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LOOKING forward

GERALD KUIPER

The New Year is here, and another year of rapid human achievement is history. In the past twenty years the scientific advance of the world has been much more rapid than any period of that length before, and the next twenty years will undoubtedly surpass the period through which we have just passed.

New inventions which hardly seemed possible twenty-five years ago, are coming into the scene now. The year Nineteen Hundred and Sixty One will be remembered as the year man entered outer space, and possibly opened a great new sphere of exploration. A new machine is almost completed through which one man can speak, and his voice will immediately be translated to many other languages with his original expression. This indeed is a great step toward mutual understanding between nations. We see great progress in the invention of more powerful bombs, and other nuclear weapons with which men threaten each other.

How can we look ahead toward coming years without feeling a great fear? The nuclear weapons of the Allies and the Communists have more than enough power to destroy the world. We can see the breakage of the language barrier as possibly presenting another Babel, with one Anti-Christian power dictating to all. Indeed we can see the decline of the church in the eyes of the human race. Through our reading and relations with others, we can find a definite departure from the truth in the "Reformed Church." The constitutional principles of freedom of speech and religion mean to our modern nation, that many of the schools may not even read the Bible class because it might offend someone there. In Russia, the younger generation are rejecting the church leaving only the older people. How long will a church last with no hope of growth?

Although we are fearful, we must not, however, withdraw ourselves from the world. Although our place may seem small we must show the world that we live lives of glory to God. We must also tell of the glad tidings which we have in our hearts to all we possibly can. Our Lord tells us in Luke 11:35 when He is speaking of the last days, "Take heed therefore, that the light which is in thee be not darkness". The old proverb, "Don't hide your candle under a bushel" can certainly be applied to us as we anticipate the coming years.

As we look ahead we have reasons to believe that the end is nearing. We know from the Holy Scripture that when the gospel has been preached to all nations — then the end will come. We also hear daily of wars and rumors of wars. This is another sign of the end. We wonder how much deeper into iniquity the world can plunge. The time seems ripe for the end.

In the future the church will be persecuted for Christ's sake, so that only those who are true children of God will stand. We must, therefore, go to the Word of God and look forward with confidence. In Revelation 14:12 we read, "Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus". How wonderful it is that we can approach a fearful future with confidence, that we are numbered with God's children. The peace the world is seeking, we know will never come. But the peace we seek will come at the Lord's appointed time. We must have faith to believe what Jesus proclaims in Matthew 24:13, "But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved".

BEACON LIGHTS
This editorial is not my reply to Rev. H. C. Hoeksema, who brings his "reflections" on a previously printed article of mine to the attention of our readers elsewhere in this issue of Beacon Lights. This article is, quite naturally, my consequent thoughts on missions which should serve to point out to our young people some sound principles of this holy calling; principles which must be kept in mind as we develop and culture our mission zeal. I purposed to compose thoughts of this nature before my former article was even sent to the printer. And this intention was also expressed, as I recall distinctly, to the editor in chief of Beacon Lights. Besides, assurance of its forth-coming was promised to interested readers who agreed fully with my former editorial. Hence please disregard Rev. Hoeksema's careless charge when he says in effect, that I should have brought to the minds of our young people constructive criticism and positive instruction about the nature of mission activity, rather than stimulating an artificial mission zeal. By this time he knows that everything cannot be pressed into one editorial, and, he is acquainted with our editorial policy or "monthly alternation" in Beacon Lights.

But be that as it may, I surely didn't expect, nor fear, that a two month delay in the appearance of a subsequent essay on mission principles would serve to "rally some sort of flighty, unbalanced, heady mission enthusiasm..." as Rev. Hoeksema so boldly predicts an article as mine would arouse.

Now some basics on missions! Actually this is a gigantic but beautiful study. And many things unfortunately always go unsaid. Yet, to my mind, there are two chief, foundational principles of missions; that no church worthy of the name should leave slip into obscurity. The first is: the congregation of Christ Jesus is spontaneously performing missions. This is simply a fact, and is so since the church is a light in the midst of darkness. She is the regenerated in the midst of the unregenerated; she is that called out of darkness into his marvelous light. And her light is her spiritual life. How that light shines when the saints are gathered in worship! How that light shines when they retreat to their daily positions and stations in life: whether in the home or by the way! This is implied, beyond doubt, in the words of our Savior when he said, "Ye are the light of this world. A city set on a hill cannot be hid." Matt. 5:14. The church as light attracts, you see, and God certainly uses this means to bring sons and daughters to Himself.

But let us never stop here! An outgrowth from this glorious principle is the fruit-bearing branch. We mean to say, it is the calling of the church of Jesus Christ to let her light shine. 1) At home? yes, of course! God's people do this by being faithful in their duties toward kingdom labors in the midst, and in maintaining a good external deportment. Possibly in a limited sense you may call this an aspect of mission work. (2) Abroad? yes, of course! Our light must be shed abroad even unto the far regions of the earth. The latter is mission work in the most selected sense of the term. Specifically the mission-mandate refers to this.

Plainly therefore, missions is the work of God who through our Lord Jesus Christ and by His Spirit causes the glorious gospel of salvation to be brought before men so that the eternal purposes of God with respect to men might be realized. These always are two-fold: the church of Christ is gathered and the kingdom of Satan is rendered inexcusable. And we witness this too in mission work!

So the church is means and instrument in the hands of the Lord to gather his people, and then the church as she possesses that tool of all tools: the preaching of the Word. That Word means everything! Our Fathers observed this when in question 54 of our Heidelberg Catechism they tell us concerning the holy, catholic church, "that, out of the whole human race, from the beginning
to the end of the world, the Son of God, by his Spirit and Word, gathers, defends and preserves for Himself unto everlasting fe a chosen communion." As young people, you may always use this bit of confession as a commentary on missions. It certainly applies.

Now surely the man of God who is engaged in such labor must be called of Christ the Lord, something which involves the church, the community of believers. Most clearly this is outlined for us by the infallible Word when we read of Paul and Barnabas that as they ministered to the Lord in the church, the Holy Ghost said, "separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away."

Another thing! how is it possible to deny the effective guidance of the Spirit of Christ when the Word so expressly tells us of the Apostolic mission history, "after they were come to Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia: but the Spirit suffered them not?"

Perhaps it is not superfluous for me to remind our young people that these are a few basic principles of missions which we must bear in mind as being the very roots of any mission work.

The practical matters are another story. Naturally a host of questions arise when the church buses herself in this work. I have in mind these: how many men should be sent out? Where should missionaries be sent? How do we know if we are called to a "given" field? What emphasis must be placed on "fruit?" We could ask many more, but let these serve to arouse an interest in missions.

In the light of my former article, in which I call our young people to a greater zeal in mission work, it should not be surprising that I raise this question now: Why have we had such "little and limited" activity along these lines? What has held us back? Is it our Gospel? To this we reply negatively, no neither our method of preaching nor our content of preaching is to blame. Our churches, differing from a vast majority of churches, does not take recourse to an offer of salvation. And to many, missions is impossible without it, therefore men frequently cite this as a reason for our limited mission work and our retarded mission interest. It all comes down to this: if we as ministers cannot go to the mission field declaring, "come now, just as you are, you can!" then missions is impossible. But we disagree with this! Rather than offering salvation in our preaching, we confront men with the glorious gospel of salvation, we command men everywhere to repent and believe and we assure the unrepentant that he will die in his iniquity, while to the one who believes goes the promise that he shall not see death but live forevermore. Not we need no offer, which by the way, never does any good anyway since the natural man cannot "take" the riches of Christ by himself. Besides, the offer certainly leaves the impression to the hearer that he has a power in himself which he could put to use.

Neither does our "message" make missions impossible for us. We teach the whole Word of God both at home and abroad, never omitting certain great truths - always striving to keep them in their proper balance. Quite obviously our gospel is not at fault.

Possibly our mission efforts would double and consequently even flourish if, as churches, we placed DUE ACCENT on this heavenly task, and then in relation to other kingdom duties. Our laxity may be due to an "unbalanced approach" to our kingdom callings. Do we think as much of the mission field as the court room? Do we think as much of the mission field as the school building? These are very weighty questions which should be answered honestly, and of course, calmly and discerningly.

