are first of all against God. That is even far more terrible than all the evil many of our sins cause to our fellow man. Our sins are a violation of the holy majesty of God. In our sins we are rebels and enemies of God. In our sins we transgress His holy commandments. If we truly love God, we will have a profound hatred for our sins. We will certainly not take them lightly.

We will have a serious attitude about our sins if we know all that our sins really involve. Anyone who imagines that sin is merely a matter of a few sinful deeds and falls will never have a serious attitude about his sin. If man's nature remains good after the fall, then he is still able in his own strength to overcome his sin. We know the seriousness of sin when we know the awful depravity of our nature. Sin is so terrible because it corrupts the whole of our nature, and out of that corrupt nature proceeds all sorts of evil deeds. The fall has left us by nature wholly incapable of doing any good and enslaved to the devil.

We will have a serious attitude about our sin if we always remember and realize that sin makes us guilty and damnable before God. Except by the grace and mercy of God we deserve the eternal judgment of hell because of our sins. We are not able to do anything at all to atone for the guilt of our sins and deliver ourselves from the wrath and judgment of God. We only every day increase the guilt of our sin and our worthiness of judgment and wrath.

More than anything else, the Christian sees the great seriousness of sin when He remembers the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ. With shame and utter humility we stand before the cross. We realize that all of the terrible anguish and torment which Jesus bore on the cross was on account of the awfulness of our sin. As the Christian stands before the cross, he cries out in amazement; "how dreadful, how unspeakably terrible was our sin that it could only be atoned for through the great sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ."

At the cross we see also the amazing wonder of the love and mercy of God that saves us from all our sins. Through the cross we have been delivered from all the horrors of hell and judgment. By His death on the cross, Jesus has merited for us perfect and everlasting righteousness. He has made us worthy of the everlasting favor and blessing of God. Profoundly moved by our remembrance of the cross, it is impossible that true children of God can be careless about their sin.

We have a serious attitude about sin because we know that as Christians we still sin daily. We bear with us until the day of our death our corrupt, sinful nature in the old man of sin. From that nature still proceed many awful sins. Sin is still the power of the devil in us, from which we can only be daily delivered through the grace and Spirit of Christ. Our daily sins and weaknesses are grievous in the sight of our God and Savior. The true child of God is profoundly conscious of the reality of his continual sinfulness. He knows that he is still very far from loving God perfectly with all his heart and soul and strength and mind. He knows that God indeed requires such perfect love. Because the true child of God loves God and loves



the Savior Jesus Christ for His great salvation, therefore he is earnestly desirous to love God perfectly. Therefore he also grieves over any sin that remains in him. The more the child of God grows in his faith, the more conscious and sensitive he is towards the seriousness of sin. He knows that God hates every evil motive, lust, and purpose of his heart. He is grieved not only over gross outward wicked deeds but also over his thoughts of pride and enmity and unclean desire and covetousness. He hates every one of them.

Therefore the child of God is serious about sin. He knows the need of daily confession and repentance before God. He knows that sin is a very terrible power, having its origin in the

devil. He knows that when he does not confess his sin before God, he will be separated from God, and interrupt the operation of His favor and love. He knows that if he continues in sin, that sin will have very serious consequences for his life. The godly man is one who therefore daily, in deep humility, cries out for the mercy of God and for the strength of His grace to fight against and overcome the sin that still remains in him. He finds the daily need to go to the cross of Christ Jesus.

The truly godly man is serious about the great sin and wickedness that he sees in the world. He does not foolishly imagine that the world is getting better and that he can somehow join himself with the world. On the

contrary, he knows that as the Word of God prophesies, the world is getting worse and worse. Therefore it is necessary always for the child of God to separate himself spiritually from the world and to flee its evil lusts. The child of God knows how extremely dangerous the temptations of the world and the devil are for his own soul. He steadfastly refuses to join the wicked world in its wicked entertainment and corruption of sin. He earnestly desires to keep himself pure and holy. He longs to be finally delivered out of this sinful world and to be finally presented holy and without blame before His Father in heaven.

