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THE POPE IS STILL PROUD

A recent issue of a nationally circulated magazine blazed across its cover the caption, “Pope John, the Humble Pope.” This description is only one of the many anathemas being sung at the present time to the honor of Rome’s head. With the calling of the Vatican Council, the “glorias” become louder and louder. Catholics, Protestants, and neutrals join in the noisy concert. But all the noise in the world cannot drown out the truth that the Pope is still proud.

That Catholics will pay any and every absurd homage to the Pope is not surprising any longer. It is the new attitude of Protestants that calls forth response. Leaders of gigantic denominations make pilgrimages to Rome for the purpose of paying respects to the Pope and strong currents begin to blow through Protestantism of a reunion with the Catholic Church. Out of this background come the flattering phrases about John XXIII. And since the muses of Protestants have been for so long impoverished spiritually, they gullibly move in the direction pointed out by their guides. That journey ends at the foot of the papal throne.

The fantastic arrogance and insatiable lust for power which characterized many of the former popes may very well not be true of John personally. That is, if John were a ditch-digger instead of Pope, he might be a retiring and unassuming man, whereas other popes would have been the haughtiest ditch-diggers in the world. But John is not a ditch-digger, he is Pope and unannounced popedom is at absolute odds with humility. A humble Pope is a contradiction in terms.

Among the titles which a Pope assumes are Bishop of Rome, Archbishop and Metropolitan of the Roman Province, Primate of Italy, Patriarch of the West, Successor of St. Peter, and Vicar of Jesus Christ and of God on Earth. Apart from the fact that the latter two titles are blasphemous inventions, a knowledge of the chicanery and outright deceit by which the Pope historically obtained these titles and their inherent rights serves to heighten the bold-faced effrontery. One addresses the pope as “Your Holiness” or “Most Holy Father.” Prescribed greetings include bowing before him or kissing his foot. He claims supreme sovereignty over the Church, infallibility when he speaks on matters affecting faith and morals, and the sole reason why he is not so loud in claiming sovereignty over all the world, as he once did, is because temporal rulers had bigger armies and, thus, checked him. His pomp and jewels and robes defy description even today. And the explanation for all this magnificence rests, says the Pope, in “divine right.”

No prouder person exists on the earth. The Pope arrogates to himself power over all the earth, although he softens his claim to temporal rule out of momentary expediency. Not the Word of God but the word of the Pope is infallible. Luther’s summary of the papacy rings as true today as it did four hundred years ago: “The Pope is God on earth, supreme in all heavenly, earthly, spiritual, and secular matters. All things are the Pope’s; and there is none who can say to him, What doest thou.” This is a true accusation of the papacy since “The Pope doth not receive his authority from the scripture but the scripture from the Pope.”

A plague on this trilling of the Pope’s virtues. Behind that benevolent mask loom unbounded pride and insuperable arrogance.

But it is not enough that he wield a sceptre over the earth, for heaven and purgatory and hell await his beck and call.
Said Luther in reference to the Pope’s mass for departed souls, “he with his mass was not satisfied to thrust himself into all corners of the earth, but he must needs go tumbling down into the very bosom of hell.” Tetzel does not hawk his indulgences as crassly as he once did but the Pope still blinds his people with his wretched sale of shorter time in purgatory and he yet exercises his authority to canonize and anathematize. All of this boundless power he exercises not as a minister of the Word, for then he would not, could not be Pope, but by virtue of his popedom.

Perhaps, the un-protestant Protestants can explain all these facts away. Perhaps, their craving for slavery in Rome’s gilded cage blinds the unity-seekers to all the pummel, all the usurpation of God’s power and glory, all the extolling of papal words at the expense of God’s Word. Then one pride still rages unbridled in the Pope. He stands as the embodiment, the personification of the doctrine of justification by works, of salvation by human merit, the impudent and impious doctrine of Pelagius. This by itself condemns out of hand all the present-day minimizing of the conflict between Rome and Protestantism. John Bevershuis’s notion that “the difference between the Reformers and the existing Church was, generically speaking, a difference of degree rather than one of kind (Reformed Journal, Oct., 1961, p. 14) is wrong. The difference was and remains the difference between preaching Paul’s gospel of righteousness by faith and preaching another gospel of righteousness by works of the law. Preachers of this false gospel do not differ from Paul by degree but by kind. The two have no similarity at all even though they both make mention of Christ and sin and salvation. Paul is blessed; the others are accursed and that not by the empty ravings of a Pope or his council but by the effective judgment of Christ Himself through Paul His ambassador (cf. Galatians 1:7, 8).

Only one ground allows for the possibility of a Protestant reunion with Rome: the Protestants in their view of salvation are just as proud as Rome is. Since they maintain the same lie of salvation by works, separately, there is no reason why they should not maintain it together.

D.J.E.

OPEN FORUM
Dear Mr. Editor of Beacon Lights:

Not too many issues of Beacon Lights ago there appeared an editorial in which the Rev. A. Mulder belittled the ability of Hollanders as poets and musicians. The writer of said editorial assumed the role of one who alleges to let us hear the voice of “history”.

Really, Mr. Editor, at the time I did not give the allegations of Rev. Mulder too much credence. Fact is, that I had almost forgotten the incidence. However, as I was reading the “Church History” of Professor Kurtz, I happened upon the following interesting paragraph from this historian’s pen:

“Church Music (104,11)—Great improvements were made in organs by the invention of pedals, etc. Church music was also greatly developed by the introduction of harmony and counterpoints. (1) The Dutch were preeminent in this department. Ockenheim, founder of the second Dutch school of music, at the end of the 15th century, was the inventor of the canon (2) and the fugue. (3) The greatest composer of this school was Jodocus Pratensis, about A.D. 1500, and next to him may be named the German, Adam of Fulda” (Vol. II, Page 182, Paragraph 115A, 8.)

Apart from this testimony, Mr. Editor, when I read the allegations of Rev. Mulder, I asked: what about the composers of the Dutch Psalmody which we have, and the many Dutch Hymns, not to speak of such men as Bilderdijk, Ten Kate, and Beets and others?

The “canon” (2) refers to the “type” used in the writing of music; it is what is known as 48-point type, while the “fugue” is “a composition in which an original theme is repeated and imitated throughout”. And finally, what is called “counter-point” (1) in music is “the art of adding to a melody a part or parts that shall harmonize with it, and at the same time be intrinsically melodious”.

