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Do You Give Thanks?

“And let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body; and be ye thankful.”

Colossians 3:15

This month the Church of God in the earth will be reminded of one of her duties, but more beautifully and significantly of one of her sacred privileges and joys, and that in the same instance, by focusing special attention on the aspect of her spiritual life called thanksgiving. At least, we may say, this will be done in a special manner by the saints as they find themselves here in the United States of America. The children of God will emphasize this aspect of their life in a particular way on November 25, 1965, the date which has been designated officially as Thanksgiving Day for this year.

You will notice, perhaps, that we have asserted, thrice thus far, that it is only the children of God who will and do give thanks. We believe that this is pointedly the teaching of the Word of God, and that there are no exceptions to this in all the history of the world. In which case, we consider here the nature of our giving thanks as an exclusive reality.

What is the giving of thanks first of all? It may be described as a spiritual activity of the saint, which it certainly is. That is the actual rendering of the thanks. The ascribing of praise and blessedness to God. It is He, after all, who must receive all thanks! That aspect, we say, is certainly involved. However, it is not central, although it is quite impossible to separate it from that which is central. The essence of the heart, my dear young reader, is central, and the heart, as you know, manifests itself in expression. The point here then is that the heart of man by nature cannot, will not, and does not give praise, give thanks, nor bless any other being than itself. It is enmity against God, and not subject to Him, nor His laws.

The child of God, on the other hand, can and wills to and does ascribe all praise and blessedness to Jehovah His God, That reality exists is indeed a wonder, for we are of one mind when we confess that all of humanity by nature are Adam’s sinful sons.

If we consider the why of giving thanks, we see that Scripture certainly goes beyond the answer that we do so because God has commanded it. His purpose is that through the loving adoration of His elected, redeemed children, He will glorify Himself, He will magnify His Name! But we do well to see that He draws such praise from His saints by and through the incomprehensibly glorious way of saving them from sin, its misery, from death! God determined that way, youth of God. And when you experience that work, the core of your heart will be a well-spring of praise, thanks and glory. Notice the text above, the chapter of which begins with the powerful promise: “If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above. . . .”, it continues with “. . . Christ, who is our life. . . .” and “ye have put off the old man with his deeds, and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him who created him. . . .” You see, there has been wrought by God a complete change in our hearts! And that change is that we see and confess what we were heretofore, and also that in that heart has been placed beauteous praises of glorification and thankfulness to the Lord our God, for all that He is and for all that He has done. What a change!

We said that the praise or thanksgiving is not just something that is commanded. Concerning that further, we ought to realize that in the dispensation of grace, the prescribed conduct of the saint is forthcoming as the spontaneous love of heart, which at once is the implantation of God. It is no longer the same as the fearful and dreading obedience of the Old Testament as under the law and without the reality of the Christ Who fulfilled all its precepts. That law said: “Do this and thou shalt live.” But the law continually cursed the best of their deeds. The law of love and liberty according to grace says: “My child, because you live, this you will surely do!”

You say, according to the testimony of
the Spirit in your heart, that you are a child of God? You say, according to that same testimony, that Christ died that shameful death on the cross in your behalf, and that in and through it you are redeemed? You say that in your heart you experience the “peace of God”?

Then you will indeed give thanks! The eyes of the faithful ones who are thus disposed acknowledge the wisdom of all the ways wherein it pleases our Lord to lead us, whether in health or sickness, prosperity or want, tranquility or controversy; in any way in which He leads, we know and believe its wisdom, and we give thanks, yea we shall give thanks to the endless praise of His blessed Name!

And as to the source of that thanksgiving, let us not presume that we add to the glory of our God, shall we? The concluding lines in a hymn we heard once phrase it rather fittingly we believe, concerning that very question:

“Thine were the songs, no gift of mine. Thou gavest them me. I but return Thee what is and ever shall be Thine!”

Do you give thanks this Thanksgiving Day season?

H.W.K.

FEATURE

PROTESTANT REFORMED EDUCATION - -
A UNIQUE ENTERPRISE

PROF. H. HANKO

Prof. Hanko presented this lecture, sponsored by the Protestant Reformed High School Circle, at Hope Protestant Reformed Church on September 23, 1965.

Introduction:
When the committee discussed with me the topic for this speech, they made clear in the first place, that they did not want a speech which spoke of the need of a Protestant Reformed High School. Presumably, they meant, at least in part, that the need of our own high school was apparent and that therefore there is little point in stressing this aspect for you. I take it that this is true and am happy about this, for I concur entirely.

Rather they wanted a speech which would spell out in some detail the manner in which a school of our own would differ from existing schools. This, I think is a worthwhile subject to discuss; indeed it is the fundamental point.

You understand, I take it, that this can hardly be divorced from “need.” If there is to be no difference, there is no “need”; if the difference is slight, the “need” is slight. But if the difference is most fundamental and basic, the “need” is urgent. If it comes to our attention that the food our children are eating is not adequate for the requirements of their health and, in fact, is making them ill, we had better attend rather speedily to this matter of providing a different diet. And, as we often say when our children are in the hospital, no price is too great to pay to restore them to health.

You notice that I have chosen as my topic “Protestant Reformed Education.” There is occasionally some question about the wisdom of using the name of our denomination to define the type of education we give our children. Some prefer to omit the name of our denomination and simply speak of “Christian Education.” I do not doubt that by the word “Christian” they mean Christian absolutely in the sense of the only proper education one ought to give to his children. And I have no objection to this, of course. But I have always failed to appreciate the hesitancy of calling education in our schools “Protestant Reformed education.” I can’t, quite frankly, see the point of the objection. And I want to make it as certain as it is possible to make it that we mean tonight education which is in harmony with the confession we make as churches - a confession which is Scriptural and of the historic Reformed faith.

With these remarks we shall proceed. Three things I would have you notice as you ponder with me the fact that Protestant Reformed education is a unique enterprise:

Two
I. ITS UNIQUE BASIS

II. ITS UNIQUE CHARACTER

III. ITS UNIQUE ADVANTAGE

I. Its Unique Basis.

That we claim a unique basis for Protestant Reformed Schools implies that the basis upon which the schools of our alternative choices have different bases which are unsatisfactory. There are principally three such alternatives.