We have outlined something of what it means to have a serious attitude about our sins. Is this great distinguishing mark of true godliness evident in you? ☐

---

## Book Review

---

**Toward Rediscovering The Old Testament**, Walter C. Kaiser, Jr.; Grand Rapids, Mich., Zondervan Publishing House; 250 pp. (hard cover), \$17.95 [reviewed by Prof. H.C. Hoeksema]

This is, as far as its purpose is concerned, a book after my heart. The title presupposes that the Old Testament has been lost. The meaning, of course, is not that the Old Testament Scriptures themselves have been lost, but rather that the Old Testament has been largely lost in the teaching and preaching of what is broadly classified as the Evangelical world. Perhaps the

latter characterization is not true of us in the Reformed tradition; at least I hope it is not. However, I do believe that the Old Testament does not receive sufficient attention in our preaching and teaching. The same is true to no little extent as far as the understanding of the Scriptures is concerned among our people generally. When I note sometimes the ignorance with respect to simple Old Testament facts and truths, I sometimes wonder how much attention the Old Testament receives in our personal and family reading and study of the Scriptures. Have we to some ex-

tent lost the good practice of reading through the entire Scriptures in our family devotions? I would not want to make the matter of Old Testament preaching and study a matter of a mathematical formula, but do you realize that the Old Testament constitutes more than three-fourths of Holy Scripture?

This work by Dr. Kaiser, Old Testament professor at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, is not an ordinary Old Testament Introduction. Nor is it a hermeneutics book with special reference to the Old Testament.



As the author himself states, he has set out "to describe how Christians may once again find meaning, relevance, and direction from that part of the canon that all too many believers all too frequently have summarily rejected as a source of any Christian guidance for faith or life. This mental and literary block is not limited to the laity; it probably exists in more massive proportions among the clergy, many of whom would do almost anything — yea, would rather die — than attempt to teach or preach from an Old Testament passage."

Here is a sample of some of the chapters: The OT As Part Of The Canon, The OT As The Promise-Plan of God, The OT As A Messianic Primer, The OT As The Plan Of Salvation. In Chapter 7 the author addresses the following questions: 1) Is the Authority of the OT Limited Only to What the NT Repeats or Modifies from the OT? 2) What Is the Relationship of the Law to OT Promise? 3) How Can Christians Derive Principles From the Specific Commands of the Law?

Without going into details in this review, I may say that I do not agree with the author at all points. But I would rather emphasize the positive this time, in the hope that reading a book like this will stimulate further study of and thinking about the Old Testament.

This book is not only for ministers. But whoever reads it will have to put on his thinking-cap.

Recommended. □

---

## News From Our Churches

---

Ben Wigger

May 1, 1988

At a special congregational meeting following the evening service on Sunday, March 27, the congregation of the First P.R.C. in Grand Rapids, Michigan called Rev. Ronald Van Overloop to become our second missionary to Jamaica. With him on that trio were the Revs. Haak and Gritters.

The congregation of the Hope P.R.C. of Isabel, S.D. called Rev. Bekkering to be their pastor. With him on that trio were the Revs. Woudenberg and Houck. However, due to the difficulties that Pastor Bekkering is dealing with at the present time, he informed Hope that he could not consider their call at this time. Since that letter from Pastor Bekkering, Hope has formed a new trio consisting of the Revs. Koole, Woudenberg, and Houck.

Rev. Kortering has declined the call he received from the First P.R.C. of Holland, Michigan.

Two items from the Pella P.R.C. in Pella, Iowa: first, the consistory gave its approval to Pastor Terpstra to begin a Young Peoples' Society for the purpose of studying the Bible and other current issues. On March 20 the Y.P.S. met for the first time and began a study of "The Signs of the Times" in Matthew 24. And second, the Building Committee was given authority to begin investigating possible plans for a new or different church building, because of the poor and deteriorating condition of their present building.

