

Clarion

THE CANADIAN REFORMED MAGAZINE

Volume 25 - No. 3

February 7, 1976



Work and Legislation

When Mr. Trudeau announced the wage- and price-controls, he upset quite a few people. It seems even that he left no group of the population untouched with his plans. The strongest reaction came from the labour unions, which claimed that this meant the end to collective bargaining and that such a control would render real negotiations useless, since the workers could do all they wanted and strike for as long as they wished only to see the fruit of their sacrifices going to waste when an anti-inflation board would order a roll-back of the wages they had succeeded in prying loose from the employers at the cost of weeks and perhaps even months of walking the picket line. "Labour" would oppose and fight these controls, we were told in the strongest terms.

More moderate elements and people with a greater feeling of responsibility, we hope, stated that, once the proposed legislation had been passed, it was the obligation of every citizen to obey the law and to abide by it.

It is a strange thing: According to our prime minister, the free enterprise system did not work; but the various laws that are passed by which other laws are, in fact, put out of commission, prove that the control of society does not work. The "Wirtschaftswunder" of the West-German republic after the second world war was certainly not caused by strict and rigid controls but by what is now so maligned: free enterprise.

Last year Ontario teachers received the right to strike. This year they used that right and they used it extensively: in Toronto, highschool teachers went on strike on November 12 of last year and they were not planning to return until they had achieved their goal: a 43.9% wage increase. One of the commentators whom I heard on this topic sneered, "What Canadian with minimum qualifications makes \$12,000 a year?" That's what the starting salary of a highschool teacher would have been if the teachers had achieved their goal.

That they did not achieve their goal was the result of legislation: they were legislated back to work. The provincial legislature was recalled to deal with the issue. It could no longer be tolerated that 140,000 students of the 135 schools that were closed as a result of the strike were deprived of the so necessary instruction. The apparent desire of some of the members of parliament to let the strike last until a settlement was negotiated, was not fulfilled: legislation was proposed and passed.

There seem to have been some that said, "Let the teachers strike until they are forced to come to a settlement by means of negotiations; they are out without a strike fund and one day they will have to come to terms." But they were ignored: it was deemed necessary to pass the back-to-work legislation.

What is the sense of giving the right to strike when that very same right is undone by means of a back-to-work legislation? And is it not time that the very fact that it is deemed necessary to legislate people back to work starts to convince the people that there is something

wrong with the laws that do give the right to strike in the form in which it is practised?

I deem it to be totally wrong to legislate people back to work. When you have given the right to strike, then you should honour the laws by which that right has been given and then you should not take it away with the other hand by forcing the workers to go back without knowing what the result of arbitration will be.

But the serious question should be considered in all its impact and reach: "Was the original legislation right?" And that's where the change of heart should begin.

It is very easy for a provincial or a federal government to enact legislation by which people are forced to go back to work. But I can well understand it when such action creates bitterness and a desire to get even at one time or another. The legislation which the NDP government in British Columbia used to get the thousands of workers out on strike back to work will have been one of the main reasons why Mr. Barrett was defeated in the last election there. "Of a Social Credit government you could expect that, but the NDP is just as bad". That was the reaction of numerous voters.

The Toronto highschool teachers are back to work. Arbitration will decide the outcome of their whole "struggle". They have been warned that any "work-to-rule" action will be regarded as if they were again on strike. They had better behave! That is the message. But nothing has been solved. There will be no "professional development days" for the remainder of the year: all available days will have to be used for teaching. But the bitterness has not been taken away. "First we get the right to strike; then, when we use that right, we are ordered back to work!"

Right they are.

And wrong.

The whole labour-legislation should be overhauled.

If anyone does not wish to work without a contract and wishes to "go on strike", that is: quit working for that boss until and unless a new contract is signed, that's all right.

If a teacher does not wish to teach without a satisfactory contract, that is understandable and no one should compel him to do so. He is free to work or not to work. The same applies to a carpenter and a plumber and a bricklayer and whatever other tradesmen there may be.

But what should not be allowed is the picketing of enterprises and places of business, the choking off of lines of supply and of the finished products to the distributors.