First of all there is the public school system. Very briefly we ought to trace the origin of these schools and their development to their present position. They were originally founded as parental schools, and many of them, consequently, were Christian. But gradually as the population increased and became more varied, many different denominations were represented in these schools and many people sent their children who had no religious convictions at all. The result was that the schools more and more lost their Christian character as the segment of the population which despised religion protested the teaching of it to their children. Along with this same trend towards secular instruction in the schools went also a trend towards government interference in the operation of the schools until the various state governments along with the federal government forbade religious instruction of any kind. This position has been strengthened recently by various rulings of the Supreme Court. It may not be generally known, but the fact of the matter is that these recent Supreme Court rulings are only several decisions in a long series of decisions beginning more than thirty years ago in which the government took the same position for the most part.

The basis for these various rulings of the Supreme Court is the principle of the separation between Church and State which is incorporated into our Constitution as the First Amendment. The argument is that the government which controls and regulates the public school system, must be neutral with respect to religion and must, therefore, forbid any religious instruction of any kind in the schools under its jurisdiction.

This is an impossible position, for it implies that there is a grey and in-between area in religion which can be described as neutrality. One can be neutral over against God. We remember, however, the words of the Lord Jesus which are applicable also to this situation: "He that is not for us is against us."

The result of all this is that the public school system is not neutral at all, but is rather the propaganda agent for a terrible atheism. There is no alternative. I recall a statement made by Prof. A. A. Hodge of Princeton Seminary: "I am as sure as I am of the fact of Christ's reign that a comprehensive and centralized system of national education, separated from religion, as is now commonly proposed, will prove the most appalling enginey for the propagation of anti-Christian and atheistic unbelief, and of anti-social, nihilistic ethics, individual, social, and political, which this sin-ridden world has ever seen. . . . It is capable of exact demonstration that if every party in the state has the right of excluding from the public schools whatever he does not believe to be true, then he that believes most must give way to him that believes absolutely nothing, no matter in how small a minority the atheists or the agnostics may be. It is self-evident that on this scheme, if it is consistently and persistently carried out in all parts of the country, the United States' system of national popular education will be the most efficient and wide instrument for the propagation of atheism which the world has ever seen."

This has indeed happened. Obviously, the public school is not an acceptable alternative.

There is second the alternative of what is called the "shared time program." This program has recently become very popular. It is a sort of compromise between private-school education and public school education. Its main purpose is purely financial. It intends to cut down the cost of education by saving money in financing private schools and by getting some benefit from the taxes which parents who support both school systems must pay.

The idea is this. There are, supposedly, two different kinds of subjects in the curriculum. There are "religious subjects" and there are "neutral" subjects. The former presumably include Bible, courses in religion, perhaps ethics, history and maybe geography. The latter include the sciences, mathematics, literature, gymnasium, etc. Because of this division in the curriculum the religious subjects only really need to be taught in the private school which is re-
ligiously colored. The other subjects can very well be taught in the public schools where no religion enters in—and money can be saved for there will be no need to hire extra teachers, build laboratories and gymnasiums, etc. We need not spend too much time pointing out why this alternative is also not acceptable to us. Once again we come face to face with that error of neutrality. There are no subjects in the curriculum which are neutral. They rightly are all religious. The Roman Catholics who are the main ones supporting this position ought to know better. If this policy is adopted, once again the results will be that our children are given some instruction in the truth and some instruction in atheism.

The third alternative is, of course, the existing Christian Schools. I have no intention of going into this alternative in detail tonight. I presume that when the “need” for our schools was discussed, this matter was also discussed in some detail. And, as I hope to point out, the basis for a school of our own excludes, by definition, the existing schools even though they be “Christian.”

What is this unique basis upon which our schools are built and which makes them principally different from any other schools in the whole country? The point is, of course, that we want to teach our children the truth. A few remarks must be made about this. God is Himself the truth. He is the only truth that there is. This is fundamental. From this it follows that God’s revelation is the truth, for God’s revelation is that which God has Himself told us about Himself. He has told us about Himself—about His being, His glory, His works, His majesty and power, His excellent virtues. This is the truth.

It might be worth our while to notice in passing that this gives to us an objective standard of truth. This is worth emphasizing because this fundamental point is often contradicted today. In fact, more and more, in the pulpit, in the classroom, in the home, in society, men rebel against an objective standard of truth. They insist that truth is relevant; that truth is whatever a particular man wants to believe to be the truth; that whatever he may claim as truth is truth for him. And on this basis he is permitted to live his life. I hear even our own people sometimes talk here and there this kind of language. They say, e.g., that a man who believes the lie is nevertheless to be commended because, obviously, he is sincere, and we must admire his sincerity. As if to be sincerely wrong is some kind of Christian virtue.

No, rather we have an objective standard of truth. And this standard of truth is to be found in God’s revelation. We have the record of that revelation in the infallible Holy Scriptures; and we accept the Scriptures, therefore, as the written record of God’s Word concerning Himself which is the rule of faith and life. Concerning this revelation of God we must also add that it is to be found in both Scripture and in creation. (Let me remark parenthetically at this point that by “creation” I mean of course all God’s works in the world, including those works in the brute creation itself and God’s works in history. They are equally God’s works, for God is sovereign over all.) But just as soon as we say that God reveals Himself both in creation and in Scripture, we must hasten on to explain what this means lest there be some false ideas about this.

This does not mean that there are two separate revelations of God. The point is not that God speaks two kinds of language concerning Himself—one language to be found in the words of Scripture and the other to be found in the words of creation. Somewhere along the line we have gotten this all mixed up. But this is a sorry mistake nonetheless. In fact, I am inclined to think that current teaching with regard to the period theory based on the evidences of scientific investigation is precisely rooted in this error.

Nor do we mean that God gives two different revelations for two different kinds of people. Some want to hold on to this position. God speaks to His people in Scripture, and God speaks to the wicked in creation. This is not true either. Rather, it ought to be established that both Scripture and creation constitute one revelation of God. And the fundamental principle of unity is Jesus Christ. Both in Scripture and creation God reveals Himself through Jesus Christ. This has a couple of important implications.

First of all, this means that all revelation
of God is only for the people of God. There is no revelation in the truest sense of the Word to the wicked. I presume, now that I have said this, that this should have a little more explanation especially in the light of what Paul writes, e.g., in Romans 1. But I cannot go into this now. Let it simply be established that the true revelation of God which conveys the true knowledge of God is for the elect alone.

