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Convention week 1962 began for some Prot. Ref. young people on Monday, August 13. But the first two days were undoubtedly different for different people. Long before the young people of the Wolverine state were thinking about the convention, our more distant friends were probably pushing east across the Great Plains toward Hudsonville. Once the out-of-towners got within a mile or two of the big burg, they could follow their noses. The more perceptive in the group, and those with an agricultural background, and all those who make a habit of breathing for a living, probably reached the conclusion that there must be an onion farm or two in the vicinity.

Other than that, however, it seemed to be a rather nice little village. They received a warm welcome from the host society, and, after being shown to their temporary abode, they took a peek around Hudsonville and even ventured as far as the All-American City, the great Grand Rapids, Michigan.

It was about this time that the young people of Grand Rapids were beginning to come out of hibernation. It was time for them also to head for Hudsonville. And with the customary Tuesday night Inspirational Mass Meeting, the 1962 convention was officially under way.

Rev. H. Hoeksema presented the first in a series of three convention speeches around the general theme “Friendship.” He assured us that he was very happy to have the privilege of speaking once more at our convention. We would like to add, however, that the pleasure was by no means one sided. Our convention would just not be the same without Rev. Hoeksema as our first speaker.

After the speech, there was a “refreshment and get-acquainted hour” in which, believe it or not, we got refreshed and acquainted and were all the more eager to begin our first full convention day.

Whoever said that “when the alarm clock goes off, the best part of the day is over,” obviously was not thinking
about Wednesday, August 15. Everybody was up bright and early and in high spirits, full of anticipation for the events of the day. The business meeting proceeded with amazing rapidity under the capable leadership of Harry Langerak (both the old and newly elected president of the Federation Board) and the “ayes” for the motion to adjourn were by far the strongest for some odd reason—one would almost suppose that they were thinking of something else.

After a quick lunch in the basement we set out for the Dune Schooner rides. These rides were breath-taking to say the very least. We tried to convince ourselves that this guy knew what he was doing, but sliding sideways and rolling backwards we were never quite sure of survival.

After shaking some of the sand out of our hair and digging it out of our ears, we headed for Pohawahomir (don’t try to pronounce it, just look at it) Beach. Besides the water (no less!) in this lake, there was also a nice high dive which one of our more daring ministers climbed up, looked down, shuddered, and climbed back down.

After the wiener roast at Dune Schooner’s Log Cabin, Rev. G. Van Baren who “was young himself not so long ago” gave an especially inspiring speech, “The Friendship of Christ,” which brought the second day of the convention to a fitting close.

Getting out of bed Thursday morning was a little rougher than it was Wednesday morning. In fact, the way some of the fellows stumbled into Hager Park for the pancake breakfast, one would almost think that they had had only a few hours of sleep—but that can’t be. A little softball after breakfast brightened everybody’s spirits, however, before we headed back to Hudsonville for the business meeting of the day. After the meeting and another quick lunch in the basement, the young people left Hudsonville in smaller groups to spend the afternoon as they saw fit.

The girls perhaps spent the afternoon “fixing” (or whatever you call it) their hair for the banquet that evening. No wonder girls are such deep thinkers—look at all the reflecting they do in front of mirrors.

The boys kept busy also. Some of them abandoned the idea of going fishing (with straight hooks because
they didn’t like to clean fish) and went to the beach instead—to swim (presumably). Another small group decided to try their hand at golfing. After finishing with scores approximately twice as high as ladies’par, they decided to keep their mouths shut about the results of the game and, if there is such a thing as a definition of a golf ball, to change it to read: “that sphere 1½ inches in diameter at which one is aiming when he hits the sphere 8,000 miles in diameter.” That big sphere really got chewed up that day.

Well, the big night had arrived and the young people came trooping to the Unity Chr. High School Gym for the banquet. The boys had a little color to show for their afternoon in the sun. The girls—hmmm—it must be that they didn’t spend that time reflecting after all—either that or it didn’t do any good. (Just kidding, of course.)

The convention picture was customary. But the photographer wasn’t. Those of us who have been at a few more conventions will never forget the
little man with the weak, high-pitched, shrill voice, the wornout referee's whistle to attract our attention, and the camera that must have survived the Civil War.

Speaking of photography, there was one person at the convention who, if the vote were taken, would have been thrown, cameras and all, into the lake, with unanimous consent.

The banquet was a success, despite the near-panic of the women servers when about sixty more young people showed up for the meal than had made reservations. The speaker for the night was Rev. M. Schipper who spoke on "The Friendship of the Church."

After the speech, the new officers were presented, Minnesota was announced as the next convention site, and "God Be With You" was sung with its usual depth of feeling. As they had come, so they left, and another convention was a memory.
Ephesians 6:13 — "Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that you may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand."

Just a short time ago I was engaged in a discussion as to the ultimate cause and purpose of education and I was struck by the statement that "education must strengthen the moral fibres of the students and provide them with the proper values for a happy and fruitful life." Upon investigation into this "happy and fruitful life", it became evident that this was something quite philosophical and abstract. Every man's life was different, depending on what values he held to be the best for him — and so if a person set up some goals for himself, based on these values and then fulfilled this goal, he was said to have lived a happy and fruitful life. Therefore, it is the purpose of education to so engrain the good values into the students, that they set up goals that are constructive both to themselves and to society.

Today's educational system is largely responsible for the fact that some people's goal is to take what belongs to another whether it be his life or his possessions. Under this type of thinking, almost any deviant behavior can be blamed upon the educational background of the individuals involved.

Juvenile Delinquency, theft and even murder is said to be the result of a flaw in the person's educational background. He was not taught the proper values and therefore he could not set up the correct goals and hence he became harmful to society.

If one is looking through the spectacles of a secular society, this sounds fine, but as Christians, we surely cannot agree with this type of educational philosophy. What then
is the ultimate goal of the education we provide in our Christian schools? Must we neglect some of the existing subjects in order to provide the students with more knowledge about historical and doctrinal aspects of the Protestant Reformed Churches? I think not! The tradition of the P.R. churches can best be taught at home and the doctrine belongs mainly in the realm of the church and the parents. Certainly these subjects should never become a replacement for parts of the core curriculum. What then is the purpose of our schools? I think the goal is summed up in the verse from Ephesians 6 as quoted above. The command comes out to all of His people to become fully clothed with the armour of God so that we will be prepared to fight the daily battle against sin. Unarmed and unprepared we shall surely lose the battle. To be armed does not mean only the ability to combat false doctrines, but also includes the ability to live a life of dedication and devotion to our God. This too, we must prepare for, and what better place is there to prepare for such a fight than in a Christian school with Christian teachers who uphold the Christian principles of education. Even the government has enough sense to train their young men before sending them into the heat of battle, for if unprepared and untrained, they would soon perish. So too can we view the schools as a “boot camp” where the children of the Church are aided in this training for the battle of the “evil day.” They must first be armed and taught how to use these arms before going out to fight the battle for themselves. If we view the schools in such a manner, then it will not be a question of what subjects should we exclude from or include in the curriculum of a Christian school, but rather we will attempt to teach all courses in such a way that they can be used in the struggle against sin that will inevitably follow. It is of utmost importance that our covenant children be fully prepared to withstand the battle in the “evil day” that shall surely come.

Wayne Lanning
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* * *

The second Beacon Lights Literary Contest is underway. February 1, 1963 stands as the tentative deadline. Membership in the Protestant Reformed Churches is the only prerequisite to entering the contest. The categories remain the same, poetry, prose fiction, and prose non-fiction, with the addition, this year, of a special fourth category which will include all the efforts of grade school youths. First place prizes will be awarded in all four categories.

Check subsequent issues of Beacon Lights for further information but begin writing now.

For What It’s Worth:

It is our opinion that the after-recess program (of Young People’s Society) can become valued and valuable if the society leaves off skipping hither and yon over that regular, tired, old list of subjects and makes instead a systematic and thorough investigation of one subject (e.g., millennialism), one book (e.g., the Apocrypha), or one confession (e.g., the Belgic Confession) a year.
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PENCILS and CHALK
LITTLE COUNTRY SCHOOL OFTEN DISPLAYS APPLE, BUT BOOK LEARNING IS BASED UPON FUNDAMENTALS

By Helen L. Beaird

A shiny, red apple, an almost forgotten symbol in most classrooms, is a reality to one teacher, Miss Ruth Kuiper, teacher of the seven-pupil Protestant Reformed Christian school, located at the former Proctor school building about three miles north of Loveland.