Several years ago (1955) I spoke for our Eastern Men's League in Hudsonville church. I spoke then on missions or evangelism. At that time I begged the gathering to give much support to missions and then in every way. I held before them the combined budgets of two of our own Christian schools, and the yearly budget of our mission program. And I compared them. To our shame, then already, there was scarcely any comparison. I pleaded for "more of a balance" assuring the men (as I want to do now again) that I am no enemy of our Christian schools by any means, but I feel if we can spend so many, many dollars for the schoolroom, then why not a few more dollars for the mission field? And take note,
since that day (1955) our educational costs have greatly risen but our mission budget has remained rather static. Possibly balanced budgeting will be an answer. More means will undoubtedly bring a new look to our mission front: mission machinery then will be in action, on the field.

And that unparalleled activity called prayer! Without it we have nothing.

Even in these critical days of perplexities and vacancies, let us not "shelve" our high calling of God: Go ye out into all the world and preach the gospel.

rev. a. mulder

TRUTH vs. ERROR

A HISTORY of the Jesuit Order

REV. R. C. HARBACH

(continued)

Its Principles

Laboring for the principle of the absolute authority of the pope in all realms of life, the Jesuits proceed on the basis that the papal ecclesiastical power is over every other power. The pope is the only real earthly power over all churches and over all governments. The pope is subject to no civil power. Roman officeholders under any civil government have their first responsibility not to that government, but to the pope, who is regarded as the divine head of that government. Allegiance to the country in which they are ostensibly citizens is only nominal, if it suits them; and often in the interests of the society they are indifferent to the welfare of their country, and even to its existence.

They were also strong advocates of Ultramontanism (from ultra montes, "beyond the mountains," i.e., the Alps from France and Germany into Italy, where the pope is settled). This is the philosophy of an Italian-Vatican-centered papacy. Its point of view is something like this: No infallible pope in Rome, no Roman Catholic Church; no Roman Catholic Church, no Christianity; no Christianity, no religion; no religion, no civilized society. Every society and civilization in the world, then, is regarded as stemming from the hub of the Vatican.

The society also assumes the right to stamp out all heresy, by force if necessary. Great efforts in this direction have been expended in the Roman Inquisition, by the King of Spain against the people of Holland, and the expulsion of the Huguenots from France. These persecutions were deemed necessary in order to stamp out the plain teaching of Scripture, which gives no credence to hierarchy, formalism or salvation by works of man. To further accomplish this dark purpose, when they "convert" the heathen to Rome, they by all means permit them to retain their heathenism, making no effort toward a change of their heart, life or moral character. No wonder the world began to ask sarcastically, Have the Jesuit converted the heathen? or the heathen the Jesuits?

Its Downfall in Europe

Great power and influence was gained through indefatigable ambition, and, as the society itself admits, by intrigue, by fomenting conspiracies, interfering in politics, becoming spying members of civil councils, enkindling wars, the doing of missionary work in the guise of civilians, going into seclusion under a change of name (even of nationality). What are the principles of this movement? It is difficult to say, because of the practice of so much secrecy, which they disavow, and the withholding of constitutions from the public eye, even from court scrutiny when subpoenaed by law. Much of their principles ceased to be published since 1672.

They were brought into disfavor because they were independent, intolerant of any but their own teaching and methods, forcing every other type of Romanism—Franciscan, Benedictine, Dominican, Vincentian, Paulist, Augustinian, Carmelite—into the narrow Jesuit form. They persisted in accommodating their brand of "Christianity" to the
heathenism of their converts, in meddling in politics to the extent of causing the nomination or appointing of public officials who would be acceptable to the order, in entering colonial trade and in forming colonial rule. They also incurred general disapprobation for their opposition to Jansenism, another movement in the Roman Catholic Church. The Jansenists had Augustinian tendencies, were inclined to the idea of salvation by grace, but were fought by the Jesuits who popularized the semi-Pelagian philosophy of salvation by self-effort. To avoid this opposition, the Augustinian monks do not hold Augustine's Augustinianism, i.e., his doctrine that salvation is according to the electing grace of God alone, and that good works are the fruit of election and grace.

The Jesuits were prosecuted and expelled from England by law under pain of death in 1579, 1581, 1584, 1586, 1602, 1604 and in 1829. They were expelled from Venice in 1606, from the Netherlands in 1622, from Paraguay in 1733, from Portugal in 1578, 1759, 1834, 1910; from France in 1594, were reinstated in 1603, only to be expelled again in 1764 through the influence of Mme. Pompadour. From Spain and Sicily they were expelled in 1767, but were reestablished in Spain in 1815 and reinstated with the possession of all their ancient property. The order was abolished by Pope Clement XIV in 1773, but was permitted in parts of Russia in 1776, and again in 1820. In 1806 the order was restored in the U.S.A. In 1814 it was restored officially throughout the world by Pope Pius VII. In 1872 it was expelled from Germany.

Its Part in Modern History

It was through Jesuit influence that in France the political alliance between the Catholic and the Conservatory party, as it was called, and the Facist-Royalist element was effected. Although in World War II Christendom battled Nazism, still it is undeniable that Romanism prepared the way for the enslaving dictatorship which was Fascism. The Roman Catholic Church went Facist, supporting the Italian hoodlum, Mussolini, and thus the basis for effective resistance to Hitler in Roman countries was destroyed. Romanism from old has fostered totalitarian government throughout the world. However, in our country, it is more popular for the order and the church to collaborate with democracy. In Germany, the Romish element demanded the intervention of the Reich to secure the right of the pope to be more than a "prisoner in the Vatican" and to stay in Rome and retain the city as his worldly dominion. It is history, too, that the pope made a concordat with Hitler.

It is a Jesuit tactic to make Romanism look as though it is the happy mean between two horrible extremes. To be the only way off the horns of a dilemma. For example, in Europe there were, politically, the Communists on the left, and liberals and radicals on the right. The "Catholic" (Romanist) parties represented the conservatives in the middle. Ignorant Protestants have been thus maneuvered into accepting the lesser of the existing evils. That is, they were led to believe that Romanist dominance would be better than Communist or Nazi dominance. However, history shows that such Romish countries as Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland, Germany, Italy, Spain, Mexico and South America are all characterized by leanings toward dictatorship, and contain strong roots of feudalism in their social structures.

In this connection, we may say that the public school movement was established to prevent the whole of education from falling entirely into the hands of the Jesuits who come as agents of education. Public schools were established in Europe as the result of the French Revolution and the conquests of Napoleon. France's National Convention, the new "republic" which destroyed the old Bourbon monarchy, also tried to destroy the Roman Catholic Church, but failed. Members of the hierarchy refused to recognize the "republic." Napoleon was the kind of ruler who would use whatever religion was in power to gain his own ends. He said, "If I had to govern a nation of Jews, I would rebuild Solomon's temple." Since he governed a nation largely Romish, he conciliated the Romanists. (Although while he was in Egypt he became a Mohammedan.) By his concordat of 1801 the papacy was forced to compromise to the point of accepting the new "republic", and of agreeing to the principle of freedom of religion. The schools had been under control of the Romish church. Napoleon re-established them.
under the control of the new "republic." Freedom to be Roman Catholic he could tolerate, but not Jesuitism. "The recall of the Jesuits I will not permit! Let no one mention that idea to me again," he charged.

Its Apologetic

Since frequent and fierce charges incessantly have been lodged against the order throughout all its history, the society has deemed it necessary to defend itself with what it regards as certain irrefutable principles. Naturally, it would only be detrimental to their cause to flatly deny these charges, or to bear them with an injured tone. There must be an intelligent and effective apologetic employed. Hence, the principle that Jesuits are fallible is laid down. Is this an appeal to man's sense of logic? For the logic of it is something like this: All men are sinners (fallible). The Jesuits are men. Therefore the Jesuits are sinners (fallible). The implication is that even Jesuits are only human. The defense is "Tis human to err. There are, to be sure, some Jesuit writers, e.g., who must be censored and censured; yet it should be remembered that these are mere child's handful as compared to the well over one hundred thousand Jesuit writers, and so we must not judge an entire organization by a few of its rash members. Why should such an orthodox body as the Sanhedrin be condemned because a few of its members connived with Judas? However, it should be noted that the Sanhedrin was not a presbyterial, but a hierarchical order, and had no basis in the Jewish Old Testament, nor in the Christian New Testament. It was therefore not only extra-church, but extra-biblical, extra-scriptural and foreign to the interests of both Israel and the church. The Sanhedrin was established with a view to providing legal sanctuary for the church's enemies, to aid and abet their false teaching within the church, and through this means to permeate the church with what was considered a more modern philosophy.