It is interesting that a German professor in Church History asserts that the “Dutch were pre-eminent in this department”. I think, Mr. Editor, that your readers will appreciate this little contribution from Professor Kurtz. People living in glass houses should not throw with stones!

Rev. G. Lubbers

BEACON LIGHTS
The Reformation and Denominations

REV. J. KORTERING

This subject implies a relationship between the Reformation of 1517 and the vast number of denominations within the scope of Protestantism. Though this has been and is assailed as a mark of failure on the part of the Protestant Reformation, I will attempt to show that the opposite is true, namely that the possibility of denominations within Protestantism was and is the only hope for the true church to maintain her identity.

Prior to the famed Reformation that we commemorate this month, the church was one large institution. During the 15th and 16th Centuries there was one great Catholic church distinguished only as Roman (West) and Greek (East). Because this church was politically a hierarchy, she swayed a dominating rod over her membership. From the Pope and Arch-Bishop down to the country Priest, the officers in the church held a tight grasp on the lives of her members. The church determined doctrine and morals for the people. When the Pope would speak ex officio he spoke as Christ and his words were as infallible as the Bible. Because sacerdotalism was commonly accepted, the priests could intercede for the sins of the people. This resulted in a belief in the church. All one had to do was trust in the church and the church would gain salvation for anyone. If one did what the church said, he had little doubt as to his salvation. In place of a personal, living faith with God in Christ, the members of the church looked to the church to save them. Instead of studying the Word of God, the common people busied themselves with doing what the church insisted e.g. penance, confessions, and the like.

This was changed in the Reformation. Against this commonly accepted tradition, Luther struggled in his soul to harbor the courage to nail the 95 theses on the door of Wittenberg Cathedral on October 31, 1517. For a man to resist the dictates of the church, even though they troubled his conscience, was virtually unheard of in his day. Besides, if the views were radically different from the teachings of the church, one could very well suffer excommunication tantamount to being cast into hell. Luther under the saving Spirit of God possessed such courage.

Principally, the whole Reformation movement emphasized the one all important truth that Scripture must be the ultimate authority for the discernment of truth and error. One must needs know the Bible if he is to know the will of God. The church must study the Bible if she is to communicate the Word of God. It follows then that the Holy Spirit of God leads and guides His church into the truth as they study the Bible. With that truth taught and preached in the church of Christ, the hearts of believers are slain by its message and are sacrificed unto God as a people well pleasing in His sight. This latter thought was especially emphasized by John Calvin in his Institutes. Book II, Chapter 15. Yes, the child of God is a prophet who hearing the Word of God, rejoices in Its word and speaks of Its glorious message. He is a priest, who under the preaching of the Word sacrifices his life in holy consecration to God. He is king in that
he rules under God in every sphere of life and brings the whole of life unto the glory of God. As prophet, priest, and king he is united with God in the office of friend-servant dedicating his whole head, heart, and hand to God's glory.

The contrast is very apparent. Before the Reformation, a personal study of the Bible was condemned. Personal copies of the Bible were almost unknown. The church took care of the salvation of a man's soul and all a man had to do was blindly follow the church. In the Reformation, believers were given true Christian liberty. Common people studied the Bible and wrestled with the true meaning of Scripture. A man is justified by faith and not by the works of the law. Faith lived in their souls, a faith that was rooted in a lively knowledge of Scripture and confidence in the God of their salvation. By that faith one learns to know that in Christ he is a new creature, called to live to the glory of his Maker.

Such freedom resulted in various conceptions as to what the Word of God really meant to teach in particular points. Different views arose concerning the interpretation of Scripture in regard to doctrine and life. Some of the earliest differences arose around the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the doctrine of predestination, and the exercise of Christian discipline. Throughout the subsequent years to the very present, the Protestant world is characterized by denominations, different churches who believe differently concerning some doctrinal or practical truth of Scripture. Today we have the one large Roman Catholic church over against a divided and varied Protestant church.

The question we ask is this, is that in itself so terrible? The majority of Protestantism seems to draw that conclusion and enviously looks at Rome. Because this idea, viz. that denominations in themselves are wrong and therefore per se a proof of weakness, plagues the minds of the church leaders today, we have the present merger complex bringing churches together under the banner of "Ecumenic Unity." Many churches are caught in a gasping death struggle, because their leaders are driven by the craze that denominations are wrong in themselves. They cry for union which possess no unity. Attempting to satiate their thirst for the bigness of the Roman Catholic church, they are willing to sacrifice the very priesthood of the Gospel which liberated them from Rome.

How do denominations begin? What motivated men like Luther and Calvin and all their spiritual children to lead a crusade against the existing doctrines or practices and call out for reform? There was really one thing, the desire for the truth to be preserved confessionally as well as dogmatically. The reformers of every age jealously guarded the marks of the true church viz. the pure preaching of the gospel, the correct administration of the sacraments, and the faithful exercise of Christian discipline. They desired the church to exercise them as organism and maintain them as institution. In the main stream of Protestantism one always finds reformers, men leading believers to seek the truth over against a prevailing heresy or corruption that had crept into the church. They would plead with the church for correction, and if the church would not heed, were forced to lead the faithful out of such a church.

Hence in the history of the Protestant Church, one finds new groups or denominations constantly being formed. Always there were those who sought to keep the church pure and maintain her distinctive marks. Always there was the large organization that decayed from within and thus occasioned the need for reform. Look into church history and discover that new churches were occasioned by and large, because the "mother church" grew lethargic and corrupt.

In this light we can look at the denominations that exist within Protestantism from two points of view. First, their existence tells us the story of decay. There was corruption, a falling away, a neglect or indifference, concerning the Word of God. This necessitated a break and the formation of a new group. From this point of view it is sad. It is the evidence of sin in the church. It graphically portrays broken homes, strained relationships, hard words and even bloodshed. Yet, secondly, the outcome gives occasion for consolation. Even though trouble was present, splits and separate groups formed, yet these very things give evidence of the living church. The church that repeatedly contended for the faith in spite of
hardships and even new beginnings, persistently led on in the progress and maintenance of the truth of the Word of God.

This is exactly the blessed fruit of the Reformation. Look at the Romish church, a large institution which is so tightly drawn together by her hierarchy, so plagued with blind submission by her members that she is invulnerable to splits and division. Of necessity she retains all the corruption that is bound to develop within. The church in the world is sinful and her institution is not free from decay. If that church slavishly binds her membership she is bound to rot from within. That is the situation in the Roman Catholic Church today.