The apple—the ABCs marching with precise penmanship across the top of the blackboard—the crayon drawings and other evidences of childish art—all form a composite picture of the little, red schoolhouse. About the only difference is that, in this instance, the little schoolhouse is white.

Absorbing the fundamentals of the three R's in the tiny room, the pupils range in grade from the first through the fifth. They include Ricky Campbell, first grade; twins David and Dennis Griess, second grade; Barbara Griess and Glenn Griess, third grade; Phyllis Schwarz, fifth grade, and Loren Griess, special work.

In addition to tuition fees, the school is supported by the school society. President of the school board is Gilbert Griess. Begun in September, 1961, the school is not accredited, but Miss Kuiper is confident of her pupils' ability to hold their own with public school students.

"I feel they could keep up with the work of the public schools without any trouble," she asserted.

Miss Kuiper, who attended Denver university, is the daughter of Mrs. Winnie Kuiper and the late Rev. H. H. Kuiper, pastor of the Protestant Reformed church.

A certain routine is followed daily, to assure each pupil the maximum benefit of the curriculum. An outsider might have the impression of witnessing a three-ring circus, however, as simultaneous efforts are applied to spelling, penmanship and science by pupils of the various grade levels.

The school day begins with prayer and a Bible story. The remainder of the time before recess is devoted to arithmetic. Morning recess from 10:45 until 11 o'clock, is followed by spelling and penmanship for the first grade pupil, reading for the second and third grade students and a lesson in geography for the fifth grader.

Students bring their lunches, which are eaten at the school at noon. Following the lunch hour, educational processes are resumed with reading and phonics for the first-grader, special work for Loren Griess, spelling, penmanship, and science for the second and third grade pupils and history and science for the fifth grade pupil. The day is completed after recess with a science lesson for the first grader and English and reading for the other pupils.

Keeping the numerous activities going is not as difficult as it may seem, said Miss Kuiper, who, during the reading lesson, retires to a bench at the back of the room.
There, she listens to each pupil, in turn, read, while the remainder read silently at their desks. Any problem, arising is dealt with at once.

"I am always available to all of my pupils," said Miss Kuiper, who asserted that discipline is not a serious problem, despite the closeness of contact and variance in ages.

The school library, with a wide range of books, is available to students to supplement their regular textbooks. Miss Kuiper checks out about 10 books each week from the Loveland public library to keep her students interested.

Art and music, too, are not forgotten in the daily routine. A room adjoining the classroom contains a large table where pupils may sharpen their creative abilities. The group learns one verse each week from the psalter.

"Sometimes we go upstairs where church services are held each Sunday, to use the piano, but most of the time, it's just up to me and my trusty pitchpipe," Miss Kuiper explained laughingly.

When the weather permits, students play outside, but otherwise, use the adjoining room for recreation.

Plans for the future include expanding to teach through the ninth grade. In the meantime, students apply themselves to reading, 'ritin', 'ritin', and 'ritin'. Teacher's morale is boosted occasionally by a shiny, red apple.

---

CRITIQUE

AGATHA LUBBERS

INTELLECTUAL LIBERTY

At this time of the year thousands of young men and women leave their summer-time occupations and wend their various ways toward high schools or colleges and universities of their choice. With eager anticipation they delve into the mysteries of the great universe which our God has created. With ardent devotion and passion they peruse and study the classics which have come down to the twentieth century student from the masters who have long concerned themselves with the problems of mankind and themselves to solve these problems. Mankind, however, is still concerned with the problems with which men of all ages have struggled.

Today more than ever it is possible for the average American to advance himself by continuing the education that he was forced into when he as a child could not choose for himself. The choice of advanced, post-high school education is not forced upon the individual but is one which the individual is free to make.

It is exceedingly true that the sophisticated thing to do is to go to college. The more renowned the college which one attends the more prestige the individual seems to gain. Be assured that the writer of this column does not in the least deprecate the choice of one who chooses to advance himself by studying further than the 12th grade in high school. Many jobs today are out of the reach of those who terminate their studies in the 12th grade. Job requirements in this space and scientific age exceed the skills acquired by the average 12th grade student.

There are many problems that accompany further study in the colleges and universities.
of our day. There are many dangers too for the Christian young man and woman who venture into the area of advanced education. Many of these dangers are rooted in the theory of academic liberty. It is often advocated by the "intelligentsia" that one who aspires to become learned must come to his subject with no preconceptions. He must be free to investigate all the areas of life and must push from him all those conceptions that would prevent him from whole-heartedly investigating the given in the area of study that he has chosen.  

"This is a danger?" you may say. It is.

The famous lawyer, Clarence Darrow, was a strong advocate of the theory that man is free to delve intellectually into all the areas of life. He maintained that man is able rationally to comprehend the deep of life. He argued that the Bible had no more to say concerning the creation of man than men who had spent a life time attempting to decipher the secrets of the universe.

The truth of the matter is, however, that Clarence Darrow and all sophisticates who argue this position are wrong. It is also deceptively dangerous because it appeals to the flesh of every man.

It is the position of the Church of all ages, however, that the Bible speaks infallibly concerning all things. It speaks infallibly concerning the creation and incarnation. These miracles which are recorded in the Bible may not be tampered with or changed by the rationality of man.

The individual is not at liberty to investigate apart from the basic principles and directives laid down in the divine Scriptures and as these are interpreted for the church in the Confessions. Those who argue that the Bible is on a par with other books or that the Bible is simply a book which is written to regulate our faith and morals are classified by Paul with stinging logic. They are those who are "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."

The concept liberty needs some elucidation in this connection. Liberty is generally thought of as freedom to do as one pleases. This is dinned into the ears of those who are citizens of the American commonwealth. For the natural man this is to do that which the flesh, i.e., one's old nature desires to do. The innate perversity in man is of such a nature that one desires to be led away with divers lusts and never come to the knowledge of the truth. The innate perversity of man would scoffingly say with Pilate, "What is truth?"

This, however, is not liberty. Liberty for the child of God is the ability to walk according to the commandments and precepts laid down by God in His Word. "And I will walk at liberty; for I seek Thy precepts." The fish is not free when he is taken out of the water. His liberty consists in his remaining in his element. He must be in the water to live. If he is taken out of the water for a prolonged period of time his gills dry up and he dies. He is equipped to live only as long as he stays in the water and can take the oxygen and food from that water.

This is likewise true of the child of God. He is free only as long as he lives according to the precepts of the Word of God. Accordingly the student dies if he is separated from the truth of the Word of God as he investigates the mysteries of this great universe. His death will be a spiritual death because the great God is inseparably linked with this miraculous creation. The student who studies the revelation of God in nature can only understand the book of Creation in the light of and through the spectacles of the revealed Word of God, the Bible.

Let us not be confused by the sophists who prate about intellectual liberty and use this intellectual liberty as a cloak for licence. Let's be Biblically honest and say with the Reformers of the 16th century and the church of all ages: "Thus saith the Lord." Let's not be fooled by those who want to pervert the truth of the Word of God. They don't speak of evolution; this is far too bland. They speak of periods of time and Genesis 1 needs a new look. Creation can be explained naturally.

We believe in the miracle of creation. Creation is as much a miracle as the incarnation. Genesis 1 and Matthew 1 must be measured by the same standard.

"Of making many books there is no end; and much study is a weariness of the flesh. Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment..."
Dear Editor:

I would like to make a few comments about the recent article in the Beacon Lights entitled "Ists and Isms." I wish to make a few comments on the definition of sect and the relationship of provincial tendencies to a sect.

First of all, the author does mention that there are many definitions of the word sect. However, he prefers the definition of "a one man affair"; that in all of its features it is a one man affair. The understanding that I get from the term sect, substantiated by Daniel (sic) Webster, is "one of the organized bodies of Christians: a denomination." From such a definition, we as Protestant Reformed Churches are a sect, a denomination, regardless of the fact that we as Churches never possess the belief that our denomination is the church militant (sic). I cannot see that the word sect definitely possesses a humanistic tie; but rather a sect is an organized group having a common purpose and a common interest.