The basic evil is not to be sought with those who use their right to strike as it has been granted them by the law; the basic evil lies with these laws themselves and with the powerful position which the labour unions have acquired in the course of the last few decades. When a government enacts back-to-work legislation, it does not place justice over against injustice and abuse, but then it simply places power over against power.

However, that will work only for a limited time.

No government has the right to order someone back to work. Who gives the government the right to order a teacher back to work because he is a teacher and a carpenter to go and build houses because he is a carpenter? That right is there only if someone does not honour the contract which is in force and stays away contrary to the agreement which he made with his employer. Then the "sword" of the magistrate should be put into action to promote fidelity and to compel people to fulfil their obligations. But if there is no contract, then no one has the right to tell someone to go and work at that specific place. As, on the other hand, no one should prevent the employer from hiring others who are willing to work on the conditions which the previous employees rejected. If there is no contract, both parties are free and this total freedom should be recognized! But then a freedom into all directions; then not just a freedom of the employees but also of the employer: freedom to stay away from the job

because one does not wish to work there on those conditions and without a contract; but also freedom to hire such workers as are willing to be employed on the conditions which are in force or which the employer would be willing to accept. Both employer and (new) employees should then fully enjoy the protection of the law.

The back-to-work legislation proves the failure of the laws by which the right to strike is acknowledged, the right to strike as it is being exercised by the labour unions.

And if the anti-inflation legislation renders lengthy strikes useless and practically undermines the bargaining position of the labour unions, then this proves that that bargaining position has gotten out of hand and that that system simply does not work.

In so far we are thankful both for anti-inflation measures and for the ordering back to work of those whose egotism jeopardizes the wellbeing of our country and the health of our economy.

vO

Drama and These Modern Days¹

Fourth in a series of five, including: Drama and Preaching, Drama and Church, Drama and School, Drama and these Modern Days, Drama and Holy Scripture.

TEACHER-CENTRED

After the disappearance of schooldrama in the 16th century, the well-known Friedrich Wilhelm August Fröbel (1782-1852) was the first one to make a plea for its re-introduction. However, Fröbel's words fell on deaf ears as a result of the general acceptance of Johann Friedrich Herbart's system, which was "teacher-centred", and intellectualistic, and consequently did not allow any space for the child's independent and spontaneous actions, e.g. in its playing.¹

CHILD-CENTRED

But since the nineties of the 19th century there has been a renewal-movement. Rationalism and intellectualism were more and more replaced by an irrationalism that expresses itself in pragmatism, a life-philosophy, and existentialism.² This pragmatism includes experimentalism: the child has to find things out for itself and all by itself, and should no longer be taught to accept things upon the authority of the teacher or others. The life-philosophy of Henry Bergson and Eduard Spranger puts strong emphasis on man's life and inner experiences. The child's activities are used as special creative powers. Existentialism teaches that there is only one thing important in life, and that is: me! Man is completely free and autarkic. He makes and determines himself. Consequently a fixed educational purpose and specification of methods of acting are impossibilities. All this served the promotion of free expression and playing.

The development in the field of child-psychology was another factor that cooperated³: a child is more than only receptive-passive-reproductive, it is also actively-creative. Attention was given not only to the developing of the child's knowledge but also to its feelings, ambitions, and aspirations.

SCHOOL DRAMA

After the fifties of this century, schooldrama began to flourish again.⁴ The pedagogic-didactic application of a child's play was generally recommended in Germany, England, and The Netherlands. The following aspects were propagated:

Playing enables the individual and groups to develop themselves.

It promotes man's development in every age group and is as such propaedeutic and therapeutic.

As a method of teaching it includes possibilities of all-round development because it is an innerly experienced and animated form of activity.

It can be applied to several disciplines and in different areas of life.

It is a form of activity that rests upon the principles of finding out by oneself, of free discussion, of self-expression in an atmosphere of freedom.⁵

RELIGIOUS DRAMA

All this was also applied in the field of religious education. However, - and this is of great significance - the efforts to renew school education in general were not the only factors of influence. There was also the re-orientation in theology, in particular the crisis with respect to the authority of the Holy Scriptures, and the "ecumenical" co-operation in general and with respect to the renewal of methods of religious education in particular.⁶

The whole of the renewal in the field of religious education is actually a matter of influences from the side of theologians, psychologists, sociologists, and pedagogues going hand in hand. This combination is a matter of course.⁷

MOTIVES

It may be clear that the motives of these renewers in re-introducing "religious schooldrama" differ widely from those of the Middle Ages.