In Protestantism this is different. Because our Reformed heritage which is rooted in the 16th Century. gives to the membership the cardinal freedom to read the Word and to be prophets, priests, and kings, to live in personal dedication to God and bring all to His glory, we may find a church within Protestantism that maintains the marks of the true church in contrast to Rome. In this freedom the church is kept alive. Even though some may misuse this freedom and equate it to license, and corrupt doctrine and life, yet the true child of God rejoices in this liberty, and jealously guards the truth of God's Word. This is then the correct relationship between the institute and organic church. The one influences the other in the preservation of the true marks of the Church. To the degree that a church maintains these marks, to that degree she stands in the tradition of the Reformation.

Church mergers are good as long as such mergers are to the advantage of the church that is concerned, as long as they further her cause in maintaining the pure preaching, proper administration of sacraments and faithful exercise of Christian discipline. If a merger hinders in any way the exercise of these marks, such a merger is not to the greater glory of God. If a church has to sacrifice the truth of God's Word for the sake of becoming greater in number, that church does not understand real unity. She is bound to sacrifice her Biblical-Reformed position.

Today, we as Protestant Reformed young people belong to the denomination known as the Protestant Reformed Churches of America. We are a church that stands in the tradition of the Protestant Reformation. We believe that by God's grace we exercise the marks of the true church most purely. We preach the whole counsel of God, we administer the sacraments properly, and exercise discipline faithfully in the name of Christ. We are not a sect as some would ignorantly imply, but we are members of the church of Jesus Christ, expressing ourselves institutionally and organically.

Do we boast? No, we thank God in this Reformation season that we have been freed from the dictates of a hierarchy and through the efforts of reformers of all ages have the privilege to maintain the marks of the true church and stand in living communion with our God.

THANKSGIVING DAY

JOANNE VELDMAN

Our topic is, in a certain sense, self-explanatory. As such it simply refers to the setting aside of a day to give thanks. However, in our land, Thanksgiving Day refers to a holiday in November at which time a formal giving of thanks is now a custom. During autumn when the glories of nature assume the form of gathered grain, ripened corn, golden pumpkins and harvest in general, who is not reminded of the Pilgrims? We are reminded on this special day to give thanks for the things we receive in the form of crops as did they. We, as Christians, must remember two things. In the first place, when we give thanks for things we must omit nothing. Being content in whatever state we are, we know that sickness as well as health, poverty as well as riches, and death as well as life are included in the "all things" that work together for our good. In the second place, we must realize that God's grace is not in the things we have here below, but in God's attitude of love and mercy. In Ephesians 5:20 we are admonished to give thanks always for all things unto God the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is evident that this text makes direct separation between those things of the church and those things of the world. The world may speak of a "kind providence" in November, but when is the name of our Savior mentioned?
The life-long, intimate friendship and mutual high regard which Luther and Melanchthon reciprocated foundered only once. That, ironically, was the matter of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Although Melanchthon differed from Luther on several important counts, Philip's view of the Lord's Supper was the one doctrine in which he more closely approximated the Scriptural presentation than did Luther. This difference almost effected a breach between the two Reformers since Luther clung tenaciously and violently to consubstantiation. Soon after 1537, tension began to be felt. Amsdorf and others stirred up Luther's latent animosity against any variation on the Lord's Supper so that Melanchthon called himself "Prometheus chained to the Caucasus" and feared that he would be forced to leave Wittenberg. But the conflict was solved with the non-theological assistance of the secular powers and the close relationship between the two reappeared. The violence of Luther on this score always checked Melanchthon from approaching too closely or too overtly to the view of Calvin. Melanchthon found the Zwinglian and Calvinistic conceptions more rational and more Biblical than Luther's semi-papal view. Rather sadly, Philip went to meet Bucer in 1534 to discuss the doctrine of the Eucharist "as the bearer of another's view, not my own." And Calvin quite correctly hit upon the cause of Philip's ambiguous writings on the matter. Mel-
lanchthon was under Luther's domination; “fearing the thunder which threatened to burst from violent men (those who know the boisterous blasts of Luther understand what I mean), he did not always speak out openly as I could have wished.” As early as 1519, Melanchthon expressed dissatisfaction with the doctrine of transubstantiation, that is, even before Luther changed his view somewhat.

Because of this but-once-threatened approachement, many critics seize eagerly the many congratulatory expressions by Luther of Philip and heartily condemn the violent antipathy which Melanchthon experienced at the close of his life. They attempt, and generally successfully, to restore the glitter which the GnesioLutherans ripped from the Melanchthon image at the close of his life and for a long while afterwards. So hostile was a large segment of the Lutheran party to Melanchthon that the epithet, “Philippist,” became an expression of extreme opprobrium. In so far as that attack resided in distaste for Melanchthon’s “crypto-Calvinistic” view of the Lord’s Supper, it stands condemned. But the many who promiscuously wave Melanchthon’s prestigious titles, “Preceptor of Germany,” “Theologian,” and “Father of Ecumenicity,” seldom conduct a thorough exploration of the principles which permeated his educational, theological, and ecumenical activities. Luther’s oft quoted comparison of himself and Melanchthon, “I am rough, boisterous, stormy, and altogether warlike, I am born to fight against innumerable monsters and devils. I must remove stumps and stones, cut away thistles and thorns, and clear the wild forests; but Master Philip comes along softly and gently sowing and watering with joy, according to the gifts which God has abundantly bestowed upon him,” invokes the question, “What was Master Philip sowing?” In response to this question, there are some who give anything but a favorable estimation of Philip. Karl Barth pointedly excludes Melanchthon from the line of Calvin, Luther, Paul, and Jeremiah. Barth lumps Philip with Schleiermacher (rather undesirable company) as those who did not possess “a clear and direct apprehension of the truth that man is made to serve God and not God to serve man.”

Melanchthon’s frequent concessions were nobly inspired by timidity and love (a la Schaff). Rather, Philip’s concessions sprang from his one great resolve to settle the Roman Catholic-Lutheran split by compromise and that of essential truths. On the other hand, historian Cox judges him to be “in all doctrinal points . . . a firm, enlightened, inflexible Protestant.” Nor can Schaff find much of a shadow in the Melanchthon luster. Was Philip merely timid? Did he possess such a great quantity of charity that he wavered a little from the necessary doctrinal inflexibility? To come to a proper judgment of Melanchthon, it is necessary to examine the main tenets of his credo in the light of Scripture. Treading carefully, and respectfully, around Luther’s frequent adulations (Melanchthon was “a divine instrument which has achieved the very best in the department of theology to the great rage of the devil and his scabby tribe.”), it will be necessary to evaluate Melanchthon somewhat differently than Luther often did: “Philippus proceeds in charity, and I in faith. Philippus suffers himself to be eaten up, I eat up everything and spare nobody.”