Secondly, the author writes: "Now a second obvious mark of a sect is her provincial tendencies. In the end, of course, such a people find themselves alone. They are entirely cut loose from the church world and in that church world they no longer have an influence." I understand that the obvious mark of a sect (a denomination) is her provincial (limited, narrow) tendencies, and that a sect will be alone in many respects. But does this mean that she will no longer have an influence in the church world? This can perhaps be answered by quoting a recent message on a church bulletin board near Fort Gordon, Georgia, where I am presently stationed, "The church that is not against something is seldom for anything." If we as churches are distinctive and have provincial tendencies, we will have an influence on the church world. We must have provincial tendencies and for that reason we are given as we read in Ephesians 6:14-17 to put on the whole armour of God.

Frank Van Baren
Augusta, Georgia

Dear Editor:

Kindly consider the following for publication in your next issue of Beacon Lights:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE REV.
ROBERT HARBACH

Dear Sir:

I have recently read your latest "Truth vs. Error" column (Beacon Lights, June-July 1962 issue) pertaining to "UNITARIAN RELIGIOUS COUNCILS AND THEIR BIBLE." Although I proudly stand within the Reformed tradition of Protestant Christianity, I am not too familiar with the Reformed denomination represented by yourself and your publication. Nevertheless, as I receive the issues of Beacon Lights through my librarian, I follow some of the events and issues with which your youth and their leaders are concerned. This is to say that I understand you personally to have a most responsible task in guiding your young readers into the path of Truth. Knowing that you would not wish to misguide young minds through inadvertent error within the abovenamed article, I should like to assert three facts and then speak to them:

1) Unitarians do not comprise leadership positions in the major denominational agencies.
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2) The National Council of Churches of Christ (NCCC) is neither “unitarian” nor a “Communist-front organization.”

3) The recent English Bible translations are neither “modernist” nor “unitarian.”

1. Unitarians do not comprise leadership positions in the major denominational agencies. As a denomination the Unitarian-Universalist Church has no participation in interdenominational activities or agencies. According to their own published literature, they have varied interests quite apart from those to which the Protestant churches are directed. It is conceivable, at the same time, that there may be Unitarians (small “u”) who are nominally within the trinitarian camp. Why they are there, only they individually know. Surely, no verifiable evidence has been found — and thus not cited — to suggest that there is a large- or even small-scale “purpose . . . to infiltrate churches, schools, committees and organizations with Unitarianism until they are completely unitarian” (p. 13). I have several Unitarian friends who inform me that their religion is not one for proselytism.

Furthermore, it should follow that they are not desirous of causing Christianity “to fall to pieces.” To say that “nearly every college and university today has a Unitarian ‘university pastor’” is to make an unfair generalization, unfair that is to the many dedicated campus Christian workers across the nation. Such a statement is in disregard of the many denominational campus foundations, some of which I have had the privilege to work with.

It is interesting to note your grouping of “freethinkers, Jews, Unitarians, rationalists and non-evangelicals” in connection with religious education. It would appear that you imply the International Council of Religious Education (ICRE) to be an organization containing non-Christian members. You rightly note that this council has merged with the NCCC and that the Division of Christian Education now concerns itself with matters similar to those of the ICRE. However, to suggest that the churches involved are what you say they are is difficult to take seriously. Readers BEACON LIGHTS — SEVEN — Aug. Sept. turning to the International Journal of Religious Education, official publication, will note the member denominations, which are above repute. Could it be Mr. Harbach, that you are confusing this group with the Religious Education Association, which is non-sectarian and which “gives its authors entire freedom of expression, without any official endorsement”? Yet, even here we would say: that there are Christians associated with it is something for which we should be glad and pray that their presence will be providentially influential.

Incidentally, you mention in your article “the well known Unitarian Joseph Henry Thayer” in connection with the American Standard Version, and refer to the Greek-English lexicon which he edited (while a professor at Harvard University). The word monogenes (“only-begotten”), recorded on page 417f (not “page 416”), is noted as referring to an only son. How is this description at variance with a trinitarian viewpoint?

2. The National Council of the Churches of Christ is neither “unitarian” nor a “Communist-front organization.” During the recent Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches at New Delhi, India, representatives of the NCCC joined the other delegates in affirming the new basis for membership, to wit:

The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of Churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour according to Scriptures and therefore seek to fulfill together their common calling to the glory of the one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

The old basis for membership called the World Council a “fellowship of Churches which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour,” hardly a unitarian affirmation!

In this connection you imply that the NCCC is (by association) a “Communist-front organization.” You mention Archbishop Nikodim of the “Communist-controlled” Russian Orthodox Church. Since the Communists are in supervisory control over everything in Russia, in this sense the Orthodox Church may be said to be “Communist-controlled.” But, it does not follow that the Russian clergy are therefore Communists. Archbishop Nikodim himself declared at New Delhi that “acceptance of the new basis (of membership) with its Trinitarian formula is grounded in the gos.
pel . . . It corresponds exactly to the common faith in the name of which we are here together."

As for the NCCC being either Communist or Communist-controlled, I refer your readers to the Louis Cassels article, "The Rightist Crisis in Our Churches" (Look Magazine, April 24, 1962). It is a report on the nature and activities of the NCCC against the background of the anti-Communism controversies that have been raging. The Council, an interdenominational organization, has done as much, if not more, as any other Christian group in combating the Communist menace in our United States.

Earlier you wrote of the Federal Council of Churches, which merged into the NCCC in 1950. You stated that "it began to meddle in politics" "shortly after World War I." You then wrote, "...The Office of Naval Intelligence of the USN Department stated, according to the Congressional Record, Sept. 10, 1935..." (p. 14). I am unable to comment on the information you quoted since there was apparently no Congressional Record published on the date you mentioned! The 74th Congress recessed between its first session (ending August 5, 1935) and its second session (beginning January 3, 1936). Hence, I did not find the source of your information. I did find, however, in the Congressional Record - Senate (August 1, 1935), page 12248, Volume 79, Part 11, 74th Congress, 1st Session, these words, "a statement adopted by the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America" (namely).

We believe that the United States should withhold aid from all belligerents in any conflict that might arise in the future.

The idea here (in 1935, remember) was that the U. S. Government should not induce the onset of war by any means, and particularly by helping to supply contraband to participating nations. Rather, the U. S. should enforce embargoes on such goods. What, I ask, is here inconsistent with the teachings of our Lord concerning peace (cf. Matthew 5:9)? And, what is wrong with "meddling" (your word) "in politics" for Christ's sake? Your big advantage in your article was that you can look back on the past decades, whereas - how could the Federal Council know Germany and Japan were preparing for all-out war? It was doing the best it could in the light of the best available information. Wasn't Pearl Harbor a surprise to you? I'm sure it must have been to a lot of other Christians, even those associated with the Federal Council of Churches.

3. The recent English Bible translations are neither "modernist" nor "unitarian." (You do not include King James' Version of 1611, which he authorized to be produced by scholars from Cambridge and Oxford.) Your article refers to a Bible, and I assume you refer to the Revised Standard Version (RSV). Thomas Jefferson's translation of the New Testament without a doubt was influenced by his deistic (unitarian) views. The other translations you mentioned are all discussed in the recent book by the conservative English scholar, P. F. Bruce, The English Bible: a History of Translations (1961).

The second half of your article is devoted to the question: How does this (RSV) Bible differ from the Hebrew text? You cite principally four Old Testament passages and two New Testament passages for examination. To these briefly I shall speak. Your objection to the RSV appears to center on its translation of these passages because the translations 1) differ from those in the KJV and 2) appear to deny the deity of Christ. To the first point, I would offer that the English language is a living language and, as such, words tend to lose their original connotation and need to be judged against the context of culture and time in which people find themselves. Your readers should understand that the RSV is simply a revision of the Tyndale-King James tradition; that is, only those words and phrases were changed which 1) had lost their original (1611) meaning and/or 2) were based on inferior manuscript readings. You wrote, "Destructive higher criticism omits that excellent, most trustworthy Received Text (TR) whenever it suits its unitarianism to do so" (p. 16). This, sir, is a biased sentence. Since higher criticism (an abstraction) is destructive of inaccurate Greek and Hebrew texts, Evangelical Christians everywhere should be grateful that such is being attempted by sincere Christian scholars. And, there ought not be any question as to the superiority of uncial man-
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scripts from the early centuries over that of the Textus Receptus.

