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boycotted?

REV. G. LUBBERS

The editor of Beacon Lights requested me to write an account of the troublesome situation which has arisen because of and against our labors here in the Tripp-Memno area.

THIS ISSUE

As the Protestant Reformed Churches point towards the inclusion of hymns within the church service, Beacon Lights calls upon one well-versed in this field for some knowledgeable investigation of hymns and hymn-singing. Roland Petersen, in this first of a series of articles, discusses what hymns are and what they ought to be if included in worship services. He then proceeds to mention several desirable and several not-so-desirable specimens. Mr. Petersen, a teacher at Adams St. Christian School, graduated from Calvin College with a major in music. He studied for a year at the Academy of Vocal Arts in Philadelphia and, at present, directs both the Men's Chorus and the Radio Chorus of the Protestant Reformed Churches.

Rev. George C. Lubbers, home missionary of the Protestant Reformed Churches, is working among the German Reformed people of South Dakota. Of late, he has been experiencing stern opposition. His article, "Boycotted?", relates that opposition and his hope in the face of it.

The editorial guest in this issue is James Jonker. He resolutely lifts the lid once more on the matter of drama and suggests that a change be made in our semi-official approach to it.

The familiar rubric-writers also take their place in the November Beacon Lights, as does the book review section, "News From. For and About Our Churches" will return in December.

News From, For and About Our Churches:

At this writing we have just received word of the passing of Rev. H. Kuiper, of our Loveland Church. We commend his family, his congregation, and all of our churches to the comfort of the Spirit of the Lord whom he served. - Mrs. C. Kregel

The term "boycott" means: to combine against by refusing to deal with or associate with. It is the refusal of all dealings with a person or persons. The term seems to be connected with the person of Captain Boycott of Ireland, who in 1880-1881 was thus treated. Hence, all action in which there is concerted effort not to deal with one, or not to associate with one is designated with the term; to boycott!

That term pretty well describes the situation here in Memno-Tripp, especially in the former place. Attempts were made in Tripp at up till now this has failed. Under the reported instigation and leadership of the Rev. E. Kemptchen the American Legion Post, the ministry have determined, at all costs, to keep the undersigned from lecturing in Memno. The only suitable building for our purpose seems to be the American Legion Hall. This hall has been refused us at the present time. On October 19, 1961 we received a letter from Mr. Aisenbrey to the effect, that, although the custodian had rented us the Legion Hall, and although the meetings were announced in the Hutchinson Herald, we could not use the building on October 26 and Nov. 9 as announced, nor at any other time. The grounds were not given, except that the Post had taken a decision on a "regular meeting" on the 21st of March, 1961 that the Hall would not be "rented to outside Religious Organizations for meetings or lectures."

When the undersigned pressed the matter a few days later with two officers of the Post he was shown the minute in question; he read it from the Minute Book. It read: "It is unanimously agreed upon not to rent the hall to outside religious organizations for meetings or lectures." The undersigned was most solemnly assured that this decision was not directed at or occasioned by his labors here in these parts, or by that of the three ministers, Woudenberg, Van Baren and Kortering. That this decision was taken at
that time was purely coincidence. It was alleged (not stated in the Minute) that the real reason for this “agreement” was that in a certain town in Northeast South Dakota a certain Post had experienced difficulty in their town by renting their hall to an "outside religious organization" and this they would prevent to happen in Menno. And this momentous (?) decision was "agreed upon" in Menno at the very time:

1. When the undersigned was renting the American Legion Hall in Tripp and the City Hall in Tripp, and was maintaining the best of human-relationships as it becomes a citizen of this land, and a confessing Christian, professing godliness.

2. When the undersigned and his colleagues were speaking and preaching to goodly audiences in Tripp in the Legion Hall and in the City Hall, among which were also members of the United Church of Christ, both of Tripp, Menno, and of Delmont.

3. When the Rev. Kaempchen wrote three identical letters to the Revs. Woudenberg, Van Baren and Kertering, who spoke in Tripp on the following respective dates: March 7, 22 and 29. This letter of Rev. Kaempchen, dated March 24, 1961, was written under a letter-head of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, and signed in the capacity of "president" of the Synod, who is at once also the "president" of the Synodical Executive Committee under the E. and R. Constitution. See By-Laws, 70, a. In this letter he, as the spokesman for the ministry complained that the evident interest in the Heidelberg Catechism on the part of the ministers, Woudenberg, Van Baren and Kertering, insinuated that the Catechism was not preached, or adequately preached in the E. and R. Church. (Tactily this letter was silent about the changed official stand of the E. and R. Church as a comparison of Section 1. 4 will show when compared with Article 189 of the Church Order of the Reformed Church in U.S.A., and with the subsequent Constitution of the United Church of Christ, recently adopted and ratified.)

4. When a concerted attempt was being made here in Tripp to have the City Council refuse the undersigned the use of the City Hall, and when those who would deprive us of the building failed to succeed in having the amount raised from the present rate to a higher rate. Those who would protect the undersigned moved and succeeded to have the decision made that we pay a month's advance.

5. When constant reports reached the undersigned here in Tripp that the American Legion Post in Menno had barred me from Tripp, by refusing to rent the hall to me.

In the light of the above we ask: boycott?

And now at this very time when we had rented the building in Menno, a special meeting is called of the Executive Committee of the Ramus-Bender Post 152, and the "agreement" of the meeting of March 21, 1961 must be enforced. The letter reads like an ultimatum: "That you cannot use the building on the dates of Oct. 26 or Nov. 9 or at any other time." The thumb-screws really had to be turned down. There was danger in delay. The Romans said, "periculum in mora!" However, when the undersigned investigated there was reason to believe that there may be members of the Executive Meeting" who were not informed; they were not aware such a meeting had been held. They were members of the Executive Board of the Post. Mirabile dictum! (marvelous to relate!)

On the Sunday following this special meeting of the Executive Committee of the Post, the Rev. Kaempchen made not little ado against the undersigned, who could, of course, not defend himself, not being present. It is reported that he railed against the undersigned, held up the eight inch ad of the local paper, the Hutchinson Herald, (it contained a photo-print of the undersigned) and calumniated the teaching of the Protestant Reformed Church, insinuating in the sermon that we teach, "if one is elected he can live the way he wants to, he will go to heaven." (The old lie of Satan, and the vile calumny of the enemies of the truth.) In

*The undersigned wrote a document this summer, in sixty-two questions and answers, in which he shows the untenableness of those who claim to be Reformed and yet live under the Constitution of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, and the subsequent merger as United Church Of Christ. He sent a copy to Rev. Kaempchen. The Post Office at Menno returned it "refused." I have the envelope as souvenir; the document I sent to a worthy brother!
fact, he had the audacity to tell his audience that the meetings and lectures would not be held, and that he had asked the local ministry to cooperate in this "announcement! At least one minister is reported to have had the sense to tell his congregation that he had been requested to make such an announcement, but since it was none of his business he was not going to do it.

We ask again: boycotted?

Meanwhile we go on in faith, and commit the cause of our Lord Jesus Christ to Him. It is His cause. He often takes the crafty in their own craftiness, and lays the mighty low and exalts the man of low degree. Possibly (for with the Lord all things are possible) He will open the door, and lead us to another building.