Secondly, that all revelation is only through Jesus Christ means that there is always the closest possible relationship between the revelation of God in the Bible and in creation. For several reasons (the chief of which is the horrible reality of sin and the curse) it is utterly impossible to see God in creation and know Him through creation without seeing Him and knowing Him first of all in Scripture. Calvin in his Institutes correctly calls the Scriptures the spectacles through which we must look to see God in the things that are made.

Now the schools have particularly to do with the revelation of God in creation. You can understand somewhat therefore the beautiful harmony that exists between the Church to which you belong and the schools to which you send your children. The Church is the means of grace where the revelation of God in Scripture is given to God's people. This is always first, and must always be first. But when this happens in the Church as it does in our Churches, then the school takes up what the Church has done and teaches to the seed of the covenant the revelation of God in creation. The Church puts on the spectacles. The school points to where the pupil ought to look in God's world to see God.

But the point which I must emphasize now is that every single subject in the curriculum is the revelation of the knowledge of God. There is no single exception to this rule. There cannot be. If we are engaged in a search for truth in the school, we are engaged in a search for the knowledge of God. It makes no difference whether we are studying history or hymnody, natural science or social science. What I have said must of necessity be true.

This does not mean that one can divorce the teaching in school from the Bible. Quite the contrary is true. While Scripture is not a textbook on zoology, botany, ethics or astronomy, it is nevertheless a book which contains the fundamental principles which are included in every one of these subjects. They are revelations of God to us only insofar as they take their starting point in the Scriptures and derive their fundamental principles from the Word of God.

This, at last, leads me to something which needs saying very badly.

You may have anticipated this already, and, indeed I hope you have.

There is, following from all I have said, an absolute antithesis between the truth and the lie. There is a certain school of thought (and this school of thought is to be found primarily among Reformed thinkers) which maintains that this is not true. This school maintains (and here again we are back to our old bug-a-boo) that there is a certain area of neutrality between the white of the truth and the black of the lie. The members of this school maintain that there is in the world a whole host of what they like to call "bare facts." These "bare facts" are, in themselves, neither truth nor lie, but somewhere in between.
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Or, as some others say, these “bare facts” are really truth, but a truth which the righteous and the wicked share together in common. It is easy to produce some examples. They are all the facts taught in the schools. That $2+2=4$ is such a fact. That Columbus discovered America in 1492 is another such fact. The law of gravitation is yet another. These bare facts (and myriads of others) are true for both believer and unbeliever. That $2+2=4$ is a fact which is not only true for a child of God, but it is also true for the wicked. The difference, so they claim, lies not in what a man says are the facts—all are agreed on this point. The difference rather lies in what one does with these facts which are common to all.

I want to protest against this idea as vehemently as it is possible. And I want to submit to you that if this is the case we have absolutely no business at all in building and operating a school of our own.

There is this absolute antithesis between the truth and the lie. The antithesis is total. So total in fact that when the believer says that $2+2=4$ he tells the truth; but when the unbeliever says this he lies with a lie from the bottom of hell.

I hope you understand this. The reason is clear enough it seems to me. The wicked takes this “fact” that $2+2=4$ and lies when he says it. He lies because he is divorcing this fact from God. He is using it to deny God. Consciously, purposely, deliberately, he is denying God when he says it. And that makes it a lie. Satan is speaking through him. It is a part of the plot of hell to overthrow God and to establish the kingdom of the devil. This is black, awful and utterly repulsive to us. Indeed when anyone who denies the truth in any of its parts says to his pupils “$2+2=4$” he is telling his pupils the most awful lie imaginable.

It is quite different in our schools. The child of God takes this “fact” in his hands with fear and trembling. He has something holy and pure that he has received. He possesses a gift of God. God is giving him a word through which God is telling this little insignificant speck of dust something about His own glorious and adorable being. He sees this, understands it, hears the Word of God and trembles in awe and reverence.

It is at this significant point that we part ways with all existing schools. And because this is so true, so awfully true, we had better get on with this business of doing it.

(to be continued, D.V.)

FROM Dort TO TODAY

A History of the Reformed Faith

The Protestant Reformed Churches

(22)

by REV. HERMAN HANKO

The country in which we live is called a Christian country. About 65% of the population belongs to some church while the remainder of the population has, at one time or another, been connected with the Church. There are many denominations in the country, some very large, numbering better than 10,000,000 members. There are others which are very small, not much larger than our own. Within this vast conglomeration of churches is found the Protestant Reformed Churches, a denomination which totals 19 congregations, 663 families, 2,906 members—if baptized mem-
bers are included. This is little more than a spot on the ecclesiastical map.

The question inevitably arises: What justification can a denomination of such smallness offer for its separate existence within the ecclesiastical world?

This is a question which needs answering from more than one point of view. It needs answering because the existence of the Protestant Reformed Churches must be justified in distinction from all the other denominations within the country—some of which are large and some small. It needs answering to explain why it exists separately from the Christian Reformed denomination from which it came out. It needs answering because there are those outside the denomination who cannot possibly imagine what business this little denomination has continuing its separate existence—especially when swift-moving ecumenical currents engulf many others. It needs answering because we who are members of this denomination need to know for ourselves why we continue when we are so small, and why we insist on continuing in the future.

In the final analysis the answer to this question is simply that we fervently and passionately believe that the truth which we confess is the truth of God’s Word. And this answer is made without apology and in the clear consciousness of the fact that there are many other denominations who claim the same thing. In making this answer, therefore, we insist without equivocation, that it can be clearly shown from Scripture itself to anyone who is willing to listen and will take the time to examine the matter honestly that this truth which we love and confess is the truth which God has revealed on the pages of Holy Writ.

And along with this assertion, we insist (and shall continue to insist) that it is our undisputed calling to preserve this truth with every means at our disposal as long as the Lord calls us to remain in the church militant.

God’s Word is the ultimate determining factor, the final standard, the most basic rule of our faith and life. Before it we must bow, and no one shall swerve us from this calling. All the other circumstances in the world cannot alter this.

But there is here another consideration. This consideration must not be divorced from our calling to submit without reservation to the Word of God. I am not going to say something which undermines what I have just said. It is a consideration which flows forth from the all-encompassing authority of God’s Word.