To the second point, concerning the deity of Christ, present-day Biblical scholars are committed to the primary aim of reproducing in translation as faithfully as possible exactly what a given text says. If (to hypothesize) a given passage was thought by the KJV translators to have a messianic connotation, and the RSV translators discover such not to be the case according to the text, then there should be no question as to which translation to follow. To illustrate:

**Genesis 6:3.** This passage was picked by you because you felt “this (RSV) version denies the Deity of the Holy Spirit” (p. 15). You are welcome to your opinion, but you are mistaken. After all, 1) the LORD is the Speaker, and He is speaking of His own spirit (1); 2) Hebrew has no capital or small letters and hence gives neither indication nor authority for capitalizing the “s.” Moreover, the Hebrew words ידוע and בשמים have, so far as I know, never been translated by the scholars. (דוע is not the same verb meaning “to judge” and בשמים has no known Biblical parallel as it presently stands in the text.) Hence, the meaning of verse 3 is at present untranslatable and unknowable. The RSV simply made an attempt at translation just as did the KJV.

Incidentally, what is the third verse really saying within the context of verses 1, 2, and 4?

**Job 15:16.** The Hebrew ish can be translated either as “man” or as “one who.” They both mean the same thing, and the RSV translators apparently thought “one who” made a smoother translation. No denial of anything here!

**Psalm 110:1, 3.** Here are to be noted two points: this psalm was understood by the Israelites as referring to the coronation of a (Hebrew) king; and, our Lord referred to it in terms of King David speaking about God’s Messiah as being his (David’s) superior, not his son (vs. 1). The RSV translators simply translated the Hebrew and left it to the reader to interpret it for himself, a most Protestant practice! Verse 3 reads literally:

> Your people are freewill offerings on the day of your host in holy clothing from the womb of dawn the dew of your youth is yours.

There is nothing in this verse referring to Christ’s lordship or to irresistible grace, but such does not necessarily blot out the translators believing these doctrines. It is just that they are not in this text but elsewhere in Scripture (for example, Acts 2:26 and 10:36; Rom. 3:21-24 and Eph. 2:4-9, RSV).

**Luke 23:42.** In this verse the RSV is following better (that is, more ancient) manuscript witnesses than was possible for the KJV. “Jesus” is on the lips of the criminal; “Lord” is not even found in the better manuscripts. The translation “kingly power” is just as permissible here as is “kingdom,” as regards the context of the statement. You, Mr. Harbach, stated: “It is true my (sic!) Nestle Gk. testament has this preferred KJV only in the footnotes. But Nestle’s Gk. testament makes a modern liberal interpretation of Scripture throughout” (p. 16). If what you say is true, then why do you even own a Nestle’s Gk. testament? (Furthermore, what authority do you have for forbidding the Christian from calling his Saviour “Jesus”?)

**Matt. 6:13.** Luke 11:1-4 also contains the Lord’s Prayer. The reader will want to place both forms side by side to compare them. Matthew’s form is the one that has been the more popular down through the years, because it lends itself to congregational usage. The “doxology” is probably the result of a congregational addendum, since the phrase appears in second century Christian documents (for example, the Didache), and does not have good manuscript support in Matthew’s gospel. Witness its absence in Luke’s version, which is undoubtedly closer to what Jesus said to his disciples. The fact that the Roman Catholic version does not have the doxology speaks well for it at this point.

Finally, you conclude: “At least two large denominations are using this (RSV) version of the Bible exclusively” (p. 16). This is an unfortunate understatement. To quote the most recent statistical evidence, by the end of 1958, thirty-seven denominations with a church school enrollment of 22,568,159 were using RSV in their curricula and the RSV has had “a continuing sale at the rate of more than a million copies a year” since it was first published on September 30, 1952. (Religious Education
(July-August 1962), pp. 283f.)

In conclusion, let it be said that the King James Version shall never be surpassed in terms of its literary beauty and of its place within the hearts of the older generations. Yet, the Revised Standard Version and, hopefully, subsequent English language translations will be of more benefit to the younger generations in searching out and understanding God’s Word in these troubled times (1 Peter 3:15).

Most respectfully,
John E. Brown
Alma, Michigan

P.S. I was much impressed by D. J. Faber’s, “What Happened to Brotherly Love?” in the same issue (page one).

REPLY:

In answer to my worthy opponent’s open-letter debate over religious councils and versions of the Bible, I submit the following. By the first paragraph of the June-July issue of Beacon Lights I mean to say that within many Protestant churches, schools and organizations there has been a falling away from the historic, orthodox, Christian faith, which we call Presbyterian or Reformed, to ecclesiastical modernism and theological unitarianism. It is not my intention to bring the Unitarian denomination to the fore, but to confute theological unitarianism. This, according to verifiable evidence in church history, developed within a formerly Protestant body until very much of that body completely disappeared by becoming Unitarian (upper case “u”). “Through skilful management the Unitarians gained control of the (Congregational, RCII) ‘societies’ so that about 1300 Unitarians dispossessed 3900 orthodox Congregationalists of property to the value of more than $600,000. Eighty-one congregations in Massachusetts lost their church property.” (Lars P. Qualben, “A History of the Christian Church,” Nelson, 1940, p. 516.)

The remark in my second paragraph is not unfair to faithful campus Christian workers. There are fine campus Christians, such as members of Inter-Varsity Fellowship.

But to indicate that there is unitarianism in many of the American schools is not unfair to faithful Christians who never slipped into or were converted from this error.

That there have been non-Christian members in some of the organizations referred to is simply a fact. Read the inside flaps of the cover on the RSV Bible.

Relative to Dr. Thayer’s statement as found in his lexicon, it is to be noted that he does not understand the Lord Jesus Christ to be the only begotten Son in the trinitarian sense. To him, “only begotten” does not mean that the Word “was eternally generated by God the Father (the orthodox interpretation),” but that Christ is “essentially Son of God” only “by the incarnation.” This implies that prior to the incarnation Christ was not by nature the Son of God. That He is, according to the Greek of John 1:18, called the “only begotten God” is recognized as “supported by no inconsiderable weight of ancient testimony . . . but is foreign to John’s mode of thought and speech (3:16, 18; 1 Jn. 4:9). dissimant and harsh, (and) appears to owe its origin to a dogmatic zeal . . . .” A reference submitted in support of the above philosophy is that of the Unitarian Review for June 1875. All this is surely at variance with the trinitarian viewpoint. Further, it should be made clear that by the doctrine of the trinity we do not mean any scheme of tritheism; nor any theory of a modal trinity, according to which the one solitary god manifests himself in three modes of action; nor any sub-ordinationist position; nor a mere economical trinity, which is deducted from the external works of God, and not from His being. But by the trinity we mean the ontological trinity. Whatever falls short of this essential trinity is at variance with the trinitarian viewpoint.

It is well known that the membership in the NCC consists of those who are theological liberals, modernists. As such, there are top and leading men in the council saying that we should abandon the principle of sola scriptura in favor of adding tradition to the Scripture; that the Apostles’ Creed cannot be accepted in the literal, natural sense; that the doctrine of justification by faith must not be held too dogmatically; and that the idea of an infallible Scripture is archaeological rubbish. With such drastic deviation from genuine, historic, biblical Chris-

*Mr. Brown, A.B., A.M., B.D., is Instructor of Religion at Alma College, Alma, Michigan. — Ed.
tianity, for the ecumenical liberals it will not
be long before every vestige of essential
trinitarianism will have disappeared.

It should be noted that we did not say
that the NCC is a Communist-front organiza-
tion. The contention is that the council
gives aid and comfort to the Communist
movement by its policies and acts. It is
also historical that it is noted for its pacificist
efforts against national defense.