This is our prayer!

With the good assistance of Rev. G. Van Baren we have prepared a document, are having it printed in a thousand copies, and will flood Menno, Tripp and Delmont with the facts. For it is reported people are asking: Why were those "lectures cancelled?"

The hearts of men and kings are in the hand of the Lord. Let us pray that the Lord of harvest prosper our work, and cause also this "evil" to turn to the advantage of the truth in Jesus, and to the furtherance of the gospel in all this region.

"And now Lord look upon their threatenings: and grant unto thy servants to speak thy word with boldness." Thus prayed the apostles.

It is not strength but weakness when those, who profess to be ministers, must resort to boycott; from the hand of such the sword of the spirit has fallen, and they seek their strength in chariots and horses.

But we will remember the Name of the LORD, and in His Name lift up our banners!

---

**Editorials . . .**

**THE SETTLED QUESTION**

There is a question that has often arisen in Protestant Reformed groups. Attempts to settle the question by discussion have met with little success. The statement that the question ought to be a settled one has proved even less successful as a solution to the problem. The question has not been asked openly for quite some time; however, it is still being asked, and with increased regularity.

Many will be perturbed that we ask the question again. Some will wonder why we cannot simply accept the arguments which have been advanced so often before and agree that the question is closed and settled. The reason should be obvious. Merely stating that a question should no longer be discussed is no sure way to end a discussion; it usually has the opposite effect. Merely stating that a question is titled does not settle the question. Advancing reasons for one's opinion is not a guarantee that one's opinion will be adopted. Those who are not convinced will continue to raise the question, if not openly, then in secret. But this has no merit. We must have the freedom to openly discuss the things which concern us. When silence becomes interpreted as agreement, we are guilty of hypocrisy.

The question is the question of drama. And the question does not concern any particular type of drama or any abuse of drama, but drama per se. We are told that it is wrong in itself and consequently can have no place in our lives. Yet we are not convinced. We face the problem constantly and are not too ready to say that the solution to the problem lies in avoiding the problem entirely.

When we face the problem in the light of the negative injunction we have received, we raise these questions. If it is wrong to partake in dramatization, is it also wrong to watch such? If it is wrong to watch it, is it wrong to read it? If it is wrong to read it, is it wrong to write it? If one of the
elders of our church tells us that "Scripture teaches that all drama is an abomination to the Lord" and that we may not attend plays, why does he sit home and watch drama on television?

Now we grant that people's inconsistencies (which in this case are as multitudinous as the sands of the seashore) can be no ground for argumentation of principle. But the fact is clearly shown that most who seem to want the principle refuse to accept its application. And we wonder whether these people are so enslaved to sin or whether they do not agree with the principle as much as they indicate.

We raise this issue again not for the sake of defending drama but for the purpose of pointing out that it is still a problem. And, as we see it, it will continue to be a problem until all agree with the principle and follow it. This, apparently, will not happen immediately.

We are faced with two alternatives. We can bring the question out into the open once again and enjoy a healthy discussion or we can close the festering wound and wish that it would heal. The first alternative has been tried, and, while it has not solved the problem, it has taught us that the issue requires critical examination. The second alternative has been tried and has had a decidedly adverse effect. A man who is told exactly how he should make up his mind cannot reach a meaningful decision. And a man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still.

TRUTH vs. ERROR

the modernistic

INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE

REV. R. C. HARBACH

E. MODERNISM ON THE CONFESSIONS

1. Modernism Evading and Enervating the Confessions

The opening tactic of Modernism with respect to the Reformed and Presbyterian (Calvinistic) creeds has been to either remove the creeds altogether, or to exile them to dusty showcases of the ecclesiastical museum. Steps in this direction have been to make minor revisions in the interests of "advanced stages of theology," and in keeping with the "latest developments of Christianity." First, a brief statement is prefixed to the standard confession which provides for a wide latitude of interpretation of the separate points. In some cases the brief statement is a compendium which is offered with the understanding that it is not intended to become a substitute for the confession. Then, after a few years, it is overtured that the brief statement be adopted as the proper creed of the church. If this step is not realized, then an attempt at evasion by revision is made. Usually the revision is first aimed at the doctrine of the decree of God and divine predestination. For example: Article 17 of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, which, by the way, declares nothing of sovereign reprobation, is in the Reformed Episcopal revision (Art. 18) whittled down to a mere mention of the words "election" and "predestination," and proceeds to affirm the doctrine of "man's free agency and responsibility." In a sort of explanatory note, not by way of a confessional declaration, it is stated that "this church simply affirms these doctrines as the Word of God sets them forth," yet it is nowhere explained just how the Word of God does set forth these doctrines. It is also added that this truth, which we believe to be the heart of the church, is submitted "to the individual judgment of the members, as taught by the Holy Spirit;" yet it is nowhere revealed how the individual judgment under the teaching of the Spirit will regard in this
truth. Modernist religion submits all matters of "faith" to the individual judgment. This
is keeping with its basic idea that the mind
man is the final court of appeal. Reformed
truth educates the individual judgment in the
Word of God, and it (the human judg-
ment) must submit to Scripture, and
the confessions based on Scripture.

In the Westminster Brief Statement of
1902, the Reformed Faith was reduced to
16 scantly articles. There man's true condi-
tion by nature is slighted in that not one
word is said about the loss of the image of
God. There are such expressions, however,
as God "offers His all-sufficient salvation to
all men," and "He has provided a way of
eternal life for all mankind." This last
statement makes the cross: (1) not salva-
tion itself, but a provision for salvation; (2)
not the way, but a way of eternal life; and
(3) for all men without exception, rather
than for all the elect. In 1903 the West-
minster Confession, Art. III on God's Eternal
Decree, was so "revised" as to teach the
Arminian philosophy of a love of God to
 continence. This is meant to contradict
Section VII where it is stated that God
claims men to dishonor and wrath for their
sin to the praise of His glorious justice.
That God ordains to eternal wrath those
He loves implies that God is either a mon-
ter or a weakening. This "revision" (corrup-
tion it really is!) then injects into the West-
minster symbol the poison of a universal
atonement, a mere provisional redemption,
makes the gift of God a mere offer to all
men; and further, in the added chapter
XXXV on Missions, the teaching of a well-
meaning offer of God to all men appears.
There is also such Arminian language as
"God invites all," and God "pleads with
men to accept His gracious invitation." It
is also proper to note that neither the decla-
atory statements, nor the chapter changes,
or chapter additions ever speak of the elect,
of foreordination, covenant, decree or im-
putation. References are always to men,
sinners or believers. The "revisions" there-
fore are no development of the Reformed
truth presented in the original Westminster
Confession, but are bold, marked departures
on that truth.

In the revision chapter XXXIV, on the
Holy Spirit, it is declared that "the Father
is ever willing to give (the Spirit) to all
who ask Him." But it should be remem-
bered that they who ask for the Holy Spirit
are the elect only. For God promises "to
give unto all those that are ordained unto
life His Holy Spirit, to make them willing
and able to believe" (VII, III). It should
be further noted that the order of salvation
presented in this new chapter is that of:
(1) conviction of sin, (2) repentance, (3)
regeneration, (4) faith. This makes salva-
tion depend upon man's act, and is not in
harmony with the Westminster, which has:
(1) elect accepted in the Beloved within
the decree of God, (2) regeneration, (3)
calling, (4) justification, (5) adoption, (6)
sanctification, (7) faith, (8) repentance,
(9) perseverance. The revisions therefore
ignore the Reformed order of salvation
which has been for centuries confessed by
the church in the Westminster document.