Before proceeding to the two central matters of synergism and the “adlaphora,” it is well to refer back, briefly, to Melanchthon’s view of the Lord’s Supper. Here, as elsewhere, it is difficult to define precisely Melanchthon’s conception. With typical avidity, Schaff boldly overstates Philip’s position, since it is somewhat favorable, when he judges that the Heidelberg Catechism “gives clear and strong expression to the Calvinistic-Melanchthonian theory of the spiritual real presence.” Allowing for the fact that Ursinus was a beloved and devoted student of Philip, the Catechism exceeds anything Melanchthon expressed about the Lord’s Supper. James Good puts it more exactly when he writes that the Reformed view of the real spiritual presence of Christ was one in which “Calvin and Melanchthon neared each other.” Not that they harmonized, for “Melanchthon . . . came to it from the Lutheran standpoint of the carnal presence. Cal-

**secretly Calvinistic.

**literally, "indifferent things." Used of actions which are neither hidden nor forbidden by God, the doing or not doing of which is, therefore, indifferent.
vin came to it from the opposite position, from the idea of a spiritual presence. . . . And Melanchthon was tainted with the idea of a carnal presence, while Calvin with a spiritual presence.”18 Philip sided from the crass position of Luther that the real body of Christ was “bitten with the teeth.” But he was far too impressed with the words of Christ, “This is my Body,” to appreciate Zwingli’s “memorial” conception. Of the Zwinglians, he said, “I would rather die than see our cause polluted by a minor with the Zwinglians.”19 Melanchthon leaned toward a spiritual presence of Christ but deliberately never became definite. He took refuge in the mystery involved. The fury of the “sacramentarians” developed in Philip an aversion to even discuss the subject and he decried the fact that that which was intended to unite believers should so divide them. An irate Italian, badgering Philip on the question of the real presence, drew the withering and witty reply, “how is it that you Italians will have a God in the sacramental bread-you, who do not believe there is a God in heaven?”20 As a transition between Melanchthon’s view of the Lord’s Supper and the crucial matter of synergism, it should be noted that, according to Melanchthon, all who eat the Lord’s Supper receive benefit. This touches upon Melanchthon’s doctrine of salvation, the doctrine which draws upon itself the fiercest criticism by the detractors of Philip Melanchthon.

Although some claim to see the thread of heterodoxy running through Philip’s entire life, he underwent some kind of change in regard to the salient doctrines of predestination, free will, and co-operation of the believer in salvation. Many elements enter in here and can properly be treated under the broad and familiar topic of “synergism.” In the first flush of Philip’s embrace of the Reformation, he turned with Martinistic fury upon the advocates of free will and the deniers of strict predestination. At the same time he excoriated the secular philosophers once held so dear. Works by Melanchthon during the years 1519-1525 rival Luther’s in strength of language and purity of doctrine. The Loci Communis of 1521 drew Luther’s astounding praise of being worthy for a place in the canon. But Melanchthon changed, and his change was progressive. The Loci of 1535 and the Loci of 1521 are at odds on the most basic of issues. The Augsburg Confession of 1530 and of 1540 reveals vital renovations in the thinking of “The Theologian.” When Melanchthon in the Augustana Variata of 1540 demonstrated anew his constant revision of the Augsburg Confession, Luther remonstrated with him, “Philippus, the book is not yours, but the Church’s Confession, therefore you have no power to alter it so often.”21

Good makes an interesting and defensible sketch of Philip’s departure from his formerly held position on predestination and free will. According to Good, Melanchthon gave up “determinism” for infralapsarianism in 1527, abandoned infralapsarianism in 1532, and embraced synergism in 1535.22 Certain it is that by 1535, Melanchthon spoke of a will which could accept or reject the Spirit of God. This same doctrine he called “godless” in 1521. Double predestination came to be for him nothing else than Stoic fatalism. In a letter to Erasmus, Melanchthon confesses, “I have, during and after Luther’s lifetime rejected the Stoic and Manichean ‘deliria,’ presented by Luther and others, that all works, good and evil, in all men, good and evil, had to come about by necessity. It is obvious that such phrases are against the word of God, harmful to all discipline and blasphemous.”23 It is wholly in keeping with Melanchthon’s general expression on the subject that he cannot describe predestination and sovereignty, except in terms of “necessity” and “fatalism.” He seems never to have grasped the Scriptural manifestation that the fulfilling of God’s will is qualitatively different from philosophic cause and effect. Melanchthon denied a secret will in God which damns some and saves others, except that “we may say that many have been reprobated from eternity, not however from any absolute hatred or decree of God, but because God foresaw that they would abide in their unbelief and impenitence.”24

Once predestination had been diluted to a mere scientia media,*** it became imperative for Philip to explain the obvious facts of salvation and damnation. The sovereign efficacy of God was replaced by synergism, or co-operation. He ascribed conversion (regeneration, or salvation in the narrower sense) to the co-operation of
three main causes, the Spirit of God, the Word of God, and the will of man. In the activity of conversion, "three causes are conjoined: the Word, the Holy Spirit and the Will not wholly inactive, but resisting its own weakness . . . God draws, but draws him who is willing."25 But Philip insisted that this co-operation of the sinner was not meritorious. Contradictory as it was, there was a constant rejection by Philip of any ascribing of merit to man's actions. Although he could write that "Spiritual righteousness is wrought in us when we are helped by the Holy Spirit. And we receive the Holy Spirit when we assent to the Word of God,"26 he yet abhorred "this profane, impious, and arrogant word, merit."27 G. C. Berkouwer makes an attempt to explain why Melanchthon left predestination and the bound will for "foresight" and co-operation. He posits the "pendulum" nature of Melanchthon's thinking. In response to the antinomian struggle, Philip sought for human freedom and responsibility, only to swing to the extreme of synergism.28 It is obvious that in keeping with his synergism, Philip veered towards Nomism in his attempt to steer the middle course between Nomism (Bona opera necessaria esse ad salutem)** and Antinomianism (Bona opera novia esse ad salutem).*****

** The doctrine that God's knowledge is such that by it God foresaw what men, with their free will, would do and, on the basis of this foresight, made His eternal decisions or decree. This view of the relationship between God's predestination and men's salvation and condemnation prevails in the Roman Catholic Church. The Reformed fathers condemned it in the Canons of Dordrecht (cf. the Canons, I, 6, 7, 9, 15 and the rejection of errors under the first head of doctrine, esp. V) but it has many adherents today, quite vocal when applying it to reprobation, who go by the name, Reformed.