As to the modern ecumenical movement
and its Soviet membership, the movement
itself has admitted that Soviet security
agents are among the Russian Orthodox
Church delegations. Although "... the
Soviet church delegation undoubtedly con-
tains some 'security agents' of the Kremlin,
it is worth searching within such a group
for a 'man you can trust as a fellow Chris-
tian'..." (The Evening Press, Bingham-
ton, N.Y., May 23, 1962). What the Soviet
church delegates have said and will say in
the future demand careful scrutiny by the
alert Christian.

Relative to the quotation from the Con-
geressional Record: I am amazed that any
one would say in opposition to this quotation
that "there was apparently no Congressional
Record published on the date you men-
tioned!" Now the date I mentioned was
plain enough—Sept. 10, 1935. It is not
the least bit difficult to verify the fact that
there was a Congressional Record published
on that date. That the "74th Congress re-
ceded between its first session (ending
August 5, 1935) and its second session (be-
ginning January 3, 1936)" conflicts with the
information I came across. Across the top
of the page where the quotation in question
appears there are the words, "Congressional
Record—Appendix—September 10, 1935,
page 15271." I should have furnished this
reference in the June-July BL. The report
in which this quotation appears begins on
p. 15270. It contains the remarks made in
the House of Representatives, Saturday,
August 17, 1935! The words of the quota-
tion come under a memorandum listing
Communist-aiding organizations in the
United States. Much has been done to be-
little and discredit this Congressional report
but without success. Read it again as found
on p. 14 of that particular BL issue.

The Look article, April 24, 1962, sup-
posed to represent the viewpoint of Amer-
ican Protestantism, is really the viewpoint
of the religious liberals of this country. It
is propaganda for the modernist ecumenical
movement.

Concerning Matt. 5:9: Jesus certainly did
not advocate "peace" as popularly conceived
today. The concept peace according to the
New Testament is not the peace of the na-
tions, nor world peace. not an earthly peace.
Peace, according to Scripture, is the peace
of God, peace through the blood of His
cross, the peace that passes all understand-
ing, and which is effected by God reconcil-
ing the estranged, elect sinner to Himself
through faith in Jesus Christ. True peace-
makers aim to advance this peace for Christ's
sake. The peacemakers of Matt. 5:9 are not
to be found among men of the world. For
they are very particularly identified in the
Beatitudes as poor in spirit, the meek, the
merciful, the pure in heart, the hungry and
thirsty after righteousness. The men of this
world are warmakers. According to the text,
only the children of God are peacemakers.
The Christian is a fighting peacemaker, not
against war itself, nor against certain exter-
nal conditions, but against the cause of all
war — sin!

Re politics. It is our contention that
Christian churches ought not to enter the
field of politics as churches. That is defi-
nitely not the calling of the church as
church. But Christian men in their capacity
as citizens may do anything in this field
which does not conflict with Scripture. How-
ever, the church must remain in its own
proper sphere, concerning itself with church
matters, and not those of another sphere, e.g.,
the state.

Re the NCC's new basis-for-membership
statement. Liberal theologians do, indeed,
aspire "Godhead" to the Lord Jesus Christ,
and so speak of Him as "God and Saviour." But
what do they mean by such expressions?
Usually, that Christ has a high, unique posi-
tion assigned to him; or that man’s God-
consciousness came to its peak in Jesus; or
that the divine attributes of grace and truth
came to the highest development in him.
If something of this sort is meant by saying
that Jesus is God, it is not the same as say-
ing that the Lord Christ is God the Son, the
second Person of the trinity, who became
man and dwelt among us.

Concerning the KJV, it is not likely that
anyone would charge it with modernism.
But as already proved, and as in later issues
I will (D.V.) prove, the ASV does make certain concessions to modernism. As to the Moffatt version, will anyone claim, much less prove, it is trinitarian?

To the charge of writing a biased sentence (p. 16), I must confess that it is biased. In fact the entire article is biased, in that it is biased in favor of the Reformed Faith as set forth in the original Westminster Confessions and in the Reformed Confessions. The truly Reformed or Presbyterian are never neutral. They never approach Scripture as an agnostic, nor with a method to determine whether the Bible is the Word of God. The Christian cannot and does not deny his faith. His starting-point, his basic presuppositions are not neutral generalizations. In all his thought he presupposes the doctrine of God and the doctrine of creation. Now, the great scholar Moffatt says of the Textus Receptus, upon which the KJV is based, that "It was, it could not but be notoriously corrupt." This is a biased sentence! Moffatt's bias regards the KJV as "notoriously corrupt." This is a bias of which I cannot be accused.

The Gen. 6:3 passage. It is denied that the word translated "strive" (KJV) means "to judge." The Hebrew is yadhon, from dun (din), "to judge." It's news to me that this word is untranslatable and therefore unknowable. Perhaps this is why such a great scholar as Moffatt so strangely translates it, "my spirit is not to be immortal in them." But if this assertion is true, why do we read, even in the RSV, where the same word is found, "the Lord will judge the ends of the earth" (I S. 2:10)? Why do we read, "appoint magistrates and judges who may judge all the people" (Ezra 7:25, RSV)? Why is the word rendered "judgment" in Ezra 7:26, RSV? Is this a mere "attempt at translation," or the satisfactory rendition of the word?

Job 15:16. True, the Heb. ish can be translated either as "man" or as "one who." But "man" is surely more in harmony with the context, especially verses 7 and 14. The Ger., Du., Moffatt and RSV Bibles have "man" rather than "one who." The ASV (and the RSV) means not that man by nature is unclean, but that merely "one who is (happens to be) abominable and corrupt" is unclean—a puerile remark. This is a denial that man by nature is totally sinful.

Ps. 110:1, 3. It is an error to think that verse 1 does not teach the lordship and deity of Christ, for He himself in Matt. 22:41-45 taught that it does. Peter also so taught (Acts 2:34-36). As to v. 3, the Heb. definitely bears out the KJV. The meaning is that in consequence of the Lord's sending out His rod of strength (v. 2), His people shall be willing in the day of His power. For this reason God has a willing army of converts! They are voluntary in the kingdom because God worked in them to will and to work for His good pleasure (Phil. 2:12f.). So, clearly, the meaning is not that Christ's armies will be a glorious host on the day that His people make themselves free will offerings. This would be patently Arminian.

Luke 23:42. Re-read the paragraph in Bl., XXI, 5, 16. Here, we prefer the KJV which follows the TR, and which, in turn, is supported by the Caesarean Text and the Syriac and Persic versions. Admitted that four of the most ancient manuscripts (mss.) have O Jesus! instead of to Jesus; and that all these four plus two additional very ancient mss. omit Lord. Still, I am inclined to agree with Godet, that "it seems to me probable that the omission of the word Lord in the Alex. (andrius). arises from the mistake of the copist, who was giving the prayer of the thief from memory, and that the transformation of the dative to Jesus into the apostrophe O Jesus! was the effect of this omission." The thief's Lord, remember! is in harmony with the enlightenment he received from the superscription placed on Jesus' cross above His head, This is the King of the Jews!

Why, if Nestle's Gk. testament is so filled with modern liberalism, do I own one? Isn't the answer obvious? I am contributing editor for Truth v.s. ERROR. I must know, and prefer to know, what the enemies of Christianity think and teach. Every minister should have a Heterodoxy Section in his library with material from Arminianism to Zoroastrianism.

Matt. 6:13. Re-read the argument presented on p. 16, above. Assertion: The doxology "does not have good mss. support in Matthew's gospel." We can agree with this. Nevertheless, consider: 1) that there are many (note: many, not merely some) authorities which add the doxology, 2) the church will probably always continue as it has to conclude the prayer with these words, 3) the words are without question scriptural, 4) there is then good reason to regard them
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as genuine, and 5) without them the prayer comes to a very unnatural close. 6) With all this being so, it does not serve us well to furnish us with a version which abruptly closes on the word "evil."

Respectfully submitted,

R.C.H.

P.S. The remark anent "Brotherly Love" seems to imply that the disputed article was not written in that vein. "Defenders of the Bible are called extreme and bitter men; their opponents usually are called kind and tolerant." — J. Gresham Machen. It is not brotherly love to oppose, omit, conceal or merely evade the truth. Nor does brotherly love require us to believe that all is well with our neighbor, nor to say that it is. For the spirit of the gospel is not only a spirit of love, but also a spirit of a sound mind (II Tim. 1:7); and the two cannot be sundered. We aim to speak the truth in love (Eph. 4:15), for truth and love are inseparable. But love without truth is a sickly non-entity.