In 1925 the United Presbyterian Church
 came up with its own version of the West-
minster Confession, consisting of 44 brief
articles rather than the original 33 com-
prehensive articles, which are said to re-
main the substance of the Westminster
standards, and contain also current convic-
tions of the denomination. However, the
United Presbyterian Church made the West-
minster symbols to teach that the gospel is
unconditionally offered to all who hear (Art.
XV). But if the offer can be rejected under
certain circumstance, as the above article
admits, how, from man's or God's point of
view, is it an unconditional offer? Is it not
according to "current convictions" condi-
tioned by the will of man? Is it not also
conditioned by God's foresight of man's
future act of acceptance? Is it not condi-
tioned by faith when it is stated that faith
is the condition of salvation (XVII)? Thus
the confessions are gradually undermined
with imperceptible, insidious subtlety. Ar-
minianism does this, inevitably leading to
Modernism, and Modernism leads to athe-
ism.

2. Criticising and Opposing the
Confessions

What are some of the more open attacks
against the confessions? For one thing,
they are denied with the contention that
they are only man-made records. Why is
it, however, that when the Bible has almost
no place whatever in the church that then opposition to the confessions becomes the most fanatical? Why is it that the most uninformed as to knowledge of confessions have the most against them? The Bible alone, or merely the New Testament, is claimed to be all the creed we need. "No creed but Christ" is one of Modernism's tired clichés. Or we hear, "Scripture, not theology!" This sounds somewhat pious, as it is ostensibly in the interest of the sufficiency of Scripture. We, too, believe the sufficiency of Scripture, but that sufficiency does not render creeds and confessions unnecessary any more than it renders the church unnecessary. Who reasons, We have the Bible, which is alone the Word of God—what need then for any church connection? Who concludes we may stay home with our Bibles? We neither disregard the church, nor the past testimony of the church. Since that testimony was of the Holy Spirit, it is not to be denied or neglected. It is our Christian duty in the church to confess the same things as the church of all the ages. The truth is unchangeable. But the church cannot make any confession or have any testimony if it considers that Scripture alone exclusive of a confession is sufficient. It is from the Scripture that our testimony originates. When we give our testimony, that is also our confession.

The Modernist mind regards confessions as a hindrance to free thought, and renders believing according to the dictates of one's own conscience an impossibility. The Modernist will not be bound by the dictates of other men. He aspires to an absolute individualistic autonomy, and will not submit to another's conscience. He will not, for anything, permit the loss of his own personal identity. As to man's thought, we believe it is never absolutely free. Only God's is that! Man's thought is free under God's providence and sovereignty. His thought is spiritually free only when it is on the track of Scripture. Man's conscience then may be as free as God's Word ordains; and only God's Word may bind the conscience—not some philosophy, not some "religion," not some organization, not some person or group of persons, nor some ruler or government—no power on earth, save the Word in the power of the Spirit. But no Chris-

 Gian is more bound by the confessions than he is by Scripture—not as much as he is by Scripture—yet the binding of the confession he welcomes, would not have it another way. Confessions, then, are no unbearable yoke. They are a binding of choice.

The confessions are also regarded as divisive, causing a rift in the churches. They are the cause of dissension and discord. They raise up walls in the church higher than those of the kingdom of heaven. They separate brethren who ought to be united. They are therefore one of the greatest obstacles standing in the way of the one world church ideal. The modern ecumenical movement for this reason has for one of its purposes the breaking down of all denominational barriers. This antidotal movement aims to merge nominal Protestantism, Romanism and Judaism into a neutral common denominator church. But the church is not so colorless and non-descript. Just as the insignia of an army indicates whether it consists of commandos or paratroops, revealing its distinctive function, so the confessions mark the real reason for a denomination's existence. The insignia is a symbol of the armies' nationality, function and purpose. Removing the insignia will not change all this. But with the soldiers of the cross, to do so would seriously impair their morale. Drop the confessions, and the churches will become spiritually demoralized, impoverished and degenerate to a club or a lodge. For when the churches lose the expressions of their distinctiveness, they soon lose the cause and reason for their separate existence and usefulness in the world.

Further objection to confessions is that they stagnate intellectual and spiritual development. Holding archaic, out-of-date tenets leaves no room for new ideals. The old confessions are so heavenly that they are no earthly good. With them, the church becomes a historical museum and ceases to be a center of culture, influence, leadership and progress. This criticism is not true, except where the churches have neglected, forsaken or corrupted their confessions and lapsed into a dead confessionalism. This is typical of the Modernist churches. Truly confessing church has not yet uttered the last word. On the basis of Scripture it
bears a testimony to the sovereignty and grace of God. That testimony is its confession. That confession, over the years, it develops, enriches and purifies.

It has also been objected that confessions make for prejudice, bigotry and intolerance. They have always been and still are a means of persecution. This is the same objection made by free-thoughtism. They who believe the most are the bigots, and they who believe the least are broadminded. Too much religion is as bad as no religion. It is narrowminded and leads to inquisitorial cruelty. According to this contention, not only were Luther and Calvin notorious heads in the rogues' gallery of bigotry, but so were Paul and Jesus. For none so hopelessly antagonized the Jews as did Jesus up to the point where they were implacably driven to murder him. Then Paul with his interpretation of Christ's principles used the same as the most divisive wedge ever to threaten an anciently established religious institution.

We answer: the Christian and the true church are admittedly intolerant to sin and the lie. So was Jesus, but He was never a bigot. He ate with publicans, Pharisees and sinners. He never allowed them to intimidate or corrupt Him. He answered the devil with, "It is written," and refuted His enemies with "Ye have heard it said . . . but I say unto you . . .!" Using the creeds to persecute is not the mark of the true but the false church. That "church" persecutes "those who live holy according to the Word of God and rebuke" it for error, covetousness and idolatry. The true church does not persecute when it exercises Christian discipline in punishing sin. Reforming, correcting and purifying are not acts of persecution. Managing everything according to the Word of God and rejecting all things contrary thereto is not bigotry, but love and integrity.

Finally, Modernism contends that confessions tempt to hypocrisy. No intelligent person believes them any more. They make the church's ship of state appear to be flying under a pirate-chaser's (heresy-hunter's) flag, whereas the craft is really a merry-ship. It is high time the old, embarrassing flag is lowered, and we "let the church be the church."

It must be admitted that there are hypocrites who pretend to the strictest orthodoxy while they live under that guise in the most flagrant sin. It is also true that there are hypocrites who sail under the Reformed or Presbyterian flag, but who have long ago deserted to the side of the enemy (Arminianism and Modernism). These especially predominate in the churches where Christian discipline is lax or non-existent. It is not the presence of the confessions in the church which makes for arm-chair believers or parlor Christians. They are godly for gain, generous for fame, and aspire after reputation for self. The hypocrite is one who has God in his mouth, but the world in his heart. Not the church, the Scripture or the confessions are to blame, but "he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed" (1) (1:14). A good confession implies belief of the truth and performance of the Word. It is defined in word, expressed in tongue and manifested in deed and in truth!