Another principle of defense is, Consider the source (of the accusations). Charges of intellectual aberration coming from the imbecilic or the ignorant cannot have any weight. This would apply to an attack of atheists upon the religious society. The infidel state persecuted Christ. Dictators have ever hampered the church. The law of separation of church and state is a suppressive and oppressive imposition which only cripples and enslaves the hierarchy and the entire clergy. The implication is, Consider the source: these evils could only spring from democracy's horrible origin— from Rousseau and Voltaire. Nevertheless, a genuinely divine institution need not sound so affronted by man's judgment. One may, indeed, gain much insight by taking heed to the criticism of one's enemy. Only let not that enemy be the Word of God. For "there is one that accuseth you," "one that judgeth" . . . "the Word that I have spoken, the same shall judge in the last day" (John 5:45; 12:48). Nor is there any appeal from that judgment. We must always go back to that source. "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no light in them" (Isa. 8:20).

An additional principle is. Consider the times. It is true that not only heretics, but Roman Catholic membership have opposed the society, but this is understandable in the light of the times! They were times of knighthood and duelling, and even clerics became imbied with the pugnacity spirit of the day. After all, King David "brought out the people and cut them with saws and with axes" (I Chron. 20:3), and Protestantism has its extremist John Calvin. One wonders—would this not exonerate Judas? For was he not a product of the times, and of the Jewish political mind? But then would this not also condemn worthy men such as Luther and Christ Himself? Was not their doctrine of justification by faith alone apart from works a product of the times? a spirit of rebellion against the established religion? The truth is, men and societies must be judged not merely in the "light" of the times, or within the context of their dark ages, but in the white light of God's holiness and on the basis of His infallible Word.

Another thrust of defense is made in the principle, What do you expect? Why be so self-righteously shocked at the vilification and persecution heaped on the Jesuits? For do not politicians often elicit more censure, caricature and condemnation in mouth than all Jesuits do in a year? Why

(Continued on page 24)
JAMES DAVID JONKER

Born on August 8, 1939

Taken from us on December 26, 1961

In Memory of

JAMES JONKER

All of us associated with Beacon Lights mourn the sudden death of our friend and colleague, Jim Jonker. By a violent auto-accident which leaves Roger Harbin seriously injured, we have been bereaved of a close friend, a fellow student, and an intimate co-worker in the cause of Protestant Reformed youth. Because we know that he is everlastingly our fellow-member in the living Body of Christ, because we believe that the Head of that Body wills and accomplishes the greatest good for His members in every happening, because the Spirit of God penetrates our despair with the mighty cry of triumph, “O death where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?”, we can go on. Not the same as before, but humbled, brought closer to God, saying more often, with more spiritual awareness, “If the Lord wills and His will be done.”

May the merciful Jehovah comfort and build up the grieving relatives and all of us who need His abundant mercy in this hour.

BEACON LIGHTS

Seven
Much has been said and written (cf. Beacon Lights, March, May, August-September, 1961) about the mission program of the Protestant Reformed Churches. Criticisms have been leveled; appeals have been made. A synopsis of the present mission state-of-affairs had been requested and then given. It has been concluded by some that the Protestant Reformed mission program is adequate when compared to its facilities, by others that we, as churches, fall far short of fulfilling the missionary mandate. Many stand, especially young people (for the previous articles have been by ministers), wondering what the entire issue is about, doing no positive thinking whatsoever on the topic. It is much easier for one to hop on the bandwagon once he sees how the issue is drifting so that a rift in the denomination will not be caused by disagreement on such a trivial subject. It is much easier for one to view the situation from the bottom upward than from the top downward. An interest in missions? Surely they have it, so they say. A true interest? Hardly so.

Before, however, we venture into a discussion of the means by which we can promote work, we must first lay a foundation for this work. A prerequisite must be met. We must know and believe what we are going to missionize. We must be thoroughly acquainted with every aspect of the church doxmas. We must be versed in the dictates of Reformed Doctrine. We must be convinced of the Protestant Reformed interpretation of the Scriptures. We must believe that the Bible is the Word of God. We must be sure of our faith in Christ Jesus. If we do not have this foundation, our work is a futile one, our cause is a lost one, our Christ which we desire to be made known is a meaningless one.

Much time has been spent in the preparation of the youth for service in the Kingdom of God. Regular catechism classes are held; societies hold weekly meetings. The weekly preaching of the Word is also heard. Furthermore, many (lament the fact that there are not more) of our churches have established their own schools so that their children can have a distinctive education. All this to instill in our minds the knowledge of God. But remember, this foundation is essential. It is necessary for obedience to the mission mandate.

Once we have this foundation, a real missionary interest will naturally follow. For one cannot believe the truth of the Scriptures and remain dormant. A true Christian has an unquenchable religious fervor. He will have the desire to spread those truths— at home, in his surrounding area, and abroad. Stop once to measure your “natural mission interest. Examine and see what you know about our mission program. How many of us know where our home missionary is? How many of us are concerned enough to find out the situation in which he is working? How many of us are aware of the operations of the mission committee? If we are not acquainted with the present program, how are we to enlarge it? Where is this “natural” mission interest?

This interest, if it exists, will result in the furtherance of the mission program of the Protestant Reformed Churches. On the one hand, we will passively be engaged in mission work through our prayers and monetary support. Pray and ask God not only how you may best be used to propagate His Gospel but also pray God to give strength and direction to His existing missionaries—those engaged in the special mission of preaching His Word. Give generously, give freely of your possessions so that mission work will not be financially hampered. On the other hand, we may actively engage in mission work. Several of us may desire to preach (Continued on page 23)
# Beacon Lights Literary Contest Results

## Poetry
1st - Morning Melody | JIM JONKER  
2nd - Autumn Anthem | JIM JONKER  
3rd - Tree | JIM JONKER

## Fiction
1st - Charity Suffereth | DAVID ENGELSMA  
2nd - The Letter | JIM JONKER  
3rd - The Vase | LOIS KREGEL

## Non-Fiction
1st - How Firm a Foundation | WAYNE LANNING  
2nd - In the Still of the Night | CHARLES WESTRA  
3rd - Today's Tragedy | ED LANGERAK

To some, the results of the Literary Contest will be disappointing, to others, disheartening. The fondest wishes of the Staff of Beacon Lights have been exceeded. Sixteen contributors submitted twenty-four entries, contestants ranging in age from fourteen to forty (give or take a few years), and, wondrously, enthusiasm was widespread. Beacon Lights intends to make the Contest a yearly thing. As it was a pioneering venture, several flaws have been noted and are being corrected. The next Contest will contain a special category for grade school children. One expects too much, if he pits youths of that age against persons far older.

The Contest Committee obtained the final results by a cold compilation of total points from the score-sheets of the three judges. Each judge made his own decision in ignorance of the authors’ identities. The truism holds that not everyone can win. But the competition was keen, and, in some cases, the margins of victory were extremely thin. This is said to encourage future participation but it is also said honestly. To quote Prof. H. C. Hoeksema on the category of poetry: “... it was a bit difficult to pick the first five. In rating the first five, I do not mean to discourage some of those who also made worthwhile efforts. I feel that some of the next best efforts were indeed worthwhile, but in some cases lacked a polished poetic form and expression...”

With thanks to the judges, Miss Hulda Kuiper, Dr. John Timmerman, and Prof. H. C. Hoeksema, and to all who contributed, BEACON LIGHTS presents the three winners of the Literary Contest 1961.