***** "Law-ism" maintains that "good works are necessary for salvation.

***** "Antilaw-ism" maintains that "good works are noxious in regard to salvation," i.e., even as fruits or expressions of gratitude.

***** The reference is to Galatians 2:11ff. Melanchthon said of Peter's action (translated loosely): "it was not a doctrinal error, but a weakness . . . Peter taught and thought rightly, but he was weak in practice," Luther saw it as an offense "not of character, but of faith and eternal damnation."

29 The depth of feeling which Melanchthon had for some kind of reinstatement of the law is indicated in his exposition of Peter's compromise with the circumcison, "non fuit error doctrinæ, sed fuit infirmitas . . . Petrus recte docebat et sentiebat, fuit tamen infirmitas in usu." Of the same struggle, the expression of Luther is that Peter caused real offense, "non morum, sed fidei et acteriorum damnation."30

The foregoing is the heart of theology. In Melanchthon's case it is a vulnerable heart, one that can only be assailed by the mighty defenders of the sovereignty of grace. Concomitant aberrations always appear. In Philip's case, there was insistance that Christ's atonement was a universal one, i.e., for all men. In fact, "the blessing of God must be recognized, in that the promise is general, and that it is the will of God to save all."31 Christ was regarded as fulfiller of all worthy religions. Philip suggested the possibility of the salvation of noble pagans. The terminus a quo of this deterioration in Melanchthon's theological thought is a matter of dispute. Some berate him as a life-long humanist, forced to hide his true convictions by his contact with the implacable Luther. From 1527, Melanchthon displayed more and more the doctrinal convictions which militated against the true principles of the Reformation.
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14. Cos, op. cit., p. 537
15. Luther, quoted by Schaff - Herzog Encylopedia of Religious Knowledge, p. 282
16. Luther, quoted by Hildebrandt, F., Melanchthon, Allen or Ally?, p. 19
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19. Man-chrechek, op. cit., p. 168
20. Cos, op. cit., p. 129
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"Arise; for this matter belongeth unto thee: we also will be with thee: be of good courage, and do it."

The children of God have been and are still noteworthy for their lack of trepidation. In the battle against sin God has equipped these children with weapons — his word and grace — so that they fight diligently but imperfectly against sin and its accompanying errors.

It is not easy to be always contrary to the general trend of life which always mitigates the principles laid down by God in his Word. This battle against the forces of hell is made doubly difficult because these warriors bear with them constantly an old nature which is very much in love with and akin to the errors and sins loved by the world.

The conflict becomes even more severe and demands even more courage when the child of God reminds himself that his battle "is not against flesh and blood but against principalities and powers." Whether he is always as conscious in his daily life of this battle against the Devil and his host as he ought to be is the question. Life is so easy for him now. He has more than enough food on his table, automobiles in his garage and a spacious house in which to live. Because of the seeming lack of persecution very little activity of that spiritual virtue — courage — is necessary.

Just as a muscle becomes soft and flabby through disuse so the courage of faith can lose vitality and vigor through disuse. We might almost wish that the Lord would send many trials into the life of the Christian so that with courage which is rooted in faith the victory may be more surely given to all those who are called to be saints.

particularly for the youth of the Protestant Reformed Churches of America is the virtue — courage of paramount importance. He has to courageously stand for the truth which is preached and believed by the defenders of the faith in the Protestant Reformed Churches. Sometimes the differences between one Reformed denomination and another are made to appear so minimal that the necessity of different denominations is negated. Often the question is asked: "What is the future of the Protestant Reformed Churches?" This should not be a question at all. He has no right to be concerned about the future of a church but standing in that church he has a calling to be a defender of the cause of Jesus Christ as this cause is represented by
the Protestant Reformed Churches of America. If the aforementioned churches are defenders of the cause of Jesus Christ, and they are, then they certainly have a task in and for the future.

The ecumenical movement has the whole church world head over heels in a dither. All denominations must become tightly knitted into one great world church. Over against such annihilation of church distinctions and the accompanying annihilation of confessional and scriptural bases the courageous, faithful warrior for the truth must stand. We have just commemorated nearly 450 years of separation from the error of the Roman Catholic Church. To the door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg, Germany, a courageous Martin Luther nailed the 95 theses in which he set forth in primitive form his basic opposition to the forces of hell as these were centered in nominal Christianity of the sixteenth century. We can be encouraged by taking this page from the notebook of Martin Luther as he battled against the established church powers of his days. We too have a calling to battle against “Christianity Today.”

Progressively Protestants have become part of the camp of those who are opposed to the truth of the Scriptures. Protestantism has lost its vitality and vigor. There is a general trend toward unity with the Roman Catholic Church. Gradually the confessional barriers are being beaten down so that church union may be consummated. Where in the world are there those who with a passion rooted in the courage of faith fight against all this seeming ecumenicity—ecumenicity at the expense of the pure preaching of the Gospel. They are few and far between.

Even nominal Reformed Churches preach a gospel which is no gospel and mitigates the absolute sovereignty of God which was so astutely defended by that great reformer, John Calvin. These same churches founded on the five points of Calvinism deny the very essential position that God in his sovereignty has decreed that some shall be saved and others damned inspite of the fact that God also commands all men to believe and repent from sin. Because this aspect of the truth cannot be understood it is not accepted and instead the leaders of these churches state openly that God loves all men. Where in the world is the truth of the Reformation defended and preached?

It is the undoubted task and calling of the Protestant Reformed Churches to develop and defend the truth of God’s absolute sovereignty and man’s innate perverseness which can only be changed by the miracle of grace in those whom God has sovereignly willed to save. This demands concerted study of the Word of God and the Confessions so that in these last days we who have the truth may remain strong, fresh, courageous warriors in our calling as Children of the Reformation.

MISSION EMPHASIS NIGHT — OCTOBER 4, 1962

JOHN KALSBEEK JR.

“Your church has a negative attitude toward mission work.” “Your church does not consider mission work important.” “Your church overlooks its missionary calling.” “Your emphasis on God’s Sovereignty makes mission work impossible.” These are but a few of the many charges brought against our churches in regard to missionary activity. Perhaps you have heard them all and have others to add to the list.