It can be conclusively shown (to our own personal satisfaction not only, but objectively as well) that the Protestant Reformed Churches stand in the line of the Reformed tradition. This Reformed tradition began with the Calvin Reformation. It continued through the Reformation in the Netherlands. It came over the sea to this country with our forbearers. It was preserved in this country through the history of the Christian Reformed Church and our own Churches since 1924 up to the present. Compare what we believe today with the teachings of Calvin. Weigh in the balances what we confess with what our fathers wrote down in the great creeds of the Post-Reformation times. Examine our faith in the light of the faith of our fathers. And the conclusion is absolutely inescapable: We confess what has always been Calvinistically, Confessionally and Historically Reformed.

This is not to say that the truth of Calvinism was not preserved in other denominations in other countries from the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands. There were Calvinists in France, in England, in Scotland, in Germany, and elsewhere. The Calvinism which came from these places to these shores was a thorough Calvinism which was represented also at Dordt and which put its stamp of approval on what Dordt decided. But this Calvinism, to a considerable degree, has been lost in one way or another as the Church has gone its dreary way through the decades of the history of the United States. Especially Arminianism has erased much of this Calvinism; while it was precisely this Arminianism which was condemned by all the Churches of the Calvin Reformation (not only in the Netherlands, but also in all the countries of the continent of Europe) now some 350 years ago.

And the point is that the reason why we exist separately as churches, why we shall insist on continuing this separate existence, why we shall, by God’s grace persevere in this confession which we make—the reason
is our calling to be faithful to "the faith of our fathers."

This is said without apology. Indeed we are small. And there is no point in trying to ignore the fact. But smallness is an insignificant price to pay in the fulfillment of such a noble and blessed calling.

This is said without a grain of pride, for it arises out of firm conviction. There is no reason for pride anyway when we know so well and experience each day anew that the reality of this preservation is caused by the power of God's mercy and grace.

But this conviction is necessary, for it hinges the well-being of our denomination.

When this is said, we have not ignored Scripture. No, the Reformed faith coming down to us along the lines of Dordt and 1924 is the truth of Scripture. We are saying that there is a tradition of the truth of Scripture handed down over the years by valiant defenders of the faith—a Scriptural tradition which has now been entrusted to our care by our fathers who preceded us to glory. In this tradition we stand. Nothing else really makes any difference.

In maintaining this, we are obligated to raise our voices loudly and clearly in defense of our position. We register our protest against the current deformation of Calvin's teachings. We complain that the decisions of Dordt have been ignored or effaced. We decline invitations to participate in movements of church union on the grounds that our heritage is sacrificed by these unions. We raise our voice in anguish and condemnation over the loud cries on every side that we must forget our past, "get with it," "go back to Dordt to change it" and make the gospel relevant to the needs of the 20th Century. We shout loudly that the creeds are ignored, contradicted, and bypassed in favor of something more palatable to a man who knows not what he wants and cares less. We cannot substitute the milk of God's Word for a tasteless and weak gruel.

This is our heritage; this is our calling. With showing this as it touches upon our existence today as Protestant Reformed Churches, we shall bring this series to its close.

"Lo, in the Gravey"

"Praise the Lord with harp; sing unto him with the psaltery and an instrument of ten strings. Sing unto him a new song; play skilfully with a loud noise." Psalm 33:2-3

It is a strange title, I suppose, for an article of this nature. Probably it is rather confusing too when first seen. It was to us too, first—but let me explain.

We have the practice of singing regularly a few songs with our children. The number of songs they know grows rapidly. And they have their favorites which they ask to sing. One evening the children wanted to sing, "Lo, in the Gravey." It took some time
and no little prompting to figure that one out. We recalled no such song. Then the light came: "Lo, in the Grave He lay," one song the children had learned in connection with the suffering and death of Christ.

The thought came: how little the children often grasp the meaning and significance of the words of songs they sing. That is not always true. The simple songs they readily can understand. But some appear to be more appealing to them because of the melody rather than the beauty of the words. By slurring together some of the words, they can make of the most beautiful of songs something which appears silly and humorous.

But children soon grow up and they learn more. Yet, are not young people (and older ones too) repeatedly guilty of a like carelessness in their singing? It is not very likely that we make such childish errors, but our "adult" errors are even more serious. We can easily forget the purpose and beauty of proper singing.

That can be done in singing songs which ought not to pass our lips. There are the common and "popular" songs of the world — the hit tunes of the day. Young people especially seem to enjoy listening to them — and singing along. With radio and television, the songs of this corrupt world can easily come blaring into the Christian home. And what a horrible clash that makes: when a home which is supposedly based upon the principles of the Word of God, admits the evil sounds of wicked men and finds joy therein!

But so often, when we sing the songs of Zion, we do no better than little children. Of course, many of us may be off-key (or lack one altogether) — but I am not thinking of this. Often we sing not at all. We make no attempt. Others must carry the burden — but we excuse ourselves. The songs of Zion, which ought to bubble up from the very depths of our hearts, seem not even to rise as high as our mouth. Sad case, isn't it?

Or we make the effort of moving our lips — but there is no life there. Were we singing solo, the words would be indistinguishable from a distance of more than two inches. Is it not strange that our mouth can so little express what supposedly fills the heart? You may smile at the silly errors of children — but this "error" is not so silly or humorous. A sorry commentary it is on our spiritual lives.

Or we can sing as though our lungs would burst — but we know not of what we sing. Have you ever heard it — in yourself? "The Lord's my Shepherd. I'll not want. He makes me down to lie. In pastures green He leadeth me. The quiet waters by." That does not completely make sense, does it? Still that is how we so very often sing. We can repeat phrases without any thought to the total thought-content. Can such singing possibly be pleasing before God?

Let's face facts. It is not easy for us to sing here on earth. The world of sin and evil intervenes. There is our own sinful flesh. The songs of Zion set us too much apart. We do not always want to be known as those who are separate. It becomes so easy to lose interest in the songs of Zion.