HELPS FOR BIBLE STUDY ON THE

Book of REVELATION

by REV. H. HOEKSEMA

LESSON XXXI (Revelation 13:1-3a)

1. Vs. 1. a. "And I stood upon the sand of the sea." The R.V. is more correct: he stood upon the sand of the sea. (1) The reference is to the dragon. (2) He went to arise, in order that he may give his power

The Beast

make war with the remnant of the seed of the woman. 12:17. (3) Now he stands on the seashore from the which the beast will to it. b. "And I saw a beast rise up out of the sea." (1) The sea in Scripture is symbol
of the world of nations in their historical development, as they are swept by wars and revolutions. Dan. 7:2, 3, 17; Rev. 17:15.
(2) The beast is a wild beast, and besides, a monster, indicative of its true character. It symbolizes the secular power of the world, a kingdom or empire together with its head. Dan. 7:17, 23; 8:20, 21; Rev. 17:10. c. “Having seven heads and ten horns”; (1) In the R.V. the order is given as “ten horns and seven heads.” This is correct. Rising up out of the sea the horns of the beast would appear first. This may also account for the fact that here the crowns are described as being on the horns, while in the description of the dragon (12:3) they appear on the heads. We must conceive of seven of the crowned horns as being on the seven heads (so that the heads are also crowned though actually the crowns are on the horns); while three of the horns are between the heads. Both, heads and horns, are crowned. (2) The heads represent seven world-powers appearing consecutively in history (see 17:10); and that, too, in such a way that five of the heads represent so many world-kingdoms of the past. one represents the worldpower that existed at the time of John (Roman empire), and one is still to come as the final manifestation of the antichristian power. Hence, figuring backward from the sixth head (Rome, the fourth beast of Dan. 7), we have: 1. The Greek-Macedonian empire (the leopard of Dan. 7:6); the rough goat of Dan. 8:5, 23; 2. The Medio-Persian empire (the bear of Dan. 7:5); the ram of Dan. 8:3, 4, 20): 3. The Babylonian empire (the lion of Dan. 7:4; 4. Before Daniel’s time there was the Assyrian empire with Nineveh as its capital; and 5. Babel, the original world-power that ended in the confusion of tongues and the separation of the nations. The 6th head is Rome. The 7th the world-empire of the future, which is also the eighth, ch. 17:11, that is, it will be the consummation and combination of all the world-powers of the past. (3) The ten horns represent ten kings or kingdoms that shall exist simultaneously at the time of the final manifestation of the antichristian beast, and they shall give their power to the beast (confederate with him) for a short time, ch. 17:12. The horn is a symbol of royal power. Ps. 89:17. d. “And upon its heads names of blasphemy.” (1)

Blasphemy is properly the reviling of that which is sacred, especially God. (2) These names, express, therefore, the antigodly character of the whole beast, i.e. of all the great world-powers.

2. Vs. 2. “And the beast which I saw,” etc. We may notice here: (1) That in general the description of the beast here reminds of the beasts in Dan. 7. (2) That here the various beasts of Daniel 7 appear not separately, but combined into one monstrous beast, denoting that the final world-empire will be a combination of all the world-powers that went before. (3) That the threefold description of the beast (leopard, bear, lion) describes the world-power in its swiftness, strength, and rapacity. b. “And the dragon gave him his power,” etc. (1) The dragon, we remember, is the devil. (2) That he gave to the beast his power signifies, in general, that he uses the political world-power (which, of course, as such has its power, throne, and authority from God) as his antichristian instrument and representative. (3) Particularly it means that the devil so influences the world-power that (a) Its power becomes an evil power; (b) Its throne an antichristian throne; (c) It authorizes an antichristian rule, used in the service of the “god of this world.”

3. Vs. 3a. “And I saw one of its heads as it were wounded to death: and the deadly wound was healed.” The meaning is, of course, that (1) Once in the past the world-power had been fatally wounded. (2) But that now, at the time of the final realization of the antichristian empire the fatal wound was healed. b. Many interpretations have been offered of this significant detail: the Roman world-power fatally wounded in the death of Christ, the wound inflicted on the Roman empire by the invasion of the barbarous hordes from the North, the death of Nero, etc. c. We prefer to think here of the confusion of tongues at the building of the tower of Babel. (1) That was the first attempt to establish a universal world-power. (2) The confusion of tongues was much more than that: it was the severing of the one race into several nations, that would henceforth war against one another. As long as they do this there can be no universal power. (3) This will be healed in the future. The nations will unite.

Eight
1. Vss. 3b, 4. a. And all the world wondered after the beast.” (1) All the inhabitants of the earth. That the wicked are denoted by this expression indicates that they predominate. The righteous are few. (2) They “wondered after” the beast, i.e., they were amazed at his great power, and they followed him, rallied to his banner because of his power. b. “And they worshipped the dragon,” etc. (1) To worship is to ascribe divine power to anyone and to bring him divine homage. (2) They worship, first, the dragon, because he gave power to the beast. The meaning probably is, not that they consciously serve the devil, but that by following after the beast they do the will of the devil and acknowledge him as the prince of this world. (3) Directly, however, they worship the beast, and that, too, because they put their full confidence in his power: “Who is able to make war with him?” The beast being supreme, war is now impossible. The long looked for peace has come!

2. Vss. 5-7a. a. “And there was given unto him a mouth,” etc. (1) The meaning is: by God is given unto him this month, i.e., not in His grace, but in His providence. Even the power of the beast is God’s and is strictly limited by Him. (2) This enables him to speak great things. See Dan. 7:8, 20, 25. The expression “great things” refers to his boastful pride, but also means that he makes great promises to the world in his own strength. (3) And blasphemies: he reviles things sacred. See on vs. 1. b. “And he opened his mouth,” etc. (1) The main target for his wicked darts of blasphemy is God. (2) Hence, he blasphemies: “His name,” i.e., all that is connected with God’s self-revelation in Christ: “His tabernacle,” i.e., God’s covenant, His house and service and fellowship; “and them that dwell in heaven,” i.e., those that dwell in God’s tabernacle in heavenly glory: the hope of future glory. These he derides and mocks and tries to extinguish. c. “And power was given unto him to continue forty and two months.” Even his time limit is determined by God. God gives him his power to carry on his wicked work. For the “forty two months” see on ch. 11:2, 3: 12:6, 14. d. “And it was given unto him to make war,” etc. (1) Notice the repeated expression: “it was given unto him.” (2) He makes war with the saints, i.e., persecutes them. There being no other political power opposing him he can direct all his attention to the “seed of the woman.” This was the devil’s purpose. (3) “And to overcome them.” Not, of course, as if he can overcome and subdue them spiritually. But he kills them, puts them in prison, and, for a time, silences their testimony. See on 11:7-10.