—ed
Here in the solemn solitude,
The glist'ning lake reflects the glory of the morning sun.
The moveless mountains' mighty majesty
Is breathed abroad; each strand of breeze is spun
With magic mist that swells across the plain.
All nature seems to stand serenely awed,
As with mute tongue she shouts the strain divine:
Here is peace and power; here is God.

CHARITY SUFFERETH

(A One Act Play, Not For Acting)

Characters
Derry Mant, a girl
Woman
Daughter of the Woman
Boy
Two Housewives
Figure
Three Blotches
Men, Women, Youths, and August Personages

Scene 1

(A tidy and quite respectable kitchen. The midmorning sun dances on polished appliances. A middle-aged woman is engrossed in a telephone conversation. As she talks, her fingers idly play over the surface of a wall-plaque which reads GOD BLESS OUR HOME. A teen-age daughter dawdles in the corner, intent upon picking up what she can of the intercourse.)

WOMAN: (hanging up the phone) She's coming back.
DAUGHTER: Who is?
WOMAN: (explosively) After all she's done, she's got the gall to come back.

DAUGHTER: What did she do?

WOMAN: I don't want you to associate with her, understand? Don't even talk to her. Ignore her completely.

DAUGHTER: Who, mother, who?

WOMAN: Derry Mant, that's who.

DAUGHTER: (thoughtfully) So she's coming back.

WOMAN: Mrs. Vapine says she saw her. She hasn't changed, still all made up. She's of the world, that's all. You haven't heard the half of it. At the sale yesterday I had my ears filled, I'll tell you that.

DAUGHTER: I know more than you think. Don't worry, we get around too, you know.

WOMAN: I think it's just terrible that we get somebody like her back in our church. Somebody should do something. (muses to herself) Tessie wasn't at the sale. I wonder if she heard. I'd better call her. (The woman picks up the phone and begins dialing. *Shakes her head*)

---

**Scene II**

_Twilight. A group of young people stand in front of an auspicious church. All are absorbed in the excited discourse of the Daughter. A thin, bespectacled boy makes his way diffidently past the group in order to enter the church. As the Daughter's voice rings out above the general babble, he stops._

DAUGHTER: And my mother said that she even . . . (The girl breaks off as she sees the boy. She views him disdainfully.) Derry's coming back.

BOY: (nervously) That's what I've heard.

DAUGHTER: (oozing scorn) That's what you heard. You asked her out already.

BOY: Something else your mother told you, no doubt.

DAUGHTER: She's no good. Don't you care about your reputation? (Bolstered by the group's muttered acquiescence, the Daughter intensifies her indignation) Don't you regard what people say about you?

BOY: Some people.

DAUGHTER: Everybody knows about her.

BOY: (bitterly) I shouldn't wonder. (pauses, as if to continue, thinks better of it, and with obvious effort remains silent)

DAUGHTER: (shrilly) Well, we'll show her what we think of her. Just wait. (The boy's face darkens with anger. He spurs up the steps and enters the building. The heavy door slams behind him.)
Scene III

(A wooded park in late afternoon. Tables are readied for a meal. The women are beginning to gather in their husbands. Clusters of young people exude jollity and friendly banter. Here and there august personages, evidently of rank, stroll benignly.

At the end of one of the tables, the woman and two young housewives peer fixedly at a lone figure, carrying a picnic hamper, which approaches them.)

FIRST
HOUSEWIFE: Look at that black hair. I think it's Derry.

SECOND
HOUSEWIFE: It is. (amazedly) She's coming to the picnic.

(The girl is scarcely twenty. Tinted black hair is piled high on her head. Her rigid body and set face reveal both determination and extreme agitation. She marches up to the table and sets her hamper on it. The Boy, who has been watching from a distance, edges toward the spot.)

DERRY: Is this place reserved?

FIRST
HOUSEWIFE: (utterly confused) Yes, I mean no, it's not. You may have it. (glances at the Woman and scurries away with the Second Housewife.)

WOMAN: What are you doing here?

DERRY: The bulletin said that there was going to be a picnic. So I came. (The girl's voice cracks. She is perilously close to losing her enforced composure. More and more people gather silently in the background.)

WOMAN: (coldly) This place is reserved.

DERRY: I'm sorry. I'll find another place. (Eagerly, she retrieves her hamper and walks toward another table. She sees the crowd and halts. Desperately, she scans people and tables. The Boy steps toward her but as the hostility of the crowd sweeps over him, he retreats again.)

DERRY: (too loudly) Is there a place which isn't taken?

WOMAN: It's pretty full.

DERRY: Then I'd better go. (Uncomprehendingly, she takes a step backwards and, for the first time, sees the Boy. Frantic hope flickers across her face. The Boy drops his eyes to the ground and begins searching for something. As his back turns to her, Derry breaks into great, shuddering sobs. She grips the hamper with both hands and begins to run. The Woman's grim smile of satisfaction follows her as she fades into the distance.)

BOY: (in a frenzy) Who made you God's avenger? I want to know. When did God tell you to kill?

WOMAN: That made-up hussy got what she deserved. Good people don't associate with her kind.

BOY: Good people? Good people? Are murderers good people? Men who kill the body, hang. (dazedly) What punishment is reserved for us? (covers his face with his hands) I stood
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here like Saul of Tarsus and she died. And all the while, we thought we did God a favor. (his voice trails off into a whisper)

**WOMAN:** (steely with outrage) What are you saying?

**BOY:** Where was love? We say we're Christians and we had no love. We're phantoms, we're appearances with no content. Facades with no structure, we seem but we are not. (pauses) Except that a man must be something. (groans) Lord, what are we?

**WOMAN:** I acted with love, I tell you. Not sloppy sentiment but the real and the deep love. (her voice crescendos) Love that remembers sin, love that punishes, love that is pitiless, love that repudiates mercy, love that implacably denies forgiveness. I tell you, I loved.

**BOY:** (gasps) But that's hate.

**WOMAN:** Do you mean that Derry's conduct in the past was pure? Do you mean that our daughters ought to live like that?

**BOY:** (hoarsely) I don't say she was right. I said we were wrong.

**WOMAN:** My love is the love of true Christians. (suspiciously) Maybe you're not a true Christian. Maybe you don't believe that love is hate. Maybe you don't belong either.

(The Boy seems not to see the woman. In the dusk several august personages bend intently towards him but he cannot tell what they are thinking. The Boy's face distorts in shock, the terrified shock of a lad plumbing the depths of self. Unable to fathom what he finds there. The crowd presses in to catch his answer. His thin frame shudders continuously.)

**WOMAN:** (harshly) Answer me. Are you apostate?

**BOY:** (aloud, but addressing himself) Am I? Me. a rebel? Is my love really hate and their hate really love? (ringingly) I don't know. Oh, I don't know. (begins to cry) I was wrong. I was wrong. I'll hate. (throws himself to the ground in front of the Woman and continues to cry over and over as the crowd melts) I'll love. I'll love. I'll love.

**Scene IV**

(Intense darkness. A sound like the relentless grinding of millions of molars. In the distance, muted wailing. Slowly, an area, seemingly a room, is illumined by lurid red rays which flicker everywhere but have no noticeable source. Three dark blotches are hazily seen to be seated around a table.)

**FIRST BLOTCH:** We did our work very well.

**SECOND BLOTCH:** She's ours, make no mistake about that.

**THIRD BLOTCH:** And the Crisis will never occur again, that's certain.
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*Thirteen*
FIRST BLOTCH: Those sillies constantly prate against television. I'll take the telephone any day.

SECOND BLOTCH: Let the women keep silent in church. Just so long as they talk at home.

THIRD BLOTCH: The young ones need not meet me in theaters if they invite me into their communal life.

(The blotches stiffen in expectancy. They hush. From the left appears a Figure, pure and softly white. With an oath, it discards what seems to be a white cloak, revealing itself to be so intensely black that one realizes, nominalists notwithstanding, that here is Blackness. The Figure dominates not by height nor by breadth but by the bristling intensity of unbounded egotism. The rays deepen in hue and fairly quiver)

FIGURE: Hast conquered?

FIRST BLOTCH: Her place has been prepared. She should be here any timeless.

FIGURE: (puzzled) Place? She?