1. They were predominantly of a pedagogic-didactic character, a matter of learning by seeing and doing.⁸
2. There was also another aspect, that of evangelizing in a secularized world. It is no wonder that many supporters of this movement were found among those engaged in Sunday School activities - in particular among the Methodists - and teaching Religious Education at the public schools in England.⁹
It may quite well be that those who took the initiative in the re-introduction of drama at Christian schools were not fully aware of this background and did not ask themselves the question whether all the experiments undertaken at the Sunday Schools and "Scripture" at public schools would fit in the curriculum of a Christian school - even apart from the main-question whether sacred history can be enacted.
3. A third motive was that one wanted to do something for the church people, in particular for the young members of the churches. Consequently this movement became at the same time a movement for liturgy renewal.¹⁰

GOLDMAN

As for the application of the principles of the school-educational renewal movement to "religious education", the name of Ronald J. Goldman must be mentioned. He wrote two books, *Religious Thinking from Childhood to Adolescence* (1964), and *Readiness for Religion* (1965). His first book is mainly a reproduction of the results of some research work undertaken by him. His main question was whether the existing syllabuses for "Religious Education" used at the English schools were really effective, that is, how far the youngsters who attended these lessons could understand them. He himself called it a "test of religious thinking". What concepts do the children have of the Bible, of the Divine, of God's activity in the natural world - a phrase that in Goldman's way of thinking replaces the

biblical term "miracles"-, of God's holiness, His concern for man, of Jesus and the problem of evil, of prayer, of the Church, etcetera? The outcome of his investigations was very negative, the level of understanding deeply disappointing. Consequently his second book contains a program that is intended to replace the existing syllabuses.

But before we are going to have a look at his program - that is to say, to the general idea, because this is sufficient to serve the purposes of these articles - we first quote some preliminary remarks which in fact repeat the conclusions of his research work. Speaking about these results he says:

What it reveals is that the Bible is not a children's book, that the teaching of large areas of it may do more damage than good to a child's religious understanding and that too much biblical material is used too soon and too frequently. What it also confirms is that the contents and methods used in religious education are out of step with educational practices in other subjects.¹¹

Further:

I suggest that it is an impossible task to teach the Bible as such to children much before adolescence, and that we must look for another approach which offers a more realistic alternative to our present ills.¹²

And also this:

The major finding supports the move from a Bible-centred content of religious education to a content which more closely approximates to the real world of children, using their experiences and their natural development rather than imposing an adult form of religious ideas and languages upon them.¹³

Since the writings of Goldman have been very influential in the field of "religious education", we have to go a bit deeper into this material.

G. VAN RONGEN

(To be continued)

¹Z. Rittersma, op. cit., pages 67, 79, and 83. — ²Same, page 79, from which we derived most of the information given in this paragraph. — ³Same, page 80. — ⁴Same, page 95. — ⁵Same, page 99. — ⁶Same, pages 100 and 103. — ⁷Same, pages 99-100. — ⁸Same, page 106. — ⁹Same, pages 100, 104. — ¹⁰Same, page 104. — ¹¹R.J. Goldman, *Readiness for Religion*, page 7. — ¹²Same, page 8. — ¹³Same, page 9.

Again: A Communist Behind Every Tree?

After having mailed the article "A Communist Behind Every Tree?" (see Jan. 24 issue), I found the following quote from LENIN, written in 1923, in *De Reformatie*:

PROPHETIC WORDS OF LENIN SPOKEN IN 1923

First we will try to get Eastern Europe in our hands; then the masses of Asia, and finally shall we encircle the United States, the last bastion of capitalism. We shall not need to fight for it for it will fall into our hands as an over-ripe fruit. We must secure the cooperation of teachers and professors in schools and universities, of light-hearted preachers, pacifists and 'world-reformers', in order to create such a mind in the young generation of capitalism which will withhold them from taking part in a bloody conflict.