We confess that we seek that better and heavenly land — the spiritual Canaan. In that place of perfection we shall sing as we can never do now. It is impossible for us who live yet on earth to begin to imagine and describe the beauty of that heaven. It is impossible to set forth the beauty of the singing and of the songs sung. But a few things can be said. The subject matter of these songs will be concerned about God, His work with us, His glory and grace. There, we will not sing about anything else. Could you imagine that in heaven we will be singing even those "innocent" old-timers as. "I've been working on the rail-road," or "Cruising down the river, on a Sunday afternoon?" No; we will find full joy and satisfaction in songs which are concerned with our God alone.

And I can tell you a little about how we will sing too. We are perfect there. Our singing will be perfectly in tune. There will be a beautiful harmony — harmony such as we can not begin to hear on this earth now. Nor will anything interfere with our singing. We shall do all our part fully. No more mumbling of words. No more unmoving lips. No more excuses. But what fills our hearts will find perfect expression through our resurrection bodies. How beautiful that must be!

There will we sing all the time. Not, I think, in the sense that we continually, night and day, stand in a group, a chorus,
singing songs. But the songs of our God will so fill our being that whatever we do there, it will be as though we will be filled with singing. Now we get a little bit of that feeling. I believe, when we may hear a wonderful choir singing in a gloriously majestic way. Something seems to fill us, to move us, so that we sit spell-bound before them. And within us arises as it were a desire, a longing, if only we could, to raise our voice in harmony with those who sing so beautifully before us. Did you ever have that feeling? A little foretaste it is of that perfect and eternal singing of the saints in glory—in whatever they do.

But why can that not be seen more, though in beginning, right now? What excuse, really good excuse, do we have for improper singing now? Why are we so often lethargic?

The faithful child of God, by grace, must seek to sing as God requires. How often does not the Psalmist speak of singing—and that too, with a full heart? We actively seek to sing that way too. That requires faithful effort. We prepare ourselves for song. We sit or stand properly. We take firm hold of the songbook. We consider the words before us. Ought they be sung slowly? Quietly? Or is more volume required? What does the song declare? When we know what the song says, we have gone a long way towards singing it correctly. We put into our singing all that we have—little though that might be.

We ought to sing more. Most of us fail in that respect. In our gatherings, private gatherings at home, do we sing? When our children sit about our feet, do we sing together? Singing is not only for church or for school—but singing too begins in the home.

Before long, it would be said: those people can really sing. Others notice that too. One can not hide the bubbling, singing heart. And then we can give a ready and correct explanation to our singing: we have something really wonderful to sing about! We confess the glorious sovereignty of our God! We declare the freeness of His grace towards His people for Jesus' sake. We acknowledge the wonder of His love directed toward His church—a people who deserved absolutely nothing of His hand. He loved us and gave His Son to be propitiation for our sins. Do you wonder, then, why we sing? Do you wonder, then, why not one of us can refuse to sing? We have something to sing about—to the eternal praise of our God!
fell, God provided a Saviour for some of the human race. Does this, then, make Him a respecter of persons? If He were a respecter of persons, would He not have saved the angels and reprobated man? Then there is the Jewish nation. God chose it to be the repository for the oracles of God. Why? for they were a people stiffnecked, murmuring, complaining, rebellious, inconstant, stubborn. A respecter of persons never would have settled on the Jews for such an honor. Election makes God a respecter of persons? Then why did He choose “the poor of this world” (Jas. 2:5)? Had He respect to the rich, how many of us would be saved? Not many magnates, not many millionaires, not many of royalty, not many of the gifted, the influential are chosen. But God has chosen the weak, the base, the despised, the nothing, the no-bodies of the world. He rejects publicans and chooses harlots. Why? That “no flesh should glory in His presence.” If He were a respecter of persons He would never have chosen any such off-scourings of humanity.

But not by force of argument does one come to believe the doctrine of election. “The reason why any one believes in election is that he finds it in the Bible. No man could ever imagine such a doctrine—for it is, in itself, contrary to the thoughts and wishes of the human heart. Everyone, at first, opposes the doctrine, and it is only after many struggles, under the working of the Spirit of God, that we are made to receive it. A perfect acquiescence in this doctrine—an absolute lying still, in adoring wonder, at the footstool of God’s sovereignty, is the last attainment of the sanctified soul in this life—as it is the beginning of heaven.

“The reason why anyone believes in election is just this, and only this—that God has made it known. Had the Bible been a counterfeit it never could have contained the doctrine of election, for men are too averse to such a thought to give it expression much more to give it prominence.

“The Bible not only teaches the doctrine, but makes it prominent—so prominent that you can only get rid of election by getting rid of the Bible.” (Dr. Geo. S. Bishop, The Doctrines of Grace, chap. 11, The Doctrine of Election True, p. 167).

Election is solely an act of God. For He made His decree of election from the beginning of the ages (Acts 15:18) of eternity. God is the chooser. His people are the chosen. Once in a while we hear that ridiculous Negro theology which has it that God votes for you, the devil against you, but you must cast the deciding vote. Scripture knows nothing of this. But far rather, “Ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you . . .” (Jn. 15:16). The truth is that “God hath from the beginning chosen you” (II Thes. 2:13). Therefore it is called “election of God” (1 Thes. 1:4), and the persons chosen are called “God’s own elect” (Lk. 18:7). The elect does become a chooser, but only after God has chosen him. We choose Him because He first chose us. “Mary hath chosen that good part.”

Election is absolute. It is entirely free, independent of everything outside of Himself. Why did He write some names in the Book of Life, and refuse to include others in that register? Paul says it was good pleasure of His will (Eph. 1:4, 5). Why does God save some and condemn others? because some believed and some believed not (Ac. 28:24; Jn. 3:18). Why do some believe? because they were ordained to eternal life (Ac. 13:48). Why do some believe not? because they are not Christ’s sheep (Jn. 10:26) and because they could not believe because God sovereignly hardens them (12:39f). Why did God decree to choose some and to reject others? There is no other answer but that of His sovereign good pleasure.

It is immutable because founded on nothing in man, but on Himself. His decree is before all things, before His so called foresight. God does not decree because He foresees. He can only foresee and foreknow what He has decreed. There is nothing else to foreknow. He cannot possibly foresee something not ordained in His decree. Whatever He foresees is certain. God cannot foresee an uncertainty. Therefore, if He foresees anything, it is certain, and certain because He decreed it. So His purpose according to election stands.