---

**Attitudes Concerning Minority Groups**

DAN MEULENBERG

A minority group is a small group of people usually composed of one to ten per cent of the population of a given country, and characterized by habits and customs differing somewhat from those of the majority of the people in that given country. The people in this minority group also frequently display different physical characteristics as a group from those of the majority as a group.

An example familiar to almost all of us is that of the Jewish people who lived in Germany in the World War II years. These Jews were characterized by a swarthy physical appearance, large noses, dark eyes, etc. People then, as now, also tend to think of the Jews as being mercenary and also as having a strong feeling of loyalty to their own group. These things then are the criteria used to describe a minority group.

The Jews, as many minority groups, can also be called an ethnic group because they have distinct group characteristics. We are more familiar to using the word "race" perhaps, however, the word ethnic group is more correct because it most clearly defines and describes a group of people who possess peculiar characteristics as compared to other groups of people.

Many ethnic groups are the butt of the majority's hostilities in the country in which they live. They are blamed for many adverse happenings because they are too weak or too small to fight back, easily accessible for maltreatment, in other words some one to placate the majority's feelings when ever the majority wishes. This is what the sociologist refers to as scapegoating; when the minority suffers to relieve the hostilities of the majority.

Again referring to the Jewish people, we see a good example of scapegoating in the inhuman treatment suffered by the Jews under the hands of the German Army. Before and during the Second World War the Jews were blamed for anything and everything, thus shifting the blame from the German political machine or the German Army to a small group of people who could resist only feebly.

One can now understand how people who have the power and the position can, if they desire, use this power as a group to torment and abuse a smaller group at their every wish and whim. This situation parallels that of the domineering person who will subject a weaker individual to his every wish and whim. The abuse rendered by this power group takes form not only in physical violence, but indeed, in forms much more
subtle and underhanded; such as making the smaller group the butt of their jokes, circulating fallacies about them, and even worse, passing on to their children their own prejudiced feelings concerning the small ethnic group. In this way a hate campaign is carried on from generation to generation. Perhaps the reader may more clearly understand this by reading the following true story which is not only stranger than fiction, but even more unrealistic than many tales of fiction.

There exists in the world in which we are living, a freedom loving country, a land of equal opportunity for all, a country which is comparable to the one in which we live. In this country of equal opportunity, there is present a very much abused and maltreated ethnic group which compromises roughly ten per cent of that country’s population. Please keep in mind while reading the rest of this true story that this country is one of the more, if not the most civilized countries in the world. It also, like America, is known as a Christian nation.

Before revealing to you the name of this ethnic group let you prejudge them on the basis of what you formerly have heard, a few pertinent facts about it would be in order. This ethnic group arrived in that country hundreds of years ago. In fact they were, relatively speaking, one of the earliest arrivals. They did not immigrate to that country but on the contrary were shipped there as slaves. Of course civilization being what it is today, we would expect that slavery would not only be forgotten but its opposite achieved and held as a goal. It is true that in that country liberty is held as a goal to be striven for diligently. However, it is very shocking to note how close that this ethnic group remains to the bonds of slavery. For example: even in the most progressive area of that country the members of this group still have almost no choice in determining where they will live, what schools their children will go to, what vocation they will choose and the like. This is sad you say, but the worst is yet to come! Speaking yet of this progressive area, this group of people are as a whole sometimes charged extremely high sums for living space, a sum they must pay because they are very much restricted as to where they may establish residence in the urban community. In spite of the obstacles experienced in the housing, schooling, and vocational fields, some of the individuals of this persecuted group do manage to fight their way at least partly up the social ladder of success. However, look at some of those whose fight has not been quite so successful. One individual did manage to purchase a home in a previously restricted area only to have it condemned by the city government to serve as a city park. This condemnation resulted from a coalition of neighbors who had more social and political power than he. There is also in this progressive area, a city largely made up of people of Dutch background and the Reformed faith such as there is in the city where this paper is being printed. One day a few of the people in this city were faced with impending doom. As is true in much of history, these common people rose to the crisis with great deeds and wiser-than-Solomon solutions. The impending doom? A person from this despised ethnic group was going to purchase a house in their neighborhood! The wise solution? Purchase this house from the seller before this inferior being could purchase it. This wise solution resulted in a financial loss but what did it matter as long as the objective was accomplished. Perhaps this was not a very American or a very Christian act but the important (?) objective was reached. This action by this group of neighbors would tend to make one think that these people had forgotten or rebuffed their principles of life. The foregoing cases are but a minute sample of stories which number in the hundreds, all of which can be proved true.

If you are now asking yourself what this has to do with you, please read on.

Going now to the least progressive area of the country in discussion. The people in this small ethnic group must, in this area, pay a special tax to vote in many cases. In other cases they must take a special pre-election test, and in other cases they may not even vote. All this in a freedom loving, progressive, Christian nation. All this stands as sheer mockery of the principles that that country was founded on and the principles it vowed to keep and teach to others.

This persecution in housing, voting, and almost any other area of life one could men-
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tion, causes the people in this group to become either apathetic or aggressive, two very natural reactions. However by becoming one or the other this ethnic group only serves to cause the majority to nod their heads in assent, chucking in shame, very seldom in pity, saying, "All the stories we hear about them must be true, for notice how they act, those despicable people! More fallacies are circulated and re-circulated. For example, take note of these stories, all of which have been proven untrue and yet are told and re-told with much relish: those people smell different, are sexually more aggressive, sexually more potent than others, they are lazy by nature, innately prefer jazzy music and loud clothing and a host of other tales which may seem to be true on the surface but under the scrutiny of common sense and scientific knowledge these theories fall apart at the seams.

You may be asking yourself what these people did to deserve all this, and well you might, because we all have a part in this. As you have probably surmised by now the country this takes place in is not only comparable to our own, it is our own. America the land of the "free." The city mentioned above is Grand Rapids. The more progressive area is know as the North, and the less progressive area its counterpart, the South. The persecuted ethnic group is comprised of the American Negro. Yes, the Negro as he is today, blackens the eye of every American and every Christian living in America.

One often feels that perhaps anti-Negro feelings may even be at higher level in areas of the country inhabited by people of traditional Dutch, Reformed background; more so than other more secular areas.

This brings up the discussion of the Christian's calling - regarding the Negro, a much more important topic than the introductory material presented in this article. Have you thought about this?

---

**GENESIS**

by REV. R. C. HARBACH

**CREATION**

Genesis 1 and 2

---

1. Creation of All Things

The name Genesis, from the Greek translation of the O. T. known as the Septuagint (Seventy) and so symbolized LXX. means birth, origin, beginning. Genesis in the Hebrew Bible is called Bereshith, which literally means, "in beginning." It is a word without an article, neither definite nor indefinite. This beginning, then, is not a beginning among other beginnings, but is the

---

*The Delegation Board of Protestant Reformed Young People's Societies voted to discontinue studying the book of Revelation. In its place, they chose to study Genesis. The "Helps for Bible Study" are to be written by various ministers rather than by the usual one man. The Federation Board, with the assistance of Rev. A. Mulder, has divided the book of Genesis into semi-equal parts and requested particular ministers to write the aids for definite sections. Rev. Harbach will conclude with Genesis 2 in the October issue. He will be followed by Rev. Lanting and Rev. C. Hanks.*

---
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absolute beginning. It is not, certainly, the beginning of God, who Himself is absolute, independent, eternal, and has "no beginning of days nor end of life." Well, then, "In the beginning of what?" Not of the creation, for it would be redundant to say, "In the beginning of creation God created." The reference is to time, and to all temporal reality. The whole universe of time and space was created with time, and not so much in time, as time itself is a creature. Genesis is the book of the beginning of the heavens and the earth, and of all created things, such as time ("beginning"), space ("heavens," "firmament"), darkness (v. 2), light (v. 3), matter ("heavens," "earth"), cold (since there was darkness), heat (since there was light), energy: force, motion (cf. the Spirit, v. 2). At the same time, God also created sound.