3. Vss. 7b, 8. a. “And power was given him over all kindred, and tongues and nations.” The R.V. has the fourfold division: “every tribe, and people, and tongue and nation.” The meaning is that the rule of antichrist is universal. And again, notice that this power is given him of God. b. (“And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him.” Notice that the form here merges into that of direct prediction: “shall worship.” The antichristian beast enjoys universal adoration and worship. (2) However this does not apply to every individual on the earth; it includes only those “whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.” (The R.V. connects the last phrase with “written” and reads: “whose names are not written from the foundation,” etc. This, however, is a commentary rather than a better translation). c. Concerning this book of life we may note: (1) That it is the book of election. (2) That it is called the book of life because the names of those that are ordained to eternal life are written in it. (3) That it is the Lamb’s book, because those written therein are given to Him. (4) That it is mentioned here for the comfort of the elect and the assurance of their final victory while it spells sure defeat for the wicked worshippers of the anti-christian beast. d. The Lamb is slain (as the slain Lamb He purchased those whose names are written in the book) from the foundation of the world: from the very beginning the world killed Christ.

4. Vss. 9, 10. a. “If any man hath an ear, let him hear.” This familiar exhortation is, of course, addressed particularly to the spiritual people of God. They only have ears to hear. By it special attention is called to the following warning. b. “He that leadeth
into captivity,” etc. (1) The expression means that just retribution shall be inflicted upon the anti-christian power and those that follow the beast. (2) To this the suffering saints that are led into prison and death, may and do look forward. (3) Hence: “Here is the patience and the faith of the saints.” The hope of their final deliverance and justification is the object of their faith, and the explanation of their patience.

**LESSON XXXIII (Revelation 13:11-14)**

Vs. 11. “And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth.” 1. A second beast appears in the vision. This also is called “a beast,” though its appearance is not at all like that of a wild animal. The reason is that its nature is quite like that of the first beast. 2. This second beast arises out of the earth, i.e., it has its origin in the sea of nations, war-swept, restless. That the second beast arises out of the earth denotes: a. That it is earthly, from below, carnal; not from above. James 3:15. b. That it has its origin not in the power of the sword, but in them that dwell on the earth, not in war and strife, but rather in the more quiet development of earthly, human life and ingenuity. It is not political, but a spiritual character. This suggests at once that this second beast is a product of human ingenuity and talents fulfilling its original mandate to have dominion over the earth: culture, science and invention, human wisdom divorced from the wisdom that is from above. 3. The description of the beast: “and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon.” a. The number of the horns has no special significance except to indicate that it looks like a normal beast, and that, too, like a lamb. There is no direct comparison to the Lamb, for He has seven horns. That his horns are like those of a lamb rather indicates that this beast is not fierce and warlike, but meek and peace-loving. However, his appearance reminds of the Lamb. We are reminded here that false prophets are wolves in sheep’s clothing. Matt. 7:15. b. The speech of this beast belies its appearance: it speaks like a dragon, i.e., with the purpose to tempt and deceive. The speech suggests that also this beast stands in the service of the devil, innocent though it looks. c. Notice, too, that it speaks. It does not exercise its power by force of arms, but by the power of its word. It represents the false prophet, i.e., not any particular person, but the entire power of false science, culture, religion.

**The Beast Out Of The Earth**

Vs. 12. “And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him.” 1. The original word for “power” means “authority.” This seems to suggest that this second beast is clothed with the official authority of the first beast. The political power of the antichrist takes antichristian culture and religion in its service. Hence: “before him,” i.e., before the first beast this second beast does all its work. It stands in the service of the antichristian empire. 2. “And causeth the earth and them which dwell therein,” etc. a. This is the very specific service it performs for the beast. It makes people all over the earth worship the beast. b. Let us note here: (1) That this is accomplished by the persuasive speech of the second beast. It molds public opinion. (2) That they that worship the beast are described as “the earth and them that dwell therein,” i.e., all men and that in their capacity of dwellers in the earth: they devote their all to the beast. (3) That it is emphasized here that the special reason for this worship and admiration is that the deadly wound of the first beast is healed. See on vs. 3.

Vs. 13. “And he doeth great wonders, so that,” etc. 1. The word for “wonders” in the original is “signs.” To be able to do signs belongs to the office of a true prophet. Signs corroborate his word. Hence, also the false prophet will produce his signs. See Matt. 24:24; Mk. 13:22. These wonders are not mere tricks, but very real, even though they are all limited to the sphere of earthly things. 2. He even brings fire from heaven. This is mentioned merely as one of the great things he will be able to do, representing other wonders. Reminds of Elijah. 3. And he performs all this “in the sight of men.” It is his special purpose that men be witnesses of his power, in order that they may believe his word. Hence, he performs them publicly.

Vs. 14. “And he deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles,” etc. 1. This again in harmony

---

*BEACON LIGHTS*
with Matt. 24:11, 24. Many will be deceived. The great deception is always that it is good and leads to happiness to depart from the living God and His Word. 2. The wonders serve this purpose. By it the second beast seems to prove that he is able to inaugurate an era of unheard of prosperity and happiness. The R.V. has “which it was given him to do.” This is correct. 3. His deception consists concretely in that he persuades men to make an image of the beast.

a. Notice here again that the worship of the beast is brought into connection with the fact that the deadly wound was healed. b. The image of the beast is meant as an idol, representing the antichristian world-power. This may very well find literal fulfillment in the future.

LESSON XXXIV (Revelation 13:15-18) The Name Of The Beast

1. Vs. 15. “And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast.” The R.V. is more correct: “And it was given unto him to give breath unto it, even unto the image of the beast.” 1. The false prophet is given power (see on vss. 5, 7) to give life or breath, literally “a spirit” to the image of the beast. 2. According to some (who interpret the entire chapter as referring to the Roman empire) some images of the deified Roman emperors were reported to have spoken, and John is supposed to have believed this superstition. Needless to say, that we must regard such interpretations in conflict with the idea of infallible inspiration. 3. Exactly in what manner this is to be realized we do not know; however in our day of radio and dictaphones, etc., it should not be difficult to visualize a literal fulfillment of this prophecy in the future. “And that the image of the beast should both speak and cause that as many would not worship,” etc. 1. The “spirit” is given to the image in order that it may speak: anything recorded can be reproduced. 2. And the specific purpose of this speech is to detect and expose the faithful saints that refuse to worship the beast and his image, that they may be killed.

2. Vss. 16, 17. “And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark,” etc. Notice here: 1. That all classes of men without exception receive a mark, by which they are distinguished as belonging to the beast and being loyal to his cause. 2. That they wear this mark “on their right hand, or in their foreheads” has, evidently, no other significance than that it must be plainly seen and, therefore, be worn in a conspicuous place. 3. The mark is given them (thus in the original), and this implies: a. That under the powerful influence of the false prophet (the second beast) it is decreed as a state law, that all worshippers of the beast shall receive and wear such a mark. b. That, nevertheless the mark is voluntarily received. It is not forced upon them, for the saints do not receive the mark. Only on swearing allegiance to the beast and worshipping him can the mark be received. 4. From vs. 17 (“save he that had the mark, even the name of the beast or the number of his name.” R.V.) it is plain that the mark consists of the name of the beast or the number of his name. Let us note here: a. That by the name of the beast is not meant the proper name of some individual, such as Nero, Domitian, etc. The name in Scripture is the expression of the nature of anyone or anything, or the symbol of belonging to someone. See Rev. 2:17: 3:1, 5, 12. Here the name denotes the antichristian character of the beast. b. That by the number of his name is not meant the numerical value of the letters of his name either in Greek or Hebrew. (1) This would limit the interpretation of this entire chapter to its application to the Roman empire. The name in that case is supposed to be the name of the Roman empire, or of one of its emperors, and the number of the name the sum of the numerical value of its letters. (2) Even then the question arises: a name in what language? Hebrew, Greek, Latin? And what name? It is better and more in harmony with the symbolism of the numbers in the book of revelation, to interpret the “number of his name” as the symbolic expression of the meaning of the name in a number (see below on vs. 18). The general meaning is, therefore, that the mark is some sign that expresses the antichristian character of the beast; perhaps, literally the number 666. 5. Again, the purpose of this mark is to distinguish the worshippers of the
beast from those that refuse to worship him, and to persecute the latter: “And that no man might buy or sell save he that had the mark of the beast.” What this means may easily be surmised. It would make social outcasts of believers, so that literally they have no place left in the world.