Are these accusations true? Does our church neglect its missionary calling? These questions were answered October 4, 1962, in our First Church auditorium.
That night, Mission Emphasis Night, we heard from our missionary Rev. G. Lubbers, who is presently working in Tripp, South Dakota; and Houston, Texas. We also heard and learned about Jamaica and its native people, who are Negroes, from Mr. Meulenberg and Mr. Zwak. Slides taken in each of these areas were shown to the large audience.

We first heard from Rev. Lubbers.

In December, 1961, he went to Houston, Texas for the first time. He stayed there for a week and used the music room of the community high school three times that Sunday for services and discussions.

He then returned to Tripp, South Dakota, where he remained for three months; after which he returned again to Houston for a period of three weeks. This time they used a large living room for an auditorium, rented a few chairs, and built a make-shift pulpit.

In the three weeks Rev. Lubbers was there they met together sixteen times, discussed thirty-three subjects, and six families became convinced that ours was the truth they sought. Our mission program has progressed in this area.

After his short three week stay in Houston the Rev. Lubbers and his wife went back to Tripp. The town of Tripp is 1240 miles north of Houston, Texas; 610 miles east by north of Loveland, Colorado; 345 miles south of Isabel, South Dakota; 240 miles south of Forbes, South Dakota; 96 miles west of Doon, Iowa; and 134 miles southwest of Edgerton, Minnesota. When he first came to Tripp he had rather large audiences of 60 people or more. However, within the crowd were many enemies, some curious, and a few faithful. The Lord was gracious and rewarded Rev. Lubbers for his work by calling out the faithful few, who now steadfastly seek the tradition of Calvinistic truth.

As we left Rev. Lubbers and the people of Tripp and Houston, and headed for Jamaica, we thanked the Lord in our hearts for his work of mercy and grace in Houston and Tripp.

Mr. Zwak and Jamaica now became the center of attention. The focal point was the island itself which is 55 miles wide and 148 miles long. It is in the West Indies in the tropical zone. The climate is comparable to Florida with temperatures ranging from 70 to 100 degrees, and showers occurring every day in the afternoon.

The people of the island are poor, earning on the average, three dollars a week. They are very much concerned about the pure preaching of the word of God, and seek our help, not physical, as might be expected, but spiritual. They seek the truth and feel that we as Prot. Bel’d. Churches can best supply their need. Jamaicans are poor, but they are content to live in the love of Christ; they have peace beyond compare. Slides on Jamaica were then shown after which Rev. Schipper closed with prayer.

Those who attended Mission Emphasis Night, October 4, 1962, will always remember it with deep feeling of spiritual joy and gladness in their souls. The charges against our mission program are false; we have not neglected our missionary calling. Instead our mission activity is a Beacon which guides those in darkness unto light. Our churches have a most wonderful message—the sovereign and marvelous grace of Almighty God—for those who seek the truth. A God all-powerful who delivers his people from their sins and gives them eternal salvation. He draws them into His presence and makes them partakers of life everlasting. What more beautiful doctrine can the church of Christ bring to the elect? That they must accept or reject Christ? God forbid! “For it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.” Romans 9:16. May His ever be the glory.

In concluding his talk Rev. Lubbers reminded the young people of our minister shortage; he pleaded with them to prayerfully consider kingdom work, for the field is ripe and the harvesters few.

Twelve

BEACON LIGHTS
THAT REVISED STANDARD VERSION AGAIN

Our familiar King James Version of 1611 was revised to produce what we call the American Standard Version of 1901, which, it is said, was in turn revised to produce the new Revised Standard Version of 1952. One would think that with all this revision of revisions that much improvement over the KJV has been accomplished, especially in view of the strange assertion made in the preface to this Bible that “the King James Version has grave defects.” For the same charge could even more justifiably be made against the ASV of 1901, because, while it contains some serious errors, it is perhaps only grammatically improved over the KJV. (E.g., “By grace have ye been saved,” instead of “by grace are ye saved.”) It adds no prestige to the ASV that it was copyrighted by the modernist International Council of Religious Education. For this only made it the ICRE Bible. Now the RSV is also copyrighted at the behest of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. This makes it the NCCC Bible. These copyrights, it is claimed, were obtained to preserve the texts from corrupting influences. But the KJV is not copyrighted, yet it has never been corrupted, and it belongs to the entire holy Catholic Church.

Now examine the content of this Bible further, as we have it in Micah 5:12, where we read, “But thou, Bethlehem-Ephrata, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.” The RSV has it thus: “But you, O Bethlehem Ephrathah, who are little to be among the clans of Judah, from you shall come forth for me one who...”
is to be ruler in Israel, whose origin is from of old, from ancient days.”

The KJ words “out of thee shall he come forth unto me” refer to Christ the King who should come in the way of the covenant line, of the stock and tribe of Judah, from the midst of the royal nation (Jer. 30:21). The reference is to His human birth. In the words “whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting” we have the divine generation of the Son. The Hebrew, to be sure, is sometimes translated “from ancient days,” as in Isa. 51:9; but in Prov. 8:22, 23 the meaning is that of eternity. “Jehovah possessed Me, the Beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was ordained from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was” (Heb.). Not “from ancient days” but “from everlasting” is certainly more appropriate when applying to God, denoting, as it does, the eternity of God. This is true, also, according to Ps. 90:2. So that “from of old, from everlasting” denotes the eternity of this promised Ruler. But the revision “whose origin is from of old, from ancient days” sets aside the eternal generation of the Son of God.

Now consider Ps. 45:6: “Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre.” But the RSV has, “Your divine throne endures for ever and ever. Your royal scepter is a scepter of equity.” Do not fail to see how “your divine throne” twists the proper name Elohim into a mere adjective, and so expels the eternity and deity of the Son from the text. Besides, the “your” and “you” instead of “thy” and “thou” reveal that the NCC scholars conceived of a mere human being, as addressed here in “your throne,” “your scepter.” For “thee,” “thou” and “thy” are supposed to be used only in reference to deity.

In Ps. 2:11, 12 we read, “Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.”