The word "create" in this chapter is "bara," "to carve out." In the same chapter there is "yatsar" which means to cut, to form, to fashion; and "asah," to make. Bara signifies the first origination of matter in its unformed state. Yatsar and asah refer to the forming of the original matter. Bara stands parallel to "hidesh," "to make new" (1s. 65:18; Ps. 51:12), and expresses the production of something new which never had a previous existence. Cf. Heid. Cat., A. 28. Thus there is a difference between "to create" and "to make." The former has to do with matter originated, the latter with creation put into its structural form.

At this point, compare the standard works on Genesis to familiarize yourself with evolution's geological ages theory which regards "the beginning" as a period of millions of years before the first day of creation. Also compare a standard work with the Scofield Reference Bible at Gen. 1:1, 2. and learn to refute the Dispensationalist catastrophe theory of creation. Further, learn to refute the modern science hypothesis of six long eras of creation.

That originally "darkness was upon the face of the deep" means that the darkness and the waters were universal. Darkness is as much a creature as water. Darkness was created before the light, and the light out of the darkness (2 Cor. 4:6). The waters covered the entire globe of the earth (if at this point we may speak of the earth's then being in the form of a globe!). But this "deep" is the cosmic deep, not the deep of the seas of v. 10; just as the heaven and the earth of 1:1 is not the heaven and earth of 1:8, 15; nor the darkness of 1:2 (cosmic darkness), the darkness of vv. 4, 5, 18. For verses 1 and 2 contain a statement of the primal creation of matter in somewhat rough, unhewn form; the instantaneous origination of the material of the universe. This work of origination antedated the creative week.

At this point it will be well to search out the meaning of "And the Spirit of God moved (marg., "brooded") upon the face of the waters." Also consider what was created on each of the six days of creation. Discuss the question, What is light? What is the meaning of the word "day" (yon) in view of the fact that it is translated also "today," "forever" (43:9), "continually" (6:5), "age" (18:11), "life" (1 K. 3:11), and "perpetually" (1 K. 9:3)? Find an article (and study it!) on darkness. What is darkness? Learn also the meaning of such terms as "heavens" and "firmament" (expanses). With v. 9 and 10 before you, consider the question whether there was originally but one continent and one sea. Answer the question, What is the relation between the person God and the impersonal earth? Also the question, Was the seed before the plant, or the plant before the seed? Also consider how organic life could be brought forth from inorganic matter. What is meant by the expression, "after its kind"? Make a study of the solar system at least from the point of view of a beginner's "Astronomy." Do research on, then discuss, modern science's findings as to the origin of life. If possible, have a toy microscope brought to class and examine: a drop of water, a drop of milk, wing or leg of a fly, sugar, salt, hair, edge of razor blade, etc.

Since there is no space available to go into detail here, on your own initiative consider additional questions for study. For example: Did the birds come from the waters, or from the ground (1:20; 2:19)? What is the meaning of the name Elohim? What does the verb "to bless" mean? What is the meaning of "man" (adam)? What is the image of God in man? Was the image of God lost in every sense of the word? How should we distinguish the image? Cf. L. D. 3, Belz. Conf. 14, Canons III, IV, I. In
"let us make man" to whom does the pronoun refer? Is temporal fruitfulness and natural increase synonymous with blessing? Was Adam a reproduce? What did God ordain for man's food before the Fall? What did He ordain for the animal's food? Why does God say everything was "very good"?

Since Modernism attacks this book perhaps more than any other in the Bible, consider these questions. What is the teaching of Jesus concerning the Mosaic authorship of Genesis? How would you answer modernism's contention that God originally made "more than one man"? (See 1 Cor. 15:45; Rom. 5:12). How would you answer modernism's claim that woman was not created after man, but along with him? (See 1 Tim. 2:13). Answer the view of modernism that paradise was not an actual place, but a figurative setting for spiritual ideas. (See your concordance under "Eden" and "Paradise"). Refute the modernist interpretation that "good and evil" means "helpful and harmful."

The Book of Genesis teaches that all creatures reflect God's glory, and tell us something of the heavenly kingdom. Our Confession makes this clear; "We know Him by two means: first by the creation, preservation and government of the universe; which is before our eyes as so many characters leading us to contemplate the invisible things of God, namely His power and divinity, as the Apostle Paul saith, Rom. 1:20," (Belg. Conf., 11). Romans 1:20 reads, "For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead." Beautifully expressed here is the thought that all creatures in the universe, great and small, whether telescopical or microscopical, are so many characters. i.e., signs, letters, words which lead us to contemplate God! God and the things of God are understood by all the things that are made. Study such a great object as the sun, or consider the infinitesimal animalcule in a drop of water — each one of these creatures is the embodiment of a divine thought. A flower is a word of God; the telescope reveals many words of God written across the face of the moon. Every single creature in the universe is the incorporation of a word of God. Every creature in the universe as to its being and essence is a symbol of something heavenly and spiritual. It is a signature or a footprint of God. The word "signs" in this chapter (othoth) means an engraving, a mark, an instruction. God could not create or make a creature without it expressing a divine thought. For God could not make a mute word. He cannot make a "brute fact." He cannot make a mere abstraction. A vacuous, meaningless creature is unthinkable and impossible. For all things were made by the Word, the Logos, the Divine Thought of the Triune God. All things declare the glory of God. They are all expressions which sing His praise. "Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein; then shall the trees of the wood be joyful. Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad; let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof" (Ps. 96:12, 11).

In the six days of creation there is an observable movement from darkness to light, to air, the waters, land, vegetation, fish and birds, then animals. Thus the way was prepared to man. Then with the sixth day God completed the outfitting of His factory and placed within it His employees, with man as its head.

All this was very good. The entire cosmos was one perfect, harmonious, organic whole. Everything was made for God's glory and for man's good, and all things suited the purpose for which they were made. Indeed, "everything... very good!" This the Lord did in six solar days. He could have made the universe in an instant. He could have said, "Let there be a universe!" and there would have been a universe "in a moment, in a twinkling of an eye." as there will be a whole world recreated at the resurrection day (1 Cor. 15:52).
MISSION METHODS: St. Paul's Or Ours?
ROLAND ALLEN – Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company – $1.65 (paperback)

This book is one of two books written by the author on the subject of missions. The second volume from the writer is entitled *Spontaneous Expansion Of The Church*.

The author was a missionary in northern China, working with the Society For The Propagation Of The Gospel. For a number of years afterward he worked in collaboration with the founders of *World Dominion* and the Survey Application Trust, and finally returned to Africa, where he died in Kenya in 1947.

In rather clear and succinct language the author tells us his purpose in writing this book. His book is really a critique, a critical survey of the methods employed by Paul and those in vogue in the Church mission of his day, which, incidentally, was in the years of 1912 through 1947. For this volume was written some forty years ago. The author envisioned himself as a frontiersman for a new approach to Missions and its Methods. Writes he, "I am not writing a book on St. Paul's Doctrine. I do not feel it necessary to argue over again the foundations of the faith. I am a churchman and I write as a churchman. I naturally employ terms which imply church doctrine. But the point to which I want to call attention is not doctrine, which has been expounded and defended by many, but the Apostle's Method. A true understanding of the method does not depend upon a true interpretation of the doctrine, but upon a true appreciation of the facts. (1 underscore, G. L.) About the facts there is very general agreement; about the doctrine there is little agreement. E. G. – It is almost universally agreed that St. Paul taught his converts the rite of Baptism; it is very far from agreed what he meant by baptism."

Briefly the author summarizes what he sets forth in this volume as follows:

1. Was there any antecedent advantage in the position or character of the cities in which St. Paul founded his churches?

We must enquire:

(1) Whether he deliberately selected certain strategic points at which to establish his churches.

(2) Whether his success was due to the existence of some peculiar class of people to which he made a special appeal.

(3) Whether the social, moral or religious condition of the provinces was so unlike anything known in modern times, as to render futile any comparison between his work and ours.

II. Was there any peculiar virtue in the way in which the Apostle presented his gospel? Under this heading we must consider (1) His use of Miracles (2) His finance (3) The substance of his preaching.

III. Was there any peculiar virtue in the teaching which he gave his converts or in his method of training his converts for baptism or for ordination?

IV. Was there any peculiar virtue in his method of dealing with his organized churches? This will include the means by which (a) discipline was exercised and (b) unity maintained.