Thus far the 'prophet' Lenin in

1923. You can hardly believe your eyes when you read these words which, all and every one of them, are being fulfilled today to the letter.

Another Dutch paper, *Gerreformeed Weekblad*, adds (it could have been said by the Russian author quoted in the article):

A sleeping West, stupid and power-losing capitalistic countries which joyfully will cooperate in new movements and pacts of 'peace' in order to prepare their own destruction.

Where is there, in our world, no infiltration of communism? How many churches, how many christians have fallen asleep!

I wonder how many among us, especially among the young who attend(ed) secular colleges, have, if not fallen asleep, shrugged their shoulders

when they read my remarks: "another old alarmist . . .".

You don't have to believe me; for once you might consider believing the father of communism!

If you would even refuse that, it only proves that your mind has already been poisoned . . .

G. VANDOOREN

P.S.

Anyone who rejects the above as 'nonsense', may be willing to listen to TIME, Jan. 19, in an article on "Tough New Man in Peking" (after Chou En Lai's death). One sentence: "The worst possibility from Washington's (only Washington's?)" vD standpoint is that Peking, feeling that the U.S. is not an effective bulwark against the Soviet menace, will decide to come to new terms with Moscow. Despite their differences, China and Russia are both Marxist states for whom capitalism is the enemy." That would be the 'encircling' Lenin prophesied! vD

"MR. & MRS. JONES"

Even if I say so myself, I get around. I talk with a lot of people, also young people. Kind of makes it easier to "look around", it does. But the world is small. Lately I seem to be hearing [and reading] the same complaint about the Canadian Reformed Churches. I am told, we have become stiff institutions, unwilling to change, unable to meet the flow of the times, incapable of adapting to the needs of modern man. The institutional form of the Canadian Reformed Churches [and some others, I guess] has become outdated, outmoded, and outlived. Change, man, development, that's what we need!

We should roll up the blinds, let the sun shine in. We should open the window, let the wind breeze through. We should broaden our vision, not hang on relentlessly to traditional expressions and forms of worship, but dare to experiment some real life into a rather dry orthodoxy. Oh yes, someone even suggested we'd be in good company: Jesus was a man of change, the progressive liberal who bulldogged the stiff upper organization of scribes and Pharisees. Of all things

It's a small world, indeed. You hear this talk all over the world. Liberal European churches, e.g., are almost tripping over their own feet in hasty attempts to introduce appealing alternatives to established forms of worship. Anything goes, as long as it's not "traditional". It even works contagiously. The one federation infects the other. The other conveniently contacts the corresponding churches overseas. Am I mistaken in concluding from various publications that our unfaithful counterpart, the Christian Reformed federation, is presently involved in a circumspect process of breaking away from sound reformed tradition [oops, pardon the word]? As they say, "Bad friends create bad habits." Some are overjoyed at such a development, others concerned. Well, it happens all over the world. And I fear it's not so much a drive toward real reformation, but mostly a case of keeping

Circumspection...

up with the Joneses, you know, those ecclesiastical trend-setters.

And when I read an article of my pastor in *Clarion* ["Sola Scriptura", January 10, 1976] also advocating a certain willingness to change, I start to wonder which point is being made. Forgive me, is it strange that such an article tends to make me wary when I place it against the background of international developments and present neo-liberalism? What changes, reverend, and why? I do not understand articles which are not specific and only hammer away at huge, undefined entities. They're scary and confusing. "Sola Scriptura" is fine, as long as we don't use that argument to bypass the basic necessity of the creeds and the church order. Or are these also "custom, tradition, or what we are used to"? My pastor, of course, doesn't mean to say this, but OTHERS have! Creeds and Church order [nowadays so easily labeled as traditional time-bound forms] do not intend to do away with "Sola Scriptura", but are meant to protect the scriptural heritage that has been "handed down" to us.

Besides, reverend, permit a naughty remark. When the Lord said, "For the sake of YOUR tradition [emphasis is Cid's], you have made void the word of God," He did not mean tradition AS SUCH, but that specific rabbinistic doctrine of self-justification. Quoting texts correctly is an art not easily learned; I myself have been caught fumbling the ball in this respect.