Due to the fact that the steeple of the Kalamazoo P.R.C. in Kalamazoo, Michigan is now paid for, the consistory there has decided the collection that was

---

*Ben Wigger is an elder in the Protestant Reformed Church of Hudsonville, Michigan.*



assigned for this cause will now be used to raise funds for some new Psalters.

The Council of the South Holland P.R.C. in South Holland, Ill. has appointed a Building Committee to investigate the possibility of enlarging the church parking lot, remodeling the balcony, erecting a new sign, updating the present parking lot lights, and adding additional rooms.

The proposal for remodeling the sanctuary of the Southeast P.R.C. in Grand Rapids, Michigan, was given unanimous approval by their congregation in late March. The project will begin as soon as materials can be ordered and received and should be completed by the end of May. It was also announced at this congregational meeting that a member of their congregation, who wished to remain anonymous, had offered to finance, without interest, the cost of air conditioning the sanctuary, additional cost for the narthex, and the cost of remodeling the sanctuary.

The Building Committee of the First P.R.C. in Holland, Michigan invited members in the congregation to meet together on March 31 to paint their parsonage.

All adults of the Grandville P.R.C. in Grandville, Michigan, were invited to Covenant Chr. High gym for an evening of fun and fellowship. Pizza was ordered and a good time was had by all who attended.

On April 4 the Young People of First Church in Grand Rapids, Michigan sponsored a family roller-skating party at the Woodland Sport Center.

This past Easter season many of our churches held special programs in commemoration of the death and resurrection of our Lord and Savior. The choir of the

Loveland P.R.C. in Loveland, Colo. sponsored an Easter Singspiration. A free-will offering was taken for their new church kitchen. Likewise the young people of the Doon P.R.C. in Doon, Iowa sponsored an Easter Singspiration.

The choir of the Hudsonville P.R.C. in Hudsonville, Michigan gave their usual fine effort on the Sunday before Easter. The Hope P.R.C. choir gave their Easter program a week later on Easter Sunday. The choir of Covenant Christian High School presented a Lent-Easter concert March 20 at the Hudsonville P.R.C. And the congregation of Pella P.R.C. in Pella, Iowa, was encouraged to stay for a half-hour of singing and special numbers.

On Thursday, March 24, the students of Adams Street Christian School presented their all-school program at First Church in Grand Rapids. And on Friday, March 25, Covenant Christian School in Lynden, Washington gave their annual spring program.

All those of 16 years and older in the Byron Center P.R.C. in Byron Center, Michigan, were urged to come to an evening that was advertised as a church potluck and volleyball night, March 29. Since for a short time yet Byron Center meets in a school gym for Sunday services, they have the distinction of being able to eat and play volleyball in their church auditorium.

A parting shot taken from *Across the Aisle* of First Church in Grand Rapids:

"Postage stamps are getting more expensive, but at least they have one attribute that most of us could emulate: they stick to one thing until they get there."

Several months ago I wrote to our sister church in New Zealand, requesting some facts that would allow me to put a profile of Wellington in our news column,

possibly around the time that Rev. Miersma was installed as their pastor.

The following information is a result of that request, and comes from Mr. B. van Herk, clerk of Wellington's session, for which I thank him.

"Some dates and events in the lead-up to the establishment of the Protestant Reformed Church in New Zealand,

"The early nineteen fifties saw large numbers of Dutch immigrants coming to this country. Among those coming from Reformed backgrounds, only a small number joined themselves with the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand. The vast majority, however, established their own church under the name of Reformed Church of NZ. The first six churches came into being in 1953 under the guidance and direction of two ministers brought out from the G.K.N. churches in the Netherlands. As the majority of church members came from this church, it became apparent that help and guidance was sought from this denomination. As the newly established church also favoured a quick assimilation in the New Zealand way of life, efforts were made to attract also ministers from English-speaking churches compatible with the Reformed faith. The result of this was that for many years hereafter we saw ministers from the C.R.C. of U.S.A. and O.P.C. of U.S.A., serving the Reformed Church of NZ.