SECOND BLOTCH: The girl. We won her. (whining) Not that it was easy. The Boy hung on for dear life.

THIRD BLOTCH: (proudly) But he couldn't cope with our methods, shall we say? Ah, what sweet victory. To snatch away by means of, and not merely in opposition to.

FIGURE: Had you not added that, you raft of worthless fools would taste my rage in briny pools. I care not for the girl. What you discard as means, were my intent. (The blotches cower. The Figure expands manically, one would almost say, "Devilishly.") Not for the one you snatched, but them who her repelled would I have places made in this abysmal hell.

BLOTCHES: (in unison) We didn't know your purpose but the end's the same. She was rejected before she rejected.

FIGURE: And they're mine. He says, "love," and they hated. And in the choice, they chose me. And they who choose me get me. It's only just.

(The four wait with anticipation. The rays whip and dance. Suddenly, the Figure crumples into an insignificant heap upon the floor).

FIGURE: (whimpers incredulously) And He even forgives that?

Scene V

(Midmorning in a tidy and quite respectable kitchen. A familiar Woman talks briskly into the telephone)

WOMAN: It's done, at any rate. The Boy will mature. But say, do you know what Mrs. Vapine told me? She said that her cousin told her that . . .
HOW FIRM A FOUNDATION

The age in which we live could well be called, not the Atomic Age, but rather the Intellectual Age. Modern man is so completely governed and dominated by the burning desire to gain more knowledge that this knowledge has completely replaced his wisdom. No task is so great, and no thought so deep, that he cannot in some way, however small, add constructively to it. Then too, he must fully understand all that he knows or else reject it as untrue. Traditional truths are questioned doubtfully, and frequently even discarded as being "old-fashioned." In defense of this idea we often hear the statement that "Tradition is not truth." True as this may be, it does not mean that "Truth is not Traditional," for the truth has been handed down from generation to generation without ever becoming old-fashioned. Discard it we may never do — but develop it we must. If this is done, then the truths established by our forefathers through blood and tears cannot be cast aside by some intellectual idiot simply because he cannot fully comprehend them. Knowledge may never replace wisdom, for as Solomon says, "Wisdom is the principal thing." Knowledge alone puffeth up and is harmful, but knowledge together with wisdom will provide great understanding. With this understanding we must not only develop the truth, but also defend it.

This development, I think, can rightly be compared to the building of a pyramid. First to be built is the broad base or foundation, which is then built upon until the final block is placed and the construction becomes complete. Our pyramid of truth must progress in the same way. First came the development of the foundation by the apostles, using Christ as the cornerstone. Added to this was the work of the early church and men like Augustine, Luther, and Calvin. The work becomes more difficult as we get closer to the top, but, if the pinnacle is ever to be reached, it must never cease completely. However, while striving for our final goal, we must be sure that our foundation is not growing weak, but rather that it shall always remain solid and strong. If the foundation is gone, then there is no longer anything to support the rest of the building and it too will topple.

The evidence for this can readily be seen in the modern church world of today. They have disregarded the words of Solomon when he says, "My father taught me and said unto me, 'Let thine heart retain my words';" and in doing this, they have let the foundation crumble until nothing remains to support their "truth." We must never let this happen to us, therefore, we must use our intellectualism to defend the truth of our fathers as well as to build upon it.

While developing, we must also defend — while growing we must also guard, so that nothing can damage our foundation. When that is gone, so is the whole basis of our Reformed faith.

As many of the second and third place winners as possible will be printed in the February issue. The remainder, along with some honorable mentions, will appear later.
Lesson XXXVII (Revelation 14:9-13) Retribution for the Worshippers of the Beast

1. Vss. 9-11. Retribution for the worshippers of the beast. a. A third angel announces the punishment that will be inflicted upon the worshippers of the beast. (1) Babylon is fallen. (2) Now is described the lot of those that drank “of the wine of the wrath of her fornication,” i.e., who worshipped the beast and his image; for this worship is spiritual fornication. b. “Saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark” etc. (1) See ch. 13:14ff. (2) The worshippers of the beast are identical with those that receive his mark. (3) In the narrower sense they are those that worship antichrist in his final manifestation; but they are representative of all that love and serve the antichristian world throughout the centuries till the end of time. All that commit “fornication,” c. “The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God,” etc. (1) This wrath of God was already in the “wine of her fornication,” vs. 8. (2) It is now poured out, or prepared, without mixture in the cup of God’s indignation or anger. (a) The cup of God’s anger is filled. (b) It is filled with pure, unmixed wrath. In the world, as they received the “wine of the wrath of fornication” from Babylon, they drank the wrath of God mixed in the intoxicating drink of Babylon’s lusts and sinful pleasures. All this is ended now. Pure wrath they are now given to drink. d. “And he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone,” etc. (1) This is the result of the pouring out of the wrath of God. (2) Fire and brimstone are to be understood figuratively, yet so that they can signify actual bodily suffering, and not merely “pangs of conscience.” (3) Their torment is inflicted upon them “in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb.” (a) We may infer that this also implies the presence of the “144,000” that are with the Lamb. (b) They are all concerned in this just retribution for which they have longed and prayed for God’s sake. (c) “In the presence of” does not merely refer to the moment of judgment: nor, of course, does it mean that they shall be in the same place with the Lamb and the holy angels; but it does mean that they shall be witnesses of God’s righteous wrath upon the wicked, and that, too, with a holy delight: it belongs to their public justification. e. “And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever,” etc. (1) “The smoke of their torment” is figurative language in connection with the “fire and brimstone.” The fire is not quenched! (2) “For ever and ever,” i.e., emphatically without end, everlasting. Eternal punishment of the wicked is clearly taught here as in other places of Scripture. (3) And this everlasting punishment shall be continuous, there will be no respite; for “they have no rest day or night,” i.e., in their torment. Hell is here presented as a pure, unmixed, continuous and everlasting suffering of the wrath of God. (4) “Who worshipped the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name,” i.e.
whoever commits fornication with the anti-Christian world, and in any way allies himself with Babylon. This is repeated here to emphasize the heinous character of this fornication as a sufficient ground for so terrible a punishment.

2. Vs. 12. The patience of the saints. a. "Here is the patience of the saints; (here are) they that keep," etc. (1) The meaning is: here is the reward of the justification of, the basis for the patience of the saints. (2) For their lot is not with the wicked: they are blessed, vs. 13. b. Their patience consisted in this that (1) They kept the commandments of God, i.e., worshipped Him, walked in His way. (2) And the faith of Jesus, i.e., the faith in Jesus, and the truth in Christ. (3) And that, too, in spite of the wrath of the beast, and in the midst of tribulation.

3. Vs. 13. The blessed dead. a. "And I heard a voice from heaven," etc. (1) John hears a voice from heaven, commanding him to write. (2) Whose this voice is the text does not designate, but the context suggests: the Lord's. (3) The voice instructs John to write: (a) That they that die in the Lord, i.e., that are in the Lord (Christ), and as such die, are blessed. (b) "Henceforth," i.e., not immediately after death (though this is perfectly true), but from the viewpoint of the end. b. "Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest" etc. (1) The Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, as He dwells in believers. In so far He is the same as "the voice from heaven." (2) He interprets the blessedness of the dead that die in the Lord. (a) "That they may rest from their labors." Labors here refers to their toil and suffering and tribulation which they endured in the world. From them they now enjoy complete rest. The former things are no more. (b) "And their works do follow them." The works in the Lord, i.e., of the Lord through them. They follow them, i.e., not merely in the form of the reward of these works, but the works themselves have eternal value for God's eternal house.

Lesson XXXVIII (Revelation 14:14-16) Vision of the End of the World

1. The chapter closes with a vision of the end of the world. a. Also in ch. 6:12ff. the end of the world was pictured. (The sixth seal). b. But there is a difference in viewpoint: (1) In the sixth seal the end of the world was presented from the viewpoint of the destruction of the physical universe. (2) Here the viewpoint is that of the ripened harvest of the earth. All things are ready for the end, both with regard to the righteous (the harvest, vss. 14-16), and to the wicked (the vintage, vss. 17-20).