3. Vs. 18. “Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast,” etc. Let us note here: 1. That it requires wisdom and understanding to count the number of the beast,” etc. In Scripture “wisdom and understanding” are not the same as human ingenuity, but they are spiritual, from above, and enable one to know the spiritual things of the kingdom of God. 2. This should warn us against those interpretations that make of this number a riddle or puzzle, e.g. L (30) A (1) T (300) E (5) I (10) N (50, O (70) S (200): 666 is LATEINOS, the Roman empire. And there are very many explanations that proceed on the same principle. 3. That it is the number of a man, i.e., not of any particular individual, but of a human being, characteristically limited as a human being, mere Man. 4. In the light of this: 6 is 7-1, the mere earthy, the week without the sabbath, labor without rest. The repetition: 600, 60, 6 represents the repeated efforts of man to establish his own kingdom of blessedness and peace, and his repeated and ultimate failure.

Hymns

ROLAND PETERSEN

While this article deals with hymns, it is not the intention of the writer to enter at this time into the present controversy concerning the use of hymns in our church services. There seems to be little question concerning the use of hymns in our schools and homes, at “hymnsings,” for special programs, and on our radio broadcasts.

Let’s begin with a formal definition of “hymn.” Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary defines “hymn” as “An ode or song of praise and adoration; esp. a religious ode or song.” This broad definition includes our “psalms” (better, psalm versifications and paraphrases), so, for our purposes, it is best to use the conventional distinction in which “hymn” means a religious song other than those based on the Psalms. It should also be made clear that “hymn” means text. When referring to the music, we use “hymn tune.”

If one were to ask the question, “Why do we sing hymns?” The most probable answer would be that we sing to praise and glorify God, to thank Him for His great goodness to His people. This lofty ideal should motivate all our singing and speaking. To deviate from this is to walk in error. When hymns become tools to be used in “saving souls” or they are mere entertainment, the signs of the true Church are probably absent.

It is obvious, from the instant objections raised by some to the introduction of hymns in our services, that there are many hymns which are not usable in Protestant Reformed circles. To these people “hymn” has a distressing connotation. When “hymn” reminds them of such horrors as “When the Roll is Called Up Yonder,” this attitude is easily understood! Perhaps at this point some refining of our definition of “hymns” is in order. What, then, constitutes a good hymn?

We should insist that all hymns be based on Scripture. This, of course, means that hymns contain doctrine. Not vague generalities acceptable to all who call themselves “Christian.” No, we must have hymns with Protestant Reformed Doctrine. It is sad and strange, but distressingly true, that songs having little or none of this doctrine
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are often heard in Protestant Reformed gatherings. We hear altogether too much of the religious entertainment that characterizes the fundamentalist movement.

Further, hymns are poems. A good hymn is a good poem. Those who say that there are no acceptable hymns and that we should write our own seem to forget this fact. We need good poems. But, with very few exceptions, the poets are not in evidence... We can learn much from the multifarious poetical garbage turned out by the "tin pan Alley" of modern fundamentalism.

If we judge hymns, then, on their faithfulness to Scripture, their doctrinal content, and the quality of their poetry, we can weed out many that are completely undesirable. First, there are those that contain error. Sometimes this error is obvious; more often it is not. The Arminian heresy is present in all its subtle forms:

**Come, sinners, to the Gospel feast,**
*Let every soul be Jesus' guest;*
*You need not one be left behind;*
*For God has hidden all mankind.*

C. Wesley

Jesus is pleading; O list to His voice;
Hear Him today, hear Him today;
They who believe on His name shall rejoice;
Quickly arise and away.
Calling today... Jesus is tenderly calling today.

Fanny J. Crosby

**Sinners turn, why will ye die?**
*God, the Spirit, asks you why;*
*He, who all your lives hath strove,*
*Wooed you to embrace His love;*
*Will you not His grace receive?*

etc.

C. Wesley

All heresy is not Arminianism. The modernist has his "hymns" too...

**For Socrates who, phrase by phrase,**
*Talked men to truth, unshrinking,*
*And left for Plato's mighty grace*
*To mold our ways of thinking;*
*For all who wrestled, saw and free,*
*To win the unseen reality,*
*To God be thanks and glory.*

Percy Dearmer

Then there is the hyper-emotional "Gospel song." This traditional tool of the wandering evangelist is important in obtaining the "decisions for Christ" that are their

stock in trade. These songs, supercharged with emotion, usually do not say very much...

*O turn ye, O turn ye, for why will ye die?*
*When God, in great mercy is coming so night?*

Now Jesus invites you, the Spirit says

"Come"

And angels are waiting to welcome you home. Rev. Josiah Hopkins

**Late, late, so late! and dark the night and chill!**
**Late, late, so late! but we can enter still**
**Too late, too late, ye cannot enter now:**
**Too late, too late, ye cannot enter now.**

Alfred Tennyson

Now then, what are we to do? Our hymns must express Protestant Reformed truth. They must be good poetry, free of emotionalism and excessive subjectivity (overuse of "I," "mine," "me," etc.). This is a large order, but it can be filled. Compare the following with the above examples:

**Ye that know the Lord is gracious**
*Ye for whom a cornerstone stands*
*Of God elect and precious,*
*Laid that ye may build thereon,*
*See that on that sure foundation*
*Ye a living temple raise*
*Towers that may tell forth salvation*
*Walls that may reecho praise.***

Living stones, by God appointed
Each to his allotted place,
King and priests, by God anointed,
Shall ye not declare His grace?
Ye, a royal generation,
Tell the tidings of your birth,
Tidings of a new creation
To an old and weary earth.

C. A. Alington

The people that in darkness sat
A glorious light have seen;
The light has shined on them who long
In shades of death have been.

For thou their burden dost remove
And break the tyrant's rod
As in the day when Midian fell
Before the sword of God.

For unto us a child is born
To us a son is given
And on his shoulder rests
All power in earth and heaven.
His name shall be the Prince of Peace
The everlasting Lord
The Wonderful, the Counsellor,
The God by all adored.