That purpose, to have an elect people, was prior to His consideration of anything relative to sin. God viewed His people first of all as perfect and glorified in Christ, and therefore as vessels unto honor, made so from an unfallen lump. In this view, election is first and primary. Everything else,
including the fall and reprobation, is subservient to it. The end does not serve the means, but the means serve the end. This is the supralapsarian view of election, which holds that the decree of predestination, in the order of the decrees, is above, beyond and preceding all the other elements in the divine system of redemption. The view which puts election after the fall, and so with a view to the fall, is called the infralapsarian view. Accordingly, total depravity is made the basis of election. That is, God elects a people for Himself out of the total mass of fallen humanity. Infralapsarians were known as Low Calvinists and supralapsarians as high Calvinists.

Although he does not enter into the supra-infra issue, J. H. Thornwell in his "Election and Reprobation" nevertheless slashes at the supra view, calling it an "extreme of squirmish timidity" (p. 4). He also accuses the supra view relative to the decrees of God as amounting "to a downright denial of their certainty and sovereignty" (ibid.), and as "no more to be regarded as the genuine doctrines of Calvinistic churches" (p. 8). These remarks are not exactly in harmony with the history of the Reformed and Calvinistic churches. For, although the Canons of Dort, for example, and certain expressions in the Westminster Confession, are infralapsarian, there never was a formal, synodical condemnation of supralapsarianism. Supra men were always accepted as Reformed and always found a place in the church. There is no credal repudiation of supralapsarianism. In the Reformed and Calvinistic creeds which are admittedly and definitely infra, the matter of infra was not made binding, not at least in the sense that it is the only view of predestination to be maintained, and that to the exclusion of supralapsarianism. Toplady tells us that the Church of England's Thirty-nine Articles are, strictly speaking, infra, "though with such moderation as not to exclude the" supra view. The supra-infra question was never resolved at any point in the history of the Reformed and Calvinistic churches. Neither does it seem likely nor desirable that it ever be. Then infralapsarians may not debar the supra man on any appeal to the confessions. Besides all this, history reveals that supralapsarians were nothing like Mr. Timorous, Little-faith, Faint-heart, Mr. Feeble-mind, or Mr. Ready-to-halt. They were lion-hearted men, like Great-heart and Valiant-for-truth. Then it is absurd to regard the views held by such men as Gomarus, Vossius, Beza, Twisse, John Gill, Thomas Goodwin and Arthur W. Pink as "squirmish timidity."

The infra view might seem to be the easier to maintain, because we perhaps most often think of our redemption from the point of view of our sin, misery and lost condition. It is a little more difficult to think of the original glory, perfection and excellency of the Church of Christ as comprehended in the eternal thought and counsel of God. But it will be found to be the presentation of Scripture that God conceived of His people in a super-creation union with Christ prior to their creature-union with Adam. God had blessed all His people with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ before the creation of the universe, and so before they fell in Adam and under the curse.

In the decree of election, we are to distinguish what is God's purpose as to the end He has in mind, and what His purpose is as to the means to attain that end. The end God planned was to glorify His Son with the gift of a people, and that for the praise of the glory of His grace. The means by which His eternal purpose is put into execution and brought to fulfillment are also ordained from the beginning. We are to determine then what in the decree is end and what are means. The end concerns the glorification of a people in their elect Head. The means include the purpose to create those people, ordain their fall, recover them from it via redemption and sanctification. The end and the means are not two separate determinations, but two parts of the one eternal purpose.

The end in mind is naturally first before the determination of the means, so that "what is first in intention is last in execution." The converse is also true: "The last thing in execution is the first thing in purpose." The glory of God is that "chief end," that "chief and only good" which He always keeps in view. He works all things to that end, so that it is the last thing in execution; but it also follows that it was always first in His intention. Wherefore God's purpose beholds His glory revealed in Christ and His church, with the church
viewed as yet neither created nor fallen, since the creation and the fall belong to God's counsel concerning the means. It is the infra view which tends to deny the "certainty and sovereignty" of the decree of God, for it is on that score difficult to see clearly any purpose of God. For if God first determined to create men, then permitted their fall, then out of the fallen mass to choose some to glory, did He not purpose to do all this without any end in view? This conception of the decrees leaves God with less wisdom than man, who first determines his purpose and end, say in making a journey, and then decides the ways and means to realize his end. How else, even for a moment, could God determine and act?

This distinction of God's purpose and God's means (to secure His purpose) is supported by the Word of God. We read, "For it became Him, for whom are all things and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings" (Heb. 2:10). The decree of His purpose is first in that God ordained many sons unto glory. Next is His decree of the means in which He ordained that the Captain of our salvation be made perfect through sufferings. So it was with Christ in the decree. There He stands at its head, first. "The Lord said unto My Lord, 'Sit Thou at My right hand'" (Ps. 110:1). It was God's purpose to exalt the Mediator to the place of highest dominion. Yet in order to that intention, it was ordained that "He shall drink of the brook in the way" (v. 7). Christ's main purpose was indeed to drink of the fulness of the pleasures which are at God's right hand forevermore, but the way He would take to that end would be to drink the bitter, black, Kedronic waters of woe and anguish. So His people were destined to Canaan, but the wilderness was also appointed as the way through which they were to attain to that higher ground.

(To be continued, D.V.)

CRITIQUE

Hilda G. Meekler

"SALVATION ON THE CAMPUS"

"Tom looked like a bum when he came home for Christmas. His clothes were filthy; he was wearing a mandarin beard and his hair hadn't been cut since September."

The above title and paragraph are quoted from an article from Harper's magazine, written by J. Glenn Gray. Mr. Gray is a professor at Colorado College and in his article discusses the searching of college students for the purpose of their existence.

The story of Tom is a familiar tale in newspapers, articles, and magazines about groups of students in various parts of the country and on several campuses of American colleges and universities. Tom and those like him are superior students who have hitherto seemed anything but heathen. For years their parents have let them steer their own courses and supported them financially at some sacrifice. What, then, are they rebelling against? Is this merely a ludicrous episode in their development or a sign of severe disorder? Their parents don't know.
Nor can professors and university administrators shed much light on the moods and motivations of students in the sixties. They have been baffled by the rioting at Berkeley last fall and other less publicized incidents elsewhere.

If a Tom had come home for Christmas 25 years ago in the same condition, his parents probably would have committed him to a different sort of institution. What lies behind this change?