2. Vs. 14. "And I looked (or "saw," R. V.) and, behold a white cloud" etc. Here John is given to see a new vision, as is indicated by the expression, "And I saw." The vision is that of Christ in His Messianic glory coming for judgment: a. That it is Christ that is revealed here, and not an angel as some would have it, is evident from the whole description: (1) He is sitting on a white cloud. A cloud overshadowed Him on the mount of transfiguration, Matt. 17:5; cloud intercepted Him at the ascension, Acts 1:9 it is said that He will come with the clouds, Mt. 24:30, 26:64: or in a cloud, Lk. 21:27. Cf. also Rev. 1:7. The cloud is white, symbol of His glory and purity; He comes to judge in righteousness. (2) He is one like unto the Son of man." This is the familiar expression that describes Christ in His Messianic glory. It is derived from Dan. 7:13. Cf. Rev. 1:13. It is especially this expression that forbids us to think of any other than Christ Himself. (3) "On His head a golden crown." The original word for crown here refers not to the royal diadem, but to the wreath of victory. Christ is Victor over the world and over all the powers of darkness. As such He here appears. b. And that He appears here as the One that is about to judge the earth is symbolized by the sharp sickle He holds in His hand. The sickle was a crooked blade used for the ingathering of the harvest. Christ is the Harvester. The whole earth is His harvest-field.

3. Vs. 15. "And another angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice," etc. a. It is especially from the mention here of "another angel" that some conclude that also the One mentioned in vs. 14 must
be an angel; because (1) "Another angel" implies this. (2) And this second angel issues a command to the One sitting on the white cloud. It would be quite inconceivable that an angel would bring a command to Christ, Who is exalted far above the angels. b. However: (1) "Another angel" distinguishes this one from the angels that were mentioned previously in this chapter. (2) This angel does not command Christ but, evidently, merely serves as a messenger to bring the command to Him. c. This angel "came out of the temple." Cf. ch. 11:19.

The temple is God's heavenly dwelling-place, where He dwells as the covenant-God, Who will surely realize His heavenly covenant till His tabernacle shall be with men forever. That the angel came out of the temple signifies, therefore: (1) That it is from the covenant-God that He carried the command to Christ: "Thrust in thy sickle and reap." (2) That the covenant is about to be realized. d. It is from God, therefore, not from the angel, that the command to reap issues forth. (1) Christ as the Mediator, in His human nature, is subordinate to the Father, His Servant. From Him Christ receives the command to reap. (2) Besides, it is now "the day and the hour" which the Father only determines. The command specifies that it now is the time for the harvesting of the earth. e. As to this "harvest" we may note: (1) That it must, evidently, be distinguished from the "vintage" which is described in vss. 17-20. The two are not the same, even though the church has fully served its purpose in the world; the measure of their works (bearing the testimony of Jesus Christ and the Word of God, etc.) and of their toil and suffering is completely filled (4) That this "harvest" implies: (a) That the earthly career of the Church is ended. Cut off the Church is taken out of the earth. (b) That through the change of the then living believers, and through the glorious resurrection of the saints that are "asleep," they are gathered into heavenly glory.

4. Vs. 16. "And he that sat on the cloud, etc. The ingathering of the elect is here presented as the work of Christ in person. He is the Sower of the wheat; His is the harvest.

OPEN FORUM

Reflections on "Mission Minded"

REV. H. C. HOEKSEMA

In the August-September issue of Beacon Lights there appeared an editorial on "Mission Minded" from the pen of Rev. A. Mulder which, in my opinion, contained such a mixture of untrue charges against our Protestant Reformed Churches and constituency and of false conclusions concerning our denominational mission activity that it should
not go unanswered. One who read said editorial would almost come to the conclusion that the old, old accusation of our opponents at we do not believe in mission work is true. Besides, the editorial was utterly lacking in constructive criticism and positive instruction concerning the nature of mission activity and concerning a sound, healthy, well-founded mission-mindedness. And it seems to me that especially if Beacon Lights is to guide our Protestant Reformed young people in the paths of truth with respect to mission-mindedness, such constructive criticism and positive instruction should have been forthcoming. It is very well to cry, “Let’s be busy!” But if real progress is to be made in this respect, we must not be characterized by an artificially stimulated mission zeal, but must keep our ecclesiastical feet firmly planted on the ground of the truth, and in the light of that truth determine our calling, in the strength of that truth perform our calling, and according to the standard of that truth examine our faithfulness.

To my mind, however, accusations of lethargy, unfaithfulness, definite lack of zeal, stinging, and a buried zeal for missions,—all of which accusations appear in said editorial,—can only serve to discourage and smother the mission zeal of our people, though it might rally some to a sort of flighty, unbalanced, heady mission enthusiasm that is so characteristic in our day of many so-called evangelistic movements.

I do not at all mean to say that our mission efforts have been beyond criticism and that there is no room for improvement. This has never been the official position of our churches either. Our mission program has always been subjected to careful scrutiny and correction, for example, at our synodical sessions. And to be sure, when we have “arrived,” so to speak, then it is high time that we understand that something is radically wrong. But I contend that the latter is not the case in our churches, that the facts do not sustain the charges made in Rev. Mulder’s editorial, that he cannot prove them, and that he does our people an injustice by making said charges.

Let me raise just a few questions, and mention some facts to sustain my position, then perhaps further discussion and editorializing might produce something positive and helpful.

1. What is it to be “mission minded”? It is all very well to use an eye-catching phrase, and to cite the so-called “great commission,” for which, by the way, the term “mission mandate” is really a misnomer. But if our people are to be “mission-minded” in the healthy, Reformed sense of the word, they must be instructed. Everyone in our day cites this great commission. And many, judging by the gargantuan size of their mission program and mission budget, are apparently “mission-minded.” But is this genuine mission-mindedness? Besides, does not this great commission include, and that too, primarily, the preaching of the gospel here at home, in our own congregations? And is it not also true that God’s people are gathered in the line of covenant generations? And may we not indeed answer the editor’s question in this light with a hearty “Yes” when he asks, “Is it going out from us?” Or does the editor have in mind an over-balanced and over-emphasized mission program, such as, for example, the schismatics launched on Guam, while the home churches rotted from within? I am only asking questions, you understand. But by all means let us have some answers to these questions before we are asked to examine ourselves: for self-examination must be calm and discerning, and must take place according to a sound, objective standard, if one wants to reach the correct answers in that examination.

2. What is the relationship between the “home front” and the “mission front”? What constitutes a proper balance between the home labors of the church and the mission labors? Is it fair and just to our churches to classify vacancies and a dearth of ministers as “only excuses”? At present, for example, we have no less than six vacancies among our twenty-one churches. For some four years to come our seminary will be able to fill only half of those six vacancies. Would it be according to the will of God, do you think, to take two or three or four more of our ministers and put them on the mission field? Moreover, I submit: a) That the record shows that since the schism we have at no time been without vacancies. b) That since the split many of our churches were in dire need of pastors, due to the circumstances brought upon us by the wickedness of the schismatics.
c) That since the split several of our congregations were in a struggle for their very existence. d) That the split left us with no missionary and no mission fund, and that we were compelled to start from "scratch" in 1954! that it was simply unthinkable, would, in fact, have been reprehensible on the part of our Synod and Mission Board, to proceed with the program of calling a total of five missionaries at that time or ever since; and that the progress and fruits of our mission program since the split, when viewed in the light of circumstances, have been, generally speaking, favorable. e) That the proposed program of five missionaries in 1953 was largely the pet project of those who soon became schismatics, who wanted to draw hordes of Liberated immigrants into our denomination, and who wanted calling churches other than churches like First, Doon, etc., because they wanted to get control of the mission program.

3. What constitutes proper order in mission work? And, in that connection, where particularly does the mission calling of our Protestant Reformed Churches lie? Has the home mission field been covered? Is our calling to do mission work among others of Reformed persuasion finished? If our calling now chiefly in the rather alluring and romantic line of foreign mission work? Or is it perhaps true, in the light of our distinctive Protestant Reformed position, that we still have a very definite calling with respect to other Reformed churches?

4. Is it possible that there is such a thing as "running ahead of the Lord" in our enthusiasm? Does not the Lord also point out our mission calling through such objective realities as man-power, talents, means, opportunities, and that too, in relation to other needs and demands in the churches?