Father, long before creation Thou hadst
chosen us in love;
And that love, so deep, so moving, Draws
us close to Christ above.
Still it keeps us, still it keeps us, Firmly
fixed in Christ alone.
Though the world may change its fashion,
Yet our God is ever the same:
His compassion and His Covenant Through
all ages will remain.
God's own children, God's own children,
Must forever praise His name.
Chinese; anon.
Translated by F. P. Jones
Of the Father's love begotten, Ere the
worlds began to be,

He is Alpha and Omega, He the source, the
ending, He,
Of the things that are, that have been,
And that future years shall see, Evermore
and evermore.

Aurelius Clemens Prudentius (348-413)
These, and the many hymns like them
are not found in a single hymnal. One must
hunt through many books to find them.
Often a hymnal will not contain a single
worthwhile hymn; occasionally, there are
several. They are worth searching out,
however, and when they are found they
are worth singing wherever and whenever
we can.

Jesus lives! Our hearts know well
Naught from us His love shall sever;
Life nor death nor power of hell
Tear us from his keeping ever
Alleluia!

C. F. Gellert

BOOKS

The Third Cross
Avin Harry Johnston – Zondervan Pub-
lishing Co. – 346 pp. – $3.50.

The Third Cross, written by A. H. John-
ston, is a sincere attempt to write a Chris-
tian novel. The depth of thought, the type
of romance, and the perpetuation of action
make this novel especially appealing to
those of Junior High and Highschool level.

Fabius, a Roman soldier, accustomed
to high living in Rome, is sent to the lonely
hills of Judea with a replacement contingent
for the Legions in Judea. He arrives here at
the culmination of the life of Christ. Here
he coincidentally meets a Jewish girl who
despises all Romans, good-looking or not.
Being repelled, he, of course, becomes
doubly much interested in this litle, dark-
haired, Jewish repellant. But, he finds that
their modes of life conflict, she, being an
avid follower of the Son of God, he, holding
only a gripping awe for him. The con-
flict is resolved. “If you will follow Him,
I will follow you!”

This novel descriptively depicts Roman
and Judean history during these times. It
reveals the nature of the Jewish people in
contrast to that of the Romans ... and the
intense hatred between these two factions.
Again, the history is based on Scripture’s
interpretation of it. One would especially
enjoy the eight page, dramatic scene of
Pilate’s dilemma in crucifying Christ.

The title of the book may lead one to
think that this is a novel portraying the
life of Christ. However, very little is evi-
denced concerning the life and words of
Jesus Christ. Christ is portrayed only as He
directly bears on the lives of these two
people. Thus, Christ’s words and works are
kept those of the Scripture, and not portrayed
(as they are by so many artists who depict
this era) to such a degree that Christ be-
comes nothing more than a main character
in the book, molded for the author’s intents.
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BEACON LIGHTS
COMING TO THE FATHER

REV. R. VELDMAN

"no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me." — John 14:6b

Few chapters in all the Word of God are more touching, more tender and loving, than this 14th chapter of John. Spoken as it was in the very shadow of the cross, this is not surprising.

The hearts of the disciples are troubled—and no wonder! It is Jesus' last night on earth. Only a few more hours and He, Whom they loved so dearly would be nailed to the cruel tree. It is the hour of separation, and as the dreadful moment nears the hearts of the disciples become more and more troubled.

Jesus, however, comforts them, first while they are yet in the upper chamber, then while He and His disciples are on the way to the garden of sorrows. He tells them, "Let not your hearts be troubled." Your souls sorrowful—that is one thing. There's nothing wrong with that. Your hearts troubled? The center of your spiritual life bewildered, confused, shaken? No! He tells them, "In My Father's house are many mansions... I go to prepare a place for you." And then He says, "And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know."

A question of Thomas leads to the words quoted above. This disciple, perplexed by it all, says, "Lord, we know not whither Thou goest; and how can we know the way?" If one doesn't know the destination, how can one know the way? Jesus replies, "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me." Hence, the "whither I go" is the Father; the "way" is Christ, without Whom is only darkness and lie and death.

This "coming to the Father" is the highest conceivable blessedness. Beyond that is nothing. It's the most, the greatest—everything. It's the covenant idea in all its fulness and glory.

Father is God, Creator of all things, the infinite comprehension of every perfection and overflowing fountain of all good. To come to the Father is to come to GOD! What can be greater than that?

Father is the Triune God. He is not merely the First Person. We do not come to only one person. He is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the three-personal covenant Jehovah. Within the Holy Trinity only the First Person is the Father; in His relation to the creature the Father is the Triune God, always, and our coming is to Him.

Father is the Triune God as Father. Father He is of our Lord Jesus Christ, the holy child Jesus, in Whom dwells the fulness of the godhead bodily. Father He is of all who belong to Christ from everlasting and to everlasting. To them He gives His life so that they are indeed born of Him. Therein lies the basic idea of fatherhood: the will to have children and the act of begetting them. Them He loves and supplies with all they need for time and eternity. In these both lie the essence and beauty of fatherhood.

Coming to this Father implies, that we forsake the world which we love so dearly by nature, renounce sin and evil, crucify our old flesh, and walk in a new and holy life; that we draw near to Him spiritually, seek His fellowship, enter into His sacred presence, know Him, love Him, serve Him; that we dwell in the light of His countenance, bask in the sunshine of His favor, share in the beauties of His glory. All this, and much, much more.

Herein, herein only, lies true and lasting blessedness for the creature, made in His image and adapted therefore to communion with God.

Never does this happiness lie in things of this earth, in sin, or even the legitimate things of this life.

In fact, true happiness for man does not
even consist of heaven, merely as a place, however beautiful it may be. Many seem to think so. Heaven will be a beautiful land of breath-taking splendor, where there will be only endless joy and peace. The great purpose of man is to get to that place. That Father is the heaven of heaven, even as our parents make home home, is not considered. Even such a heaven does not constitute man's chief glory.

To be with Father, to be near to God, that is true happiness—that, and nothing more.

This coming to the Father, this supreme blessedness, is impossible outside of Christ. That's the great thrust of this word of Jesus.

First of all, it was not the Father's will that the creature should dwell with Him outside of Christ. Jesus is His own beloved Son. It is the Father's eternal good pleasure, that all the fulness of the godhead and all the riches of His virtues should dwell bodily in Him, that He should be the way and the truth and the life, and that only through Him salvation should be imparted to a multitude of elect.

Furthermore, we cannot come to the Father and enjoy His heavenly communion outside of Christ because of the essential difference between Father and children. Father is God, remember? And God is the absolutely transcendent one, the light unto which no man can approach, the eternally unreachable and unknowable one as far as mere creature is concerned, invisible, infinite, omnipresent, beyond all knowledge and human comprehension. That God can be known only in His revelation. That revelation unto heavenly blessedness is Christ. He is Immanuel, God with us! He is the face of God—the most we shall ever see of the Father. To see Him is to see the Father; to know Him is to know the Father. Without the former the latter is impossible, "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me." "I am the way, and the truth, and the life."

Also, however, we cannot come to the Father outside of Christ by reason of sin.

Father is the perfectly righteous one. Who must demand that all who dwell with Him be in complete harmony with His will and law. Besides, Father is the spotlessly holy one. who can tolerate in His presence only that which is holy as He is holy. "Lord, who shall abide in Thy tabernacle? who shall dwell in Thy holy hill? He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart." Psalm 15:1, 2. Nothing less can satisfy Him. Those requirements cannot be altered or bent.