For one thing, today's student is more affluent, more comfortably housed, and better equipped with the materials of scholarship than he was 25 years ago. But his college life is also more impersonal and competitive, and less humane. It is harder for him to know his professors, the administration, or even his all too numerous fellow students. The student of today has become one of the crowd.

If he has reached the age of reflection, today's student is seeking above all to differentiate himself from the crowd. Twenty-five years ago it was distinctive merely to be a college man. Now he must struggle to be more than a grade-point average, an anonymous statistic with a college and home address. Often he expresses this yearning for uniqueness in ways that parents, administrators, professors, and other outsiders consider illegitimate. Well publicized are the bearded, sloppily dressed students, defiant of even minimal administrative regulations, studious enough, but incontinent in their demands for alcoholic and sexual freedoms, fiercely insistent on leading their own lives.

The desire for self-definition goes hand in hand with an inner need for a compelling authority to make freedom meaningful. In the thirties, economic pressures for existence rescued from this dilemma. In the forties there was the war, and afterward, the threat of the Bomb to distract attention from inner conflicts. For some students in the sixties the civil-rights struggle has become a Cause, but has not reached the impact of the thirties or forties.

Lacking an embracing cause and a fervent ideology, the student's search for a durable purpose is likely to become aggressive, extremist, at times despairing. Paradoxical as it sounds, the real problem of the college youth is to discover some authority, both private and public, that will make possible authentic individuality.

How then do these students of today seek their so called "salvation"? They have resorted to what is known as Existentialism. The Existentialist says, since God does not exist, there is no purpose, logic, or plan in the universe. There is no essential human nature common to man. Thus each individual creates his own essence or character in time by his own choice of interests and actions.

In colleges all over America, courses dealing with Existentialism are currently very popular. Thousands of paperbacks on Existentialism are being sold from the newstand. Numerous books are being translated from German and French Existentialists.

Why this sudden emphasis? Simply because Existentialism appeals to the situation. Its deepest conviction is that through his choices each individual makes himself. According to this metaphysical concept everyone determines his own course. He can choose to lead an authentic existence or choose to be lost in the crowd. Existentialists are against group activities. To them "existence" literally means to "stand out from."

Even the so called worldly men of today doubt that Existentialism can ultimately satisfy the search for authority. The professors of the leading universities today claim that we must find a way to help these poor lost souls who are trying so hard to discover and know themselves. The world is changing too fast they say and because of this incredible pace, it is a wonder that so many are sane and resilient.

So the modern professors send out a plea to all mankind—a plea for help. Experienced professors must provide patient listening and attention to these students who are tomorrow's citizens. Because professors are busy with research, government contracts, and sabbatical travel, there has developed a rift between the generations and at the same time increases the sense of impersonality, discontinuity, and absence of community that makes college life less satisfying than it used to be.

Nowadays nearly everyone looks to education for salvation as once they looked to religion or to a political ideology. To succeed in building the great society one must first resolve the doubt and bafflement about
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the validity and worth of that society and its existence.

Many of the harassed young men and women at schools today have not yet decided what sense, if any, their existence has.

It is not difficult for the Christian to see the wicked errors in not only the plight of the poor student of the world but also in the remedy put forth by students and professors. In this we see another sign of the times for which we are commanded to watch and be not deceived.

The worldly man vainly seeks to find his answer here below. It is good that we may know that no answer or satisfaction can ever be found aside from God. We do not need to find a way out of a dilemma. We belong to God and thus all satisfaction and peace are in Him.

But there is more of a lesson to us than merely recognizing that the wicked hate God. As the wicked young person denies a decreed purpose for his existence, we sometimes too forget that God decrees and controls the lives of each of His creatures. We only too often want to help God a little bit by adding some of our own works to faith. Or we often pray for God’s will to be done and under our breath whisper our own wants and wills. Or we often complain because things don’t seem to be going our way.

Only through faith can we recognize not only the workers of iniquity but we can only then recognize our own weakness and sin.

But we know too that our sins are forgiven us in Christ Jesus and then we may prayerfully sing:

Ere into being I was brought
Thy eye did see, and in Thy thought
My life in all its perfect plan
Was ordered ere my days began.

Search me, O God, my heart discern,
Try me, my inmost thoughts to learn;
And lead me if in sin I stray,
To choose the everlasting way.

---

HELPS FOR BIBLE STUDY ON THE

by REV. G. LUBBERS

DAVID ENGELSMA

(Book of GENESIS)

(continued from Sept.)

c. He keeps the faith. He is faithful in performing his new responsibilities as sent here by God. Two sons are born to him. The first Manasseh, which means “causing to forget”, expressing that he could now forget the sting of being sold as a slave, since God was with him even here in Egypt. The second, Ephraim, means “double fruitfulness”, expressing hope for the realization of God’s covenant in the line of his generations, even though temporarily separated from the covenant family. What a marvelous power of faith in the land of his affliction!

Genesis 42

THE FIRST MEETING OF JOSEPH AND HIS BROTHERS

I. The Occasion.

A. The historical events that lead up to this confrontation.

1. Beginning with the determination of the brothers to slay Joseph (Gen. 37:19,20), note all the events that work together to effect this meeting, particularly the events that account for:

a. Joseph’s being in Egypt.

b. Joseph’s being “governor” (Gen. 42:6) over Egypt.

c. Joseph’s brothers coming down to Egypt (Gen. 41:56,57; 42:5).
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2. Is not the history that culminates in this meeting full of seemingly accidental happenings? Does not Scripture itself indicate that, apart from the viewpoint of Divine revelation, an observer of this history would conclude that it could just as well have happened that this meeting never took place?
   a. The Midianite-Ishmaelite company comes by just when Joseph is in the pit.
   b. Joseph “happens” to be bought by a high-ranking Egyptian, who has access to the king’s prison where Joseph can make contact with the Pharaoh’s butler. (cf. Gen. 39:1,20).
   c. The Pharaoh “happens” to become disgusted with his butler while Joseph is in prison so that, through the butler, Pharaoh becomes aware of Joseph and his gift of interpreting dreams.