5. Is not the charge of stinginess in mission offerings grossly unfair in the light of the following incontrovertible facts? a) Our mission assessment, in a time when our assessments are at all-time highs and in a time when the Lord has seen fit to burden us with the care of many needy churches, has been consistently among the highest. For 1962 it will be almost 22% of our total synodical budget. This is exclusive of a First Church radio budget of $5700 and a Foreign Mission contribution of $4000. b) Generally speaking, the contributions per family of our people to the cause of the church rank high. If you add to this contributions to the cause of our schools, our people do exceedingly well in most instances. c) Our people have always been ready to meet the financial needs of the church, missions included, when such need has been presented and when they have been instructed therein prudently. d) Several of our congregations are busy, both with talents and funds, in localized church extension work.

In conclusion, therefore, I would suggest that we keep a level head, keep both feet on the ground, and, in the meantime, engage in positive and constructive discussion of our mission calling, of our mission program, and of our mission activities. If we do, a good, healthy "mission mindedness" will result. But cutting charges and wild accusations will simply antagonize our people, and justly so.

---

REPLY TO REV. H. C. HOEKSEMA

missions defended

REV. A. MULDER

I want to express my appreciation for all the notes and comments of praise I received on my "controversial" article on mission mindedness, but I equally would ex-
press appreciation to Rev. H. C. Hoeksema for his cunning but careless criticism since possibly will serve to bring this all-im-
portant calling of the church more promi-
nently before the minds of our youth.

Before I pen my defense, please allow me to publicly protest against his repeated use of the term “schismatic” when he refers to the people who left us in the split of 1953. This to my mind has excited unnecessary antagonism in others. I have long since failed to see the Christian spirit expressed in name-calling such as this. And I fall short in finding any good that can come out of it. I claim it has been a major reason for the failure of our mission efforts in the Reformed community; a sphere of mission labor which of late has shown little success and proven almost impenetrable.

I can certainly testify that such name-calling has greatly hindered me in my “private mission enterprises” here in Kalamazoo.

Generally speaking, the “reflections” of Rev. Hoeksema are simply gross exaggerations of my statements. At one time he hastily casts me, by suggestion then, into the camp of those who would support a sly, irresponsible and fanatic mission program. Then again, throughout his article he definitely shows an aversion to any criticism in the least of a project (in this case our missions) so carefully “watched” by synod, and which in his opinion is quite adequate, as the entire tenor of his article implies. This is true even though he claims to allow for some room for improvement. I resent and regret all this, convinced that this is contrary to Christian ethics. I will prove these points.

Specifically I will reply to his “reflections” paragraph for paragraph, point for point.

(1) To be mission minded is to be greatly interested and enthusiastic about the spread of the gospel through the proper channels, the church. Such a person will show a more vivid acquaintance with our labors on the mission field, and will undertake in many ways to make this labor more prosperous. That, as a denomination, we are lax in our interest and enthusiasm I surely claimed and proved. And I want to prove it again! We have no mission rallies for our people to whet their interest and vent their enthusiasm; not even a space in our church magazines which could serve to guide our maturing young people into proper paths of mission conception. The very thought of missions is not even impressed on their minds! Where. I ask, is that “instruction” my critic claims is so necessary for our young people if they are to be mission minded in a healthy Reformed sense? Surely the lack of past instruction and the lack of impressing this on the minds of our children has led to pathetic lethargy — I repeat my claim.

I am not sorry that I quoted the mission mandate in my editorial. Simply because other churches cite this text, doesn’t make it wrong. But if it offended Rev. Hoeksema then allow me to quote another beautiful bit of holy Writ, “Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men . . .” I sincerely hope Rev. Hoeksema does not consider the mission mandate of Christ to be “somewhat” out of date! Does he imply perhaps that the mission mandate chiefly means that where the people of God are, there they must be busy preaching and teaching? Does he mean to say that those blessed words of Christ are faithfully kept when we simply let the light shine within and around about our local churches? I wonder if this is, “going into all the world and teaching”? Possibly such a view of things is a contributing factor to such tiny efforts in the past.

His comment, even though he assures us he is only asking questions, re my perhaps wanting an over-balanced mission program as the former De Wolf group launched on Guam is a perfect insinuation and an evil suggestion. It is an attack on my orthodoxy. The De Wolf group somehow or other supported a missionary on Guam who was not a member of their churches, as I understood it. Now, I never even suggested a forsaking of mission principles or even of our mission practices in my article; I never advocated a new-styled mission program nor did I suggest a fanatical change. I plainly pleaded for greater interest and more action in and behind our program. This is still my cry!

Of course I have no dispute with the fact that God gathers his covenant people in the
line of covenant generations, but I must never and do not overlook the fact that God also begins gathering his people in new lines. Think of the Philippian Jailor and even our own “Dutch” fathers.

(2) As to the relationship between the “home front” and the “mission front,” I think I answered this partly in my editorial. However, allow me to emphasize again that we must assuredly have proper balance in every way: funds, manpower, etc. I fail to see this “balanced” program in our churches, especially in the past. I realize that just at present vacancies have become a serious matter. Rev. Hoeksema emphasizes the very present, but in my article I emphasized both. I still claim the past has not recorded us faithful, still claim candidates waited for calls, still claim the vacancies we have had were always comparatively few and I still claim a crisis shouldn’t smother our interest and enthusiasm even though it may objectively affect our “mission front” somewhat. Besides, I will again label the fact that we had to begin from “scratch” in 1954 as only an excuse for our buried zeal and interest. At the same time I would inform Rev. Hoeksema that I never advocated in my editorial of September that suddenly we should call two or three or four more missionaries to the field. What a gross exaggeration of my views! Of course in the light of the present circumstances—being critical—it would be unjust to call five additional missionaries. I never asked for this.

Probably we should all be reminded that we could be making too much of those six vacancies. Other churches do mission work with a substantial number of vacancies! Besides, only two of our vacant churches have extended “calls” to ministers during the past whole year. One of these vacant churches has not called in years! I have every sympathy for our vacant churches but they know right well that when they do not call, it is a bad sign. But my point is: maybe we are making too much of that vacancy matter.

I especially want to inform him that I deeply deplore hearing that the zeal of 1952 was largely due to the De Wolf people—in fact their “pet project.” I am sure many of our people have been proud of that proposed program, and have occasionally used it as proof of our mission mindedness when we had means and men. Now I am told we were not even back of it. This makes the future of missions to appear very gloomy for us.

(3) All the questions raised in this paragraph are very big. About them volumes could be written. I want to say only this: if the author of “reflections” suggests that the greatest share of our mission labors must be directed to the Reformed community, I openly disagree with him. Evidences will show that there is an almost impenetrable iron curtain between them and us. Except in some communities we bear virtually no influence. I think this is more true today than 10 years ago! Our magazines find little entrance into other homes and other Reformed people cannot find our church parlors. As a pastor I have personally tried to resurrect this most coveted thing: an influence on the Reformed community. It has not been a total failure here. But I can certainly appreciate every attempt made by our local churches through church extension work to get the glorious message of the gospel into the hands of others near to them.

Here are two more very general questions.

If Rev. Hoeksema places mission work among the chief tasks of the church, then these questions would never have been raised.

He cites several objective standards which must be considered as the way pointed out by God. I agree with this. I only wonder why these are not used in our other kingdom enterprises, i.e., our court actions and school movements. In these latter we seem to go forward unconcerned. We erect schools when we cannot possibly see a plentiful supply of teachers, we erect schools when we do not even have church-buildings in some cases! Often I wonder! But how about these things? Let’s measure all kingdom endeavors with the same ruler! If so I think our mission front will blossom.

Did the early church “scream” when the seventy were sent out? Did they cry, “running ahead of God,” when Paul and Barnabas and Silas were sent out? Well, just something to think about! I am sure these men could have been used on the “home front.”