The RSV has this as follows: “Serve the Lord with fear, with trembling kiss his feet, lest he be angry, and you perish in the way; for his wrath is quickly kindled. Blessed are all who take refuge in him.” Notice how “the Son” is omitted, and instead we have a translation which better suits the unitarian (perhaps we should say Arrian) bias. For “with trembling kiss his feet” is merely a Hebrew Bible footnote reading. It is not the reading of the text itself, which has it exactly as in the ASV and the KJV, “Kiss the Son.” The same word is correctly translated (even in the RSV) “son” in Prov. 31:2, where again the reference is to Jehovah’s Son, the King set on God’s holy hill of Zion. Many “bibles” have put Christ the Son of God out of the Scriptures. The RSV does it in “kiss his feet.” Another new translation(?) also does in the reading, “do homage in purity,” while the Douay (Bombs) Bible, based on the Latin Vulgate, has instead of “Kiss the Son,” “embrace discipline.” Now it is important that we have “the Son” in the text, as the words belong there, and also to retain the obvious meaning of the last sentence in verse 12. For if you follow the RSV, the pronoun “him” in “Blessed are all who take refuge in him” has no proper antecedent, which in reality is “the Son.” The RSV makes the text speak of taking refuge in the Lord, whereas the KJV speaks of putting trust in the Son. The Lord, through Jeremiah (17:5-7), pronounced a curse on all who trust in a mere man. Here a blessing is pronounced on all who trust in this Son, who is more than a man, who is very God.

In addition to what has already been exposed in the RSV New Testament, examine one more text with me, viz., 1 Tim. 3:16. There we read, “And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh…” Now the ASV of 1900 has this: “And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: He who was manifested in the flesh…” At this point there is a marginal note which claims, “The word God in place of He who rests on no sufficient ancient evidence.” With modern-processism like this on record for so long a time, we are not surprised to read in the NT under discussion (published in 1946): “Great indeed, we confess, is the mystery of our religion: He was manifested in the flesh…”

Now the real question is. What does this text say? GOD was manifested in the flesh? Or merely, HE was manifested? If “God,” the word would be “theos.” If only “he” or “who,” the word would be “hos.” Is
there any danger of these words becoming mistaken for one another? Yes, there is, as I will indicate below. But is it true, as the ASV boldly claims, that the word GOD rests on no sufficient ancient evidence? It is simply not true. This claim is modernistic interpretation.

For among the literally thousands of manuscripts and versions of the new testament we have one outstanding manuscript called the Codex A. (Codex means book.) This is the Codex Alexandrinus. My Nestle's Greek NT rejects the reading of Codex A, rejects the word "God" for the pronoun "who," which is accompanied with a footnote of some slippery line informing us that the authentic TR (Textus Receptus, or Received Text) with its God is based on "noteworthy rejected readings." Where or what these readings are we are not told. But the Codex A of the British museum makes it, according to all the testimony of 300 years, God (theos). Dr. Scrivener, foremost English critic, says it is theos, i.e., God. Codex C (or Codex Ephraemi Syri) has contracted the word theos into two letters, OC, with a hairline mark within the O. This denotes the abbreviation th for theos God.

Then there are the manuscripts F and G which also make it OC, the abbreviation for theos. All the cursive (running hand) manuscripts of Paul's epistles, 254 of them with the exception of two of them, have theos. These copies were produced in every part of ancient Christendom, and their testimony may be regarded as final. Thirty out of thirty-two Greek lexicons give theos. More than twenty of the Greek fathers testify to theos. It is interesting to note that one manuscript, five versions and two late fathers (eight witnesses) read ho that which. Six manuscripts, only one version, but not one Greek father (i.e., seven witnesses) read hos, "who" or "he who." Two hundred and eighty-nine (289) manuscripts, three versions and more than twenty Greek fathers read theos in agreement with the TR upon which our KJV is founded. There we have at least 312 witnesses additional. Now what's the score? More than 619 witnesses in favor of theos, God! The ASV Bible states, "some ancient authorities read which." The statement would be more accurate if it read, "Few authorities read..." But with so many witnesses to the word God, how may it be justly claimed that there is no sufficient ancient evidence for the word God? How much more evidence would be required to convince the unitarian mind?

When the Dutch Reformed Church came to this country in 1628 it was incorporated in 1819 as The Reformed Protestant Dutch Church. (My maternal grandmother's parents were members in this denomination.) The name was changed in 1867 to The Reformed Church in America. In this denomination there was a minister by the name of Dr. Geo. S. Bishop. In 1885 he visited the British Museum where he was permitted to study this I Tim. 3 passage in the great Codices C and A. He had Codex C for one week, studied the membrane under sunlight and lenses, compared the theos in dispute with every other theos on the page, and out of the five, finds it the plainest one there. He found that all five are written with two letters: OY, OY, OC, OY and the fifth with Omicron and Omega. Only two of these five have the mark of contraction above the letters. One of these two, the plainest, is the one the modernists deny. Only three of the five have the H-shaped hair mark in the Theta (Gk., th), and one of these three is the one they deny! Is this word OC, "he who," or is it OC with the contraction sign over the letters and the theta mark in the O, thus GOD? It is beyond question the latter!

Therefore we unhesitatingly agree with the KJV, "God was manifested in the flesh!"

To me, the infallibility of Scripture, its verbal and plenary inspiration must be maintained. To me, anyone not willing to do so is asleep at the switch, and has already lost the safeguard of his most profound interests, namely, peace and unity. The Revised Standard Bible is not likely to lead us in the direction of contending earnestly for the faith once and for all delivered to the saints. It leads to the left. It draws the churches more and more into modernism. Accepted in ignorance and without criticism, it hurls to sleep. The King James Bible leads to the right. It does not lead to modernism. It has always: Alerted the church, been its indispensable basis of unity, and afforded true peace to believers everywhere!
Nero read his music by the light of burning Rome and the city itself fell, not because its walls were low, but because its citizens were low. The conservative element in the United States, made popular by Senator Barry Goldwater et al., is predicting a similar, if somewhat more sophisticated end to the United States. That is, unless we again recognize such old-fashioned concepts as sin, sloth, greed, selfishness and dishonesty for what they really are.

One of the most eloquent and frequently quoted messages which falls into this category is an address by Mr. Jenkin L. Jones, Editor of the Tulsa Tribune, which he gave to the Inland Daily Press Association entitled, "Who is Tampering With the Soul of America?"

"Our Puritan ancestors were preoccupied with sin. They were too preoccupied with it. They were hag ridden and guilt ridden, and theirs was a repressed and neurotic society. But they had horsepower. They wrestled livings from rocky land, built our earliest colleges, started our literature, caused our industrial revolution, and found time in between to fight the Indians, the French, and the British; to bow for abolition, women suffrage, and prison reform. They were a tremendous people.

"In recent years, all this has changed in America. We have decided that sin is largely imaginary. We have become enamored with 'behavioristic psychology.' This holds that a man is a product of his heredity and his environment, and his behavior to a large degree is foreordained by both.