B. The absolute control, in all of this, of God’s providence.
1. One of the most, if not the most striking and important truth in the whole account of Joseph is that of God’s providence.
   a. What is the literal meaning of the word, providence?
   b. What does genuinely Reformed theology mean with the term? (cf. Heidelberg Catechism, Lord’s Days IX, X and Belgic Confession, Art. XIII)
   c. According to Scripture as summed up in the Heidelberg Catechism, Lord’s Day X, what are the two elements of God’s providence? (cf. Hebrews 1:3 and Isaiah 45:7)

2. God’s providential control over the entire matter of the meeting of Joseph, as governor of Egypt, with his brothers, including all the events leading up to this meeting.
   a. Are we to conceive of God’s control in this matter as does the philosopher (William James, The Dilemma of Determinism) so that God is the expert chess player, who at the very beginning is determined to win, that is, bring Joseph into Egypt and achieve a meeting of Joseph with his brothers, but who does not know (much less, determine!) what moves the other chess players, namely, Joseph’s brothers, Potiphar, Potiphar’s wife, etc., will make so that God’s “moves” are dependent upon those of men; however, since God is superior in wisdom and might, He can still achieve His purpose?
   b. Are we to explain God’s control as consisting of His knowing beforehand what will take place, so that God is able to react, at the proper time, in such a way as will accomplish His desire?
   c. In either of the theories above, is God really in control, that is, really God?
   d. Whose hand (will and power) controlled the Devil as Satan worked in the hearts of the brothers to sell Joseph? brought the merchants to the pit? moved Potiphar to buy Joseph? withheld the rain in Canaan to cause a famine?

3. God’s purpose with the meeting of Joseph, as governor of Egypt, with the brothers.
   a. Did God purpose to bring Jacob and the whole Old Testament Church into Egypt? Did God decide this before or after the Church actually went into Egypt, that is, was God dependent upon circumstances (making the best out of a bad thing) or were the circumstances dependent upon God’s will (using also bad things for His good purpose)? (cf. Gen. 15:13-16)
   b. Is there a deeper purpose of God in making Joseph ruler in Egypt and in the subsequent immigration of the Church into Egypt than the physical relief of the Church during the famine?

4. Apply the teaching of the Heid. Cat., Lord’s Days IX and X, regarding God’s providence to the event of the famine (Gen. 41:54, 56; Gen. 42:5).
   a. What purpose does God’s providence serve, always, as far as “we,” God’s people are concerned?
   b. Take note of and discuss the following in connection with God’s making the evil (famine) turn out for Jacob’s and the Church’s advantage:
      1) A fierce evil is imposed upon “the face of the earth” in order to achieve the welfare of only a handful of the sufferers.
      2) In what respects God made the famine turn out for the Church’s advantage.

(to be continued)
News from, for, and about our churches

KARLENE OOMKES

Rev. J. Kortering declined the call extended him from Randolph, Wisconsin.

Rev. B. Woudenberg received the call from our congregation in Lynden, Washington.

On October 1, Robert Decker was ordained into the ministry at a special service in Doon, Iowa. Professor H. C. Hoeksema and Rev. J. Kortering officiated at this service. Rev. Decker preached his inaugural sermon on the following Sunday. The congregation of Doon held a reception for their new pastor and his family on October 8.

Rev. G. VanBaren was installed as pastor of First Church in the morning service of October 3 and preached his inaugural sermon that Sunday evening. Rev. M. Schipper, the moderator of First Church during its vacancy, conducted the installation service. Rev. Van Baren and his family were welcomed by the congregation at a reception on October 6.

Future Conventioners:
- A daughter, Denise Ruth, born to Mr. and Mrs. Richard Moore (First).
- A daughter, Ellen Beth, born to Rev. and Mrs. J. Kortering (Hull).
- A son born to Rev. and Mrs. D. J. Engelsma (Loveland).
- A daughter born to Mr. and Mrs. Roger King (Hope).
- A son born to Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Kamps (Hope).
- A daughter born to Mr. and Mrs. Peter Poortenga, Jr. (South Holland).

Congratulations to
- Marcella Vander Zee and Henry Lenting (South Holland) who were united in marriage on September 24; Mr. P. Minnema (First) who celebrated his 81st birthday on September 26; and Len Somers and Carol Van Putten who spoke the marriage vows on October 16.

Concerning Our Servicemen:
- Robert Ekema (Redlands) was scheduled to be transferred to Vietnam during October.
- We have received the address of Ken Haak (Oaklawn) who is presently stationed in Vietnam. It is as follows:
  - H.H.O. 4th TC (TA)
  - A.P.O. 96307
- San Francisco, California
- Andy Brummel (Hull) left for the service on October 13.

Membership Changes:
- Hope welcomed Mr. Marcellis Korsten from the Walker Christian Reformed Church. Gerald VandenBerg recently transferred from Oaklawn to Holland; and Southeast welcomed Mr. and Mrs. Peter Faber and Professor and Mrs. H. C. Hoeksema into their midst from First Church.

Items of General Interest:
- The Western Ladies’ League Meeting was held October 8, in Edgerton. Rev. Decker spoke on “Prophecy of Scripture.”
- On September 23, Professor H. Hanko lectured on the subject: “Protestant Reformed Education, A Unique Enterprise” in Hope Church. The lecture was sponsored by the Protestant Reformed High School Circle.
- The Sunday School Teachers Mass Meeting was held October 1 in Hudsonville. Professor H. Hanko was the speaker.
- The young people of Hull held a farewell social for Andy and Pete Brummel who were expected to leave for the Armed Forces in the near future.
- Professor H. Hanko addressed the P.T.A. of Hope School at their October meeting on the subject: “Teaching Our Children to Pray.”
- The Northwest Iowa School Society spon-
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Attention

The Editor

It happened again. I am very sorry, and I will try not to let it happen again.

H. C. Hooestema
This issue was written by Mrs. H. C. Hooestema. It includes all the other poems, essays, and articles in this issue.

Interview of Dr. School Societies was written by Mr. School Societies. It includes all the other poems, essays, and articles in this issue.
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September 14 at the age of 68 years

Mme. H. Regan (South Holland) on
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Secundy made confession of faith.

Hymn "Hymnura," by J. H. Hooestema

MISSION WORK, Past, Present and Future
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Professor H. C. Hooestema, addressed the

problems in application. He spoke on the subject:

The meeting was held in Hope Church on October 17. The

preached a public lecture on September 29.