(5) I have not accused our people of
stinginess in general, nor in particular. In fact I graciously ascribe liberality to them by stating, "to other causes we give our dollars while the mission offering gets our nes." Therefore Rev. Hoeksema should never have written 5 b. "generally speaking, the contributions per family of our people to causes of the church rank high," as if I claim they do not! And, he should never have written 5 c. "our people have always been ready to meet financial needs of the church, missions included, when such need has been presented and when they have been instructed therein prudently," as if I ever criticized our people for an unwillingness to meet financial needs when they were presented!

He lists several financial figures and one percentage figure. These are supposed to refute my contention that missions gets our dimes but other causes our dollars. But allow me to place his figures and percentage into the true light. In the first place, my article clearly expresses praise for our radio work, which could never exist but for generous support. I recognize this! In the second place, my article clearly calls for a more generous support of our real mission needs: that for missionaries and the mission field. Now then, we put a total of only $10,000.00 into this worthy cause, an amount which also includes $3,000.00 for more radio broadcasting and several hundreds of dollars for other miscellaneous items. Is less than $7,000.00 anything to boast loudly about? And then please notice that the offerings taken in all of our churches throughout the year 1960 for that worthy cause of Foreign Missions (which offering again is spent only for Radio work) amounted to only a small twelve hundred dollars. This I emphatically claim is dimes to dollars! Percentages usually look impressive but when figures are used and compared, then new light shows the truth of the matter.

In conclusion, of course my statements were exaggerated and ridiculously inflated and my position on missions was suggested to be of a heady sort; not the product of a foot firmly planted on the ground nor the product of a level-head. But I am afraid of a false bugle, blown in a false alarm and sounded an unwarranted blast of the trumpet. I consider his "reflections" not of the healthy kind. Unless he abandon the way of insinuations and exaggerations a wholesome atmosphere and mission zeal cannot survive. And I judge his article the produce of being super-sensitive and hyper-critical. Such false trumpet blasting could only serve to render our people insensitive and relaxed with respect to our mission duties; and furthermore, such trumpet blasting might very well excite our people to uneasiness and irritation. Unwarranted blasts of the trumpet can even result in scattering them.

Hence I kindly ask him to bury his undue alarm and join with us in keeping before the minds of our young people a beautiful calling. Let our feet be on the ground indeed, ere they pass on and be no more: feet under the ground. Work for the night is coming. Thirty-seven years is rather late to cry, "I would suggest that we . . . in the meantime, engage in positive and constructive discussion of our mission calling . . . ." but it is not too late to culture and nurture some genuine effort and interest in missions.

YOUTH AND MISSIONS

(Continued from page 8)

the Word on the mission "field." Probably a SWIM program should be set up. But one does not have to be a minister or a "SWIMer" to be actively engaged in mission work. We must have, as well, teaching missionaries, medical missionaries, homemaker missionaries, factory-worker missionaries. Missionaries which come into contact with the population, with the "all nations" of Matthew 28. In short, each of us must maintain a personal mission, a personal witness. We must witness for the children of God. We must witness to the children of God. We must witness because we are children of God.

Give us time, you say, to enlarge our program. We will develop an adequate mission program in due time. But time is wasting! The signs of the times are upon you, say our clergy. Observe the world. Now is the time for mission work. Wake, for the Night is coming!
then permit yourself to be influenced by the political strategies of satire, sarcasm and invective? But this seems less apologetic and more an attempt to find comfort in the thought that some false prophets do not raise the eye of suspicion, or evoke the noise of denunciation as much as other false prophets do.

Finally, there is the so called Jesuit legend. It is really all fable and myth, these charges of secrecy, interference in politics, state and civil affairs, the plot to control public education, the aim to spread Romanism by every available secular power?

Jesuitism has been fictionalized into a cloak-and-dagger clan master-minded by some insidious Dr. Fu Manchu. One must admit the Jesuit legend is rather bizarre, and reads much like the adventures of the characters created by Chester Gould. Sometimes legend does degenerate to caricature, and caricature to ridicule. But the "legend" argument becomes a convenient dumping ground where all charges, difficulties, "lies" and offences may be easily disposed. But orthodox, historical Christianity has never feared such flimsy shafts, such stubble-tipped arrows. What is legend in the face of history? in the face of a position firmly entrenched upon the impenetrable rock of Holy Writ? What shall we think of an organization which must defend itself by all kinds of sophisticated subtleties and clever casuistries, instead of submitting to the test of scripture? instead of making a direct appeal to, or challenge to evaluate according to the judgment of the Divine Word?

NEWS from, for, and about our churches

MRS. C. KREGEL

Our schools touch the lives of all of us, whether as children, young people preparing for the teaching profession, teachers, parents, or others who are interested in the sound education of the future church. At present our schools stand between the busy Christmas season and the coming mid-year examinations. Judging from the Adams Announcer and the Hope Highlights, much progress has been made in the various subjects taught, from the simple Bible stories and basic skills of the kindergarten and primary grades to the study of the Covenant and the complex subjects of astronomy, physiology, and many others, in the Junior High Grades.

The School auxiliaries have also been active. Hope School Circle held its annual sale Dec. 1 in Hudsonville; the current squad of Adams St. School sponsored a tea and apron sale December 14.

We urge all of our readers to consult the back cover of this issue for an important announcement by the Radio Committee of The Reformed Witness Hour.

Our societies have not only been enjoying fellowship and Bible study within their own circles, but also recently have been much engaged in visiting one another. Oaklaw and South Holland enjoyed a combined
Meeting; Men's Society of First visited Holland's Men's Society; Senior Mr. and Mrs. Society of First Church spent a pleasant evening with Hope's Mr. and Mrs. Society; Hudsonville's Mr. and Mrs. Society visited Southeast; Hudsonville Men's Society welcomed that of Southwest; First's Junior Mr. and Mrs. Society met with Southwest.

Wedding bells rang for Glen Windemuller and Judith Ter Vree (Holland) on Nov. 11; for Jay Holstege and Arla Ruth Hoezee (Hudsonville) on Nov. 29; for Gary Lee Lubbers and Carol Fay Heys (Hudsonville) on Dec. 1; and for John Frederick Schut and Carolyn Jean Fredricks (Hudsonville) on Dec. 1.

- - -

Our group of Future Conventioners continues to grow. They include the following:

A son born to Mr. and Mrs. B. Zandstra (Oaklawn).
A son born to Mr. and Mrs. Paul Buys (Edgerton).
A son born to Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Faber (First).
A daughter born to Dr. and Mrs. John Peters (First).
A son adopted by Mr. and Mrs. Henry Boer (Hudsonville).
A daughter born to Mr. and Mrs. John Kamps (Hudsonville).
A daughter born to Mr. and Mrs. D. Vander Kooi (Southeast).

- - -

Membership changes:

Hull welcomed Mrs. Duane Brummel from First Reformed Church of Sioux Center.

Miss Sylvia Brummel transferred to First from Edgerton.

Miss Alice Vander Meulen came to Hudsonville from Lynden.

Southeast received the following as members from the now disbanded First Orthodox Prot. Ref. Church: Mr. and Mrs. Gerrit Gritter, Sr.; Mr. Joseph Gritter; Mr. and Mrs. A. Gritter and two children; Mr. and Mrs. P. Vanden Engel: Mr. Dick Flietstra.

- - -

Change of address:

Pvt. T. L. De Vries 1899273
1st ITR, 2nd Bn., Group 16, M.C.B.,
Camp Le Jeune, N.C.

Miscellaneous:

Rev. Lanting of Holland received permission from his consistory to preach two successive Sundays in Loveland at their request. The dates have not yet been determined.

Hudsonville's bulletin gives evidence of the fact that their young people are busy laying plans for the convention next summer, and that they hope to make it a good one.

The Church Extension Committee of Oaklawn-South Holland asked for typists now and addressograph operators later to help with the extensive program of mailing literature which they are planning for after the first of the year.

Lynden's always attractive bulletin often contains a pithy quotation or two, which may serve to point the Christian to the way of sanctification or perhaps comfort and encourage him. On the Sunday after Rev. Kuiper was called home the following poem appeared:

The flock must feel the shepherd's loss,
And miss his tender care;
But they who bear with joy the cross,
The crown shall brightest wear.

And is not He who called him home,
Still to His church most nigh,
To bid successive laborers come,
And all her need supply?
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