And now, who and what is this man, who is speaking of drawing near to this righteous and pure God? Who are we?

We are guilty, are we not? Our sins rise up against us day by day. "My transgressions I confess, Grief and guilt my soul oppress," Thus we may not come to the Father. We lost every right to dwell in Father's house. By nature there is for us, not fellowship and life; only damnation and death.

Also, are we who wholly corrupt, dead in sin, allies of the devil, inclined to all and every corruption? Thus we cannot come to the Father. "I am evil. born in sin; Thou desirest truth within." His holy being must needs consume all that is not according to the purity of His will.

In addition, we are utterly incapable of raising one finger in behalf of our own salvation. No, we do not want to come to the Father either. But, deeper than that, we cannot. Who can atone for even the remotest part of his debt? Who can deliver himself from the law of sin and death, wash away the leopard's spots, change the Ethiopian's skin?

"No man cometh unto the Father."

"But by Me," Our precious Redeemer.

Don't you feel, that only He may dwell with the Father. not only as the eternal Son, but also as the Christ, the Son in human nature, the holy child Jesus, on Whom the Lord has laid the iniquity of us all?

He has fully satisfied the justice of God, by paying the full penalty of sin.

He has fulfilled the entire law in His active obedience. Always His meat was to do the will of the Father. In purest truth He can say, "I have glorified Thee on the earth; I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do."

Only by Him we may and can come to the Father.

By His blood, first of all. His righteousness must be reckoned unto us unto com-
plete justification. Then we may come to the Father.

Then by His life, given in the miracle of our re-birth.

Both we have only by a true and living faith in Jesus Christ. Faith, therefore, is indeed the victory. You believe in the Lord Jesus? Then, however small the principle may be, that Christ is your Christ too in all the riches of His saving grace. Then the Father is your Father too in all the depths of eternal love.

“No man . . . but by Me.” Ever mindful of that connection, therefore, between destination and way, the eternal Father and our Mighty Savior, we may well join the church of many ages in that familiar and touching prayer:

“Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee;
Let the water and the blood,
From Thy wounded side which flowed.
Be of sin the double cure;
Save from guilt and make me pure.

Not the labors of my hands
Can fulfill Thy law’s demands;
Could my zeal no languor know,
Could my tears forever flow,
All for sin could not atone;
Thou must save, and Thou alone.”

CHURCH-CONTROLLED SCHOOLS
AGATHA LUBBERS

One of the first themes that the freshman student at Calvin College was required to write in English 103 some years ago was: "Should Calvin College Be a Church-Controlled School?" This question was asked because it was one which was debated at considerable length by clergy, faculty, members of the board of trustees, and even by some members of the student body.

A topic such as this may hardly seem apropos or of importance to us in the Protestant Reformed Churches because we are not currently faced with the difficulty nor obligation to finance and administer a church school in the area of secondary education. In the Christian Reformed Churches the Synod is responsible for the administering of a school which has mushroomed into a liberal arts college from a small school dedicated to the training of ministers and teachers. The Synod carries out this obligation by appointing a board of trustees who appoints experts in the field of secondary education.

Even to many which belong to churches which support colleges a topic such as this seems unimportant from an academic point of view. From a financial and material standpoint I would imagine that the question assumes more serious proportions for these. There are many who can not understand why the church should be “taxed” to help future doctors, lawyers, engineers, business administrators, and professional chemists, to name a few, get their start in these secular professions.

This question is not only aired and discussed in professedly Reformed circles but is also discussed by professors and leaders in the so-called Bible Belt of the South. Under the caption, “Why Evangelical Colleges Die,” C. Gregg Singer of Catawba College in North Carolina discusses a problem related to this whole problem of church supported and controlled colleges. He attempts to answer the question by investigating the historic reasons for the decline of the Christian position and the eventual total denial of the historic Christian position by many colleges which were previously founded on Christian principles.

The author of the article mentioned takes the position that Christianity is exclusively true and that it transcends all human systems of thought and must therefore be sovereign over the minds of men. He contends that the situation is deplorable and lamentable when this basic position is denied. He gives four basic reasons for the sobering fact that colleges that were previously dedicated to the Christian position have now long departed.

He cites as the first reason a loss in church control. Particularly colleges which were founded by those churches using the Congregational or Baptist form of govern-
ment have defected. A basic weakness in the political structure in the church has made departure from doctrinal orthodoxy possible. Colleges which operate in this loose political structure permit a proclamation of theological independence from the founding church.

The second reason given by Dr. Singer is the inherent theological weakness in many of the churches which supported these colleges which have become secular. Arminianism and semi-Pelagianism because official positions of these churches and these theological positions are considered by the writer as “conscious accommodations to humanism and unbelief to the extent to which they deny the sovereignty of God and the depravity of the race after the Fall.” This professed Arminianism has been “the Achilles heel of much evangelical education effort in this country.”

The writer also stresses that a sound philosophy of education cannot be developed by educators unless there be a sound theology which supports a Christian world and life view. Many churches which were historically evangelical in outlook have singularly failed in their educational activities simply because their theology did not provide the necessary foundation for a philosophy of education that would bring the teachings of Scripture sharply to focus on the educational program.

Because of a decided theological indifference the educational level was reduced to a culling of prevailing humanistic philosophies of education. The college program came, under the control of those who did not care to examine problems of scholarship and culture in terms of the Scriptures.

The shunning of intellectual issues is given as the third reason for the decline of Christian colleges. The great intellectual questions that arise in educational circles were avoided and the whole counsel of God was not presented in all its grandeur and fullness. Pietistic leaders began to proclaim that learning was dangerous and because learning was dangerous it was to be avoided.

Because the educational enterprise demands trained personnel many colleges were forced to employ competent scholars without too much regard for their doctrinal standards. It was simply assumed that these professors could not infringe upon the faith of the students—because they did not teach courses in Bible or theology. Dr. Singer keenly observes on this point: “The finest educational philosophy must remain ineffective unless it becomes the guiding principle for competent scholars who are, at the same time thoroughly grounded in the Scriptures and committed to the historic Christian faith.”

Conformity to environment is stated to be the last great reason for this decline. Christian colleges attempt to accommodate their own program to the cultural milieu of the day. Colleges have conformed “to the demands of the American way of life and democratic philosophy.” The writer sagely insists that “the basic differences between contemporary non-Christian philosophies and the plain teachings of the Scriptures in regard to God and man, sin and salvation and meaning of the human drama itself are to be the basic teachings in Christian educational effort.

It is certainly true that there are decided dangers in the educational endeavor. Natural man is always ready to pervert the truth. Only when one is guided by the principles of the Word of God and as these are stated for us in the Three Forms of Unity does one remain distinctive and antithetical in his teaching. Basic philosophies of education one must hold and these must be based on the Word of God.

Church controlled colleges are not absolutely essential but because of the depravity of men this type of college seems to be most feasible. A strong church institute which is interested in the maintenance of pure doctrine and is willing to oppose, expose, and dispose of all offenders of the faith is a necessary requisite to the maintenance of the truth and the development of the truth in the educational endeavor.

We do not intend to cast stones but our Protestant Reformed students do well to observe the results in today’s colleges.