"This diversity of ministry also caused some minor divisions in this denomination. The question of Sabbath observance was hotly debated, and a gravamen against the teaching of the Westminster Confession of Faith was a regular feature on the agenda of Synod for many years hereafter.



# THE STANDARD BEARER

P.O. Box 6064  
Grand Rapids, MI 49506

## SECOND CLASS

Postage Paid at  
Grand Rapids, Michigan

"The late sixties and early seventies saw new controversies arising in the church, mostly caused by the writings of Prof. Runia, who at that time taught theology at the Reformed Theological College in Geelong, Australia, to which the Reformed Church of NZ owned allegiance.

"It was those writings which drew the attention of Prof. Hoeksema who, as editor of *The Standard Bearer*, responded to this in several editions during those years. It was from those years onward that a permanent relationship was established between a small core group and the P.R.C. in the U.S.A. Through all those years Hope Church in Grand Rapids provided us with a tape ministry.

"The year 1975 was the year of the first personal contact. Prof. & Mrs. Hoeksema and also Rev. C. Hanko visited us on their round-the-world trip. The public lecture held by Prof. Hoeksema at that time was the occasion that one of our present members became for the first time acquainted with us. Rev. Van Overloop became our next personal contact. After that came Rev. Heys, who by now has visited us at four different times.

"Our geographic position is still reason for concern. Because of this, two of our families are deprived of attending our worship services on the Lord's Day,

and are dependent on the tape ministry.

"With Rev. and Mrs. Heys having left our shores again, we now look forward to the arrival of our pastor's personal possessions and books in order to be provided with the tools for the ministry; God graciously providing him with His Spirit."

Mr. B. van Herk also provides some statistical information along with this brief profile which you also might find interesting.

Presently Wellington has a total of 7 families, with 17 communicant members, and a total membership of 23. Their consistory consists of 2 elders and 1 deacon. There are also 4 members who attend catechism and there are 8 who make up the membership of the Adult Bible Study Group.

Divine services are held at 11 AM and 7 PM on Sunday.

Following are the names, addresses, and phone numbers of various men who make up the Session of the P.R.C. of New Zealand.

Church — Protestant Reformed Church of New Zealand  
(c/o Lutheran Church Cnr. Walter St. and Oxford TCE. Lower Hutt.)

Pastor —

Rev. Rodney Miersma  
21 Main Road  
Wainuiomata, New Zealand  
Phone — 011-64-4-646-129

Clerk —

B. van Herk  
66 Fraser St.  
Wainuiomata, New Zealand  
Phone — 011-64-4-647-687

Treasurer —

R.J. Kane (Bulletin Clerk)  
18 Baffin Grove  
Kingston Heights  
Wellington 2, New Zealand  
Phone — 011-64-4-894-922 □

## ATTENTION STUDENTS!

The Protestant Reformed Scholarship Fund Committee is taking applications for scholarships to be awarded to future Protestant Reformed ministers and teachers for the 1988-89 school year. Each applicant must also submit an essay of at least three hundred words, presenting a defense of the Bible's infallibility in the context of theistic evolution. For an application, contact Dirk Westra, 7960 Ronson, Jenison, MI 49428. The application, accompanied by the essay, must be returned by June 1, 1988.

## RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

The consistory and the congregation of the Hull Protestant Reformed Church of Hull, Iowa, extends their Christian sympathy to our fellow office-bearer, Elder Ray Brunsting and family in the death of his sister, MISS RUTH BRUNSTING of Grand Rapids, Michigan.

"I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help. My help cometh from the Lord, which made heaven and earth." (Psalm 121:1, 2)

Rev. R. Moore, President  
Egbert Gritters, Clerk