V. Finally, I shall call attention to certain principles which seem to lie at the back of all the Apostle's actions and in which I believe we may find the key to his success, and endeavor to show at least some of the ways in which the apostolic method might be usefully employed today.

There was something which continually eluded me while reading this book and try-
ing to give an honest appraisal of its contents and purpose. Frankly, I was and am interested in the author's doctrinal bias which underlies his writing on the "Methods Of Paul." Such a phrase as Paul's "use of miracles" is, to say the least, dubious. Did Paul really "use" miracles, or did God work with Paul in signs and wonders? Acts 14:27; Mk. 16:20. Howbeit, it was not till I read the above-underlined sentence that I could pin-point my basic criticism of the author's mistaken presupposition. I refer to the author's contention, "A true understanding of the method does not depend upon a true interpretation of the doctrine, but upon a true appreciation of the facts." It is one thing to say, that, in demonstrating Paul's methods in mission work, one is not going to argue a treatise on doctrine; however, it is quite another matter to insist that the doctrine of Paul and the Methods of Paul are not relevant to one another, and that, therefore, we need not attempt to ascertain the Pauline and Biblical meaning of baptism to determine Paul's method of evangelizing, but all we need is the "fact" of baptism, since it is "agreed that Paul taught his converts the rite of Baptism."

I submit:

1. That an attempt to ascertain Paul's method from a collection of data gleaned from the writings of Luke in Acts, can only lead to a purely formal comparison, but will not yield a normative course of action, having the sanction of Christ, the Head of the Church.

2. That it should be remembered that the success of Paul, at bottom, was not so much his method, as the fact that the eternal truth stands that as many as were ordained to eternal life believed. Pray, was it due to a weakness in Paul's method that so many did not believe? Acts 13:48; John 12:39. Wherefore Paul says that his speech and preaching were not in persuasive words of wisdom but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, that our faith should not stand in the wisdom of men but in the power of God.

3. That no man can escape the inevitable law that a man's doctrine (metaphysics in philosophy) determines a man's conception of ethics and methods. Although the late Roland Allen does not discuss Paul's Doctrine, he nonetheless proceeds from definite preconceived ideas concerning the Gospel, preaching, calling, the efficacious or non-efficacious working of the Holy Ghost. Frankly, the writings of the author smack of a practical pragmatism: a working formula, a practical solution of racial and ethnic prejudices in international missionary action.

I recommend this book for its illuminating data on missionary methods and its difficulties, as experienced by such an organization as founders of the World Dominion, to the judicious reader.

Rev. G. L.

---

**NEWS**

**from, for, and about our churches**

**LOIS E. KREGEL**

**Our Witness**

Continuing his ever-active witness, Rev. Robert Harbach wrote an article for the Lyden Tribune entitled, "The Marks of Christians."

Hull's bulletin of September 2 contained a word of thanks to that congregation for the fine spirit of cooperation which they showed in preparing the latest pamphlet for mailing.

Thursday, October 4, will be Mission Emphasis Night at First Church, D.V., and an interesting program is being prepared. Rev. Lubbers will speak and show slides about his work and experiences as our home missionary, and Mr. H. Meulenberg and Mr. H. **Twenty-three**
Zwik will tell of their recent trip to Jamaica, also illustrating their talk with slides. **Beacon Lights** is sponsoring the event.

From the Radio Committee of the Reformed Witness Hour we have received the following report: “Through much work and effort on the part of their book committee, practically all of Rev. Hoeksema’s publications, are again available. Many of these books are out of print; that is, no more copies will be printed. Consequently the librarian of the book committee could not fill the requests received for many of these issues. After an exhaustive investigation, and with the cooperation of a local book publisher, the committee located and obtained a limited amount of copies which can be purchased by our readers who wish to begin or complete their own library with these fine works. Our young people especially should be interested to learn this news, now that the various societies, catechism classes, etc., have again resumed their meetings. All of these publications are excellent for study and for reference purposes. For a list of titles and prices of these editions, write to The Reformed Witness Hour, P.O. Box 1230, Grand Rapids 1, Michigan. And remember, they are ‘Cheaper by the Dozen.’”

Randolph recently joined those churches actively engaged in witnessing to the truth of the Word of God as professed in our churches by sending out pamphlets produced by the Society for Protestant Reformed Action of Hull, Doon, and Edgerton. The consistory began by sending out two letters: the first was to every post office box in Randolph, 435 in all, explaining the project, inviting comment, and enclosing the first pamphlet; the second was to the congregation, telling why they decided to take part in this work, pointing them to their calling in respect to witnessing, and asking for their financial support to defray the expenses. We wish them God’s blessing in their labors, and joy in their new pastor, Rev. Van Baren.

---

**Wedding bells**

rang on June 27 for Arnold Bleyenberg and Charlotte Miersma (Edgerton); on June 29 for Alice B. Vandermeulen and Melvin W. Yonkman, in Lynden; on August 23 for Wayne Lanning and Delaine Huber (Hope); and on August 28 for Alvin Bleyenberg and Betty Ann Bleyenberg (Edgerton).

---

**Education**

On September 4 convocation exercises were held in South Holland Church, after which hour South Holland School opened. Parents and friends were invited to the convocation.

Adams St. School began its classes on Sept. 5. The Mothers’ Club held its first meeting of the season on Sept. 6. The program consisted of slides by Seymour Beiboer of his most recent trip to Colorado; several members of our church in Loveland appeared on these slides.

Perhaps many of our readers are not aware of the existence of the Northwest Iowa Protestant Reformed School Society. Although at present they do not have a Protestant Reformed School, to use their own words: “We are not standing still. We are pressing forward, laboring with joy in this essential aspect of our Christian calling.”

---

**Membership changes**

Mr. Harold Tilma joined Hope, coming from the Westview Christian Reformed Church.

Lynden welcomed Mrs. Henry Vander Meulen from the First Christian Reformed Church there.

Mrs. Jacob Kuiper came to Hope from the Fairview Reformed Church.

Miss Sylvia Brummel transferred her membership from First Church to South Holland Church.

---

**Called Home**

Mrs. Henry Lenting (South Holland) at the age of 69 years.

Arie Alvin Ver Hey (Edgerton) at the age of 27 years.

---

**Congratulations**

to Mr. and Mrs. John Boelma (Hudsonville) who observed their 40th wedding anniversary on August 16.

---

**Future Conventioneers**

A son born to Mr. and Mrs. Gerrit Brummel (Hull)

A son born to Mr. and Mrs. John Besselsen (Hope)

A son born to Mr. and Mrs. Ron Miedema (Hudsonville)

A son born to Mr. and Mrs. Robert Garvelink (Hudsonville)
A daughter born to Mr. and Mrs. Henry Vander Meulen (Lynden)
A son born to Mr. and Mrs. Harold Van Overloop (Hudsonville)
A son born to Mr. and Mrs. M. De Vries (Oaklawn)
A son born to Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Corson (First)
A son born to Mr. and Mrs. Willem Hofman (First)
A daughter born to Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Miedema (Hudsonville)
A son born to Mr. and Mrs. James Miedema (Hudsonville)
A son born to Mr. and Mrs. Henry Wigger (First)
A daughter born to Mr. and Mrs. Peter Roy Westra (Hull)

A daughter born to Mr. and Mrs. Egbert Gitters (Hull)
A daughter born to Mr. and Mrs. Paul Schipper (Hudsonville)
A son born to Mr. and Mrs. George Kamps (Hudsonville)
A son born to Mr. and Mrs. E. Miedema (Oaklawn)

The Reformed Free Publishing Association was to meet in Hope Church on Sept. 20; Prof. H. C. Hoeksema was to speak on the topic "We Protestant Reformed."

Lynden planned a congregational meeting for Sept. 10, to discuss the matter of a church building.
MISSION-EMPHASIS NIGHT

THURSDAY-OCTOBER 4

FIRST PROTESTANT REF. CHURCH

8:00 P.M.

- SPEAKER — REV. G. LUBBERS
- SPEAKERS — MR. MEULENBERG and MR. ZWAK
- SLIDES — MISSION FIELD OF THE WEST AND JAMAICA
- SPECIAL NUMBERS
- REFRESHMENTS