"Well, the theory that misbehavior can be cured by pulling down tenements and erecting in their places elaborate public housing is not holding water. The crime rates continue to rise, along with our outlays for social services. We speak of under-privilege. Yet the young men who swagger up and down the streets, boldly flaunting their gang symbols on their black jackets, are far more blessed in creature comforts, opportunities for advancement, and freedom from drudgery than 90 percent of the children of the world. We have sown the dragon's teeth of pseudo-scientific sentimentality; and out of the ground has sprung the legion, bearing switch-blade knives.

"Relief is gradually becoming an honorable career in America. It is a pretty fair life—if you have neither conscience nor pride. The politicians will weep over you... Nothing is your fault. And when the city fathers of a harassed community like Newburgh suggest that able-bodied welfare clients might sweep the streets, the 'liberal' editorialists arise as one man and denounce them for their medieval cruelty.

"I don't know how long Americans can stand this erosion of principle. But I believe that some of my starry-eyed friends are kidding themselves when they pretend that
every planeload of Puerto Ricans that puts down at Idlewild is equivalent in potential to every shipload of Pilgrims that put into old Plymouth. Nations are built by people capable of great energy and self-discipline. I never heard of one put together by cha-cha-cha.

"Can anyone deny that movies are dirtier than ever? But they don't call it dirt. They call it 'realism.' . . ."

"And we of the press are a party to the crime. Last year the movie ads in our newspaper got so salacious and suggestive that the advertising manager and I decided to throw out the worst and set up some standards.

"Within a couple of hours the exhibitors were down with much milder ads. How was this miracle accomplished?"

"Well, it seems that the exhibitors are supplied with several different ads for each movie. If the publishers are dumb enough to accept the most suggestive ones, those are what they get. But if publishers squawk, the cleaner ads are sent down. Isn't it time we all squawked?"

"I think it's time we quit giving page 1 play to the extramarital junkets of crooners. I think it is time we stopped treating as glamorous and exciting the brazen shack-ups of screen tramps. I think it is time we asked our Broadway and Hollywood columnists if they can't find something decent and inspiring going on along their beats. . . ."

"We are drowning our youngsters in violence, cynicism and sadism, piped into the living room and even the nursery. The grandchildren of the kids who used to weep because the Little Match Girl froze to death now feel cheated if she isn't sluggled, raped, and thrown into a Bessemeyer converter."

These Are Tame Now

"And there's our literature. The old eye-poppers of the past, which tourists used to smuggle back from Paris under their dirty shirts, are now tame stuff. . . ."

_Lady Chatterley's Lover_ has been draped with the mantle of art, and it is now on sale in the corner drugstore to your high-school-age son or daughter for fifty cents. . . .

"The quick-buck boys have apparently convinced our bunfuddled judges that there is no difference between a peep show and a moral lecture."

"Don Maxwell, of _The Chicago Tribune_, has recently asked his book department to quit advertising scatological literature by including it in the list of best sellers. The critics and the book publishers have denounced him for tampering with the facts. I would like to raise a somewhat larger question: Who is tampering with the soul of America?"

"For nations do have souls. They have collective personalities. People who think well of themselves collectively exhibit clan and enthusiasm and morale. When nations cease believing in themselves, when they regard their instructions with cynicism and their traditions with flippancy, they will not long remain great nations. When they seek learning without effort and wages without work, they are beginning to stagger. When they become hedonistic and pleasure-oriented, when their Boy Scouts on their fourteenmile hikes start to hitch, there's trouble ahead. When payola becomes a way of life, expense account cheating common, and union goonery a fiercely defended 'right,' that nation is in danger. And when police departments attempt to control burglary by the novel method of making it a department monopoly—then the chasm yawns.

"Do not let me overdraw the picture. This is still a great, powerful, vibrant, able, optimistic nation. Americans—our readers—do believe in themselves and in their country.

"But there is rot and there is blight and there is cutting out and filling to be done if we, as the leader of free men, are to survive the hammer blows which quite plainly are in store for us all.

"We have reached the stomach-turning point. We have reached the point where we should re-examine the debilitating philosophy of permissiveness. Let this not be confused with the philosophy of liberty. The school system that permits our children to develop a quarter of their natural talents is not a champion of our liberties. The healthy man who chooses to loaf on unemployment compensation is not a defender of human freedom. The playwright who would degrade us, the author who would profit from pandering to the worst that's in us—these are not friends."
"It is time we hit the sawdust trail. It is time we revived the idea that there is such a thing as sin—just plain old willful sin. It is time we brought self-discipline back into style..."

"Let's quit being bulldozed and bedazzled by self-appointed longhairs. Let's have the guts to say that a book is dirt if that's what we think of it, or that a painting may well be a daub if you can't figure out which way to hang it. And if some beatnik welds together a collection of rusty cogwheels and old corset stays and claims it's a greater sculpture than Michelangelo's David, let's have the courage to say that it looks like junk and probably is.

**Give Decency a Chance**

"Let's blow the whistle on plays that would bring blushes to an American Legion stag party. Let's not be awed by movie characters with barnyard morals, even if some of them have been photographed climbing aboard the Presidential yacht. Let us pay more attention in our news columns to the decent people everywhere who are trying to do something for the good of others.

"In short, let's cover up the cesspool and start planting some flowers.

"I am fed up with the educationists and pseudo-social scientists who have underrated our potential as a people..."

"And again I am genuinely disturbed that to idealistic youth in many countries the fraud of communism appears synonymous with morality, while we, the chief repository of real freedom, are regarded as being in the last stages of decay.

"We can learn a lesson from history. Twice before our British cousins appeared heading toward a collapse of principle, and twice they drew themselves back. The people rebelled. They banged through the reform laws, and under Victoria went on to the peak of their power.

"In this hour of fear, confusion, and self-doubt, let us learn the lesson for America. Unless I misread the signs, a great number of our people are ready. Let there be a fresh breeze, a breeze of new honesty, new idealism, new integrity."

Dr. Abert Schweitzer in his book "The Philosophy of Civilization" points out that the promoting of Christian virtues has become fashionable in many areas even by those who do not believe in Christ. Mr. Jones' comment in some ways could fall into this category, since his concern for Christian virtues is limited to what it could do for America rather than the ideal Christian hope that returning to this fundamental ideal would be uplifting to the honor of God.

And once again we see a demonstration of God using all things (even newspaper editors who have very different intentions) to tell His truth.

_Eighteen_