Please, don't get me wrong. I'm willing to change and stimulate changes. I'd hate to be part of a dead orthodoxy. I'll even try to keep up with Mr. & Mrs. Jones, if they're RIGHT, that is. I'll go all the way and say, "Anyone opposed to a change because it is a change, should reconstruct his values." That's not it.

The point is: WHEN do we change and WHY? And also, which changes can truly be introduced as "changes for the better"? We get nowhere at all by indiscriminately throwing established traditions overboard. The alternative is often worse than the original, mark my words. It may be quite fashionable to stimulate all kinds of changes, but we're not here to strut before a jury of modern theologians like progressive poodles; we're here to serve the Lord according to His word. If OTHERS change, that in itself is no reason why WE should. If we must keep up with the Joneses, we'd better rid ourselves of the Bible as God's infallible word and the creeds as the true confession of that word, because most changes nowadays are based on that starting-point.

We must change only on certain conditions. We must change either when an accepted tradition has proven to be contrary to God's word and our confession, or when the suggested change really is an improvement in keeping with God's word. To use a variation, whether we change or not, it must be to God's glory! Our main goal is not to adapt to the tastes of modern man, but to meet the demands of the God of the covenant Who ALONE determines how He is to be worshipped in truth. Change must be adequately argued from Scripture and clearly further the edification of the church. Otherwise, friends, forget it.

Prove to a reformed church that a certain SPECIFIC change is a necessity, and I'm sure it will be accepted. But, no fooling around, reformed traditions and expressions are not easily discarded. They have PROVEN their value in the struggle of the centuries. Alternatives haven't.

So, Mr. & Mrs. Jones, get off my back. Cid

press review

THE SYNOD OF OUR AUSTRALIAN SISTER CHURCHES AND BIBLE TRANSLATIONS

From November 1 to 7 of last year the Free Reformed Churches of Australia held their Synod. Among other things, the Synod made a decision regarding the question which Bible translation in the English language should be used in the future. In art. 23 of the Press Release (see also CLARION of Jan. 10) we are informed:

Re English Bible Version synod decides:

1. to reject the New International Version on the grounds that the dynamic equivalent method of translation does not do full justice to the in-scripturated inspired Word of God;
2. to reject the King James Version II on the ground of several weaknesses indicated in the report of deputies;
3. to discharge deputies;

Letters-to-the-Editor

Dear Editor:

On a recent visit we came to talk about the happy event that Winnipeg received a minister of the Word in Rev. de Bruin.

Now maybe I should have known this, but I was annoyed to find out that Rev. de Bruin was married and even had a large family! To tell you the truth, I argued the fact quite vehemently. Do you know, the first thing on coming home, I went through all the latest editions of Clarion and to my knowledge this has not been reported in any reports. Now don't worry, I also am married and we have been blessed with our eight children. Also, I am no advocate of Women's Lib, far from it, as the Lord teaches us differently in His Word. But was it fair to Rev. de Bruin's wife and family that never once in any of the reports they were mentioned? I am sure that she also must have had very trying times in the years her husband was studying and that she also was a blessing and help meet for him. May we as yet have a mention of the family?

And praise to our Father in heaven Who also gives our ministers faithful and loving wives!

Yours in Christ,
(Mrs.) JENNY SCHOEN

We'll gladly publish additional information and even a family picture. Come on, Winnipeg!

vO

4. to appoint new deputies with the following mandate:

(a) to study fully the New American Standard Bible and the Revised Standard Version, taking into account the many objections expressed against the R.S.V. over the last years;

(b) to compare these versions with each other and with the Authorised Version (A.V.) (K.J.V.) in order to find which translation is to be preferred;

(c) to report to next synod.

In UNA SANCTA of October 18, 1975, the second part of the "report re English Bible" was published. The Rev. J.D. Wielenga writes (page 2):

Bible Versions can be distinguished, roughly by:

(a) principles of translation: a. the formal equivalent method (F.E.) b. the dynamic equivalent method (D.E.)

F.E.: a word-for-word translation; follows the Hebrew and Greek sentence structure. ERV-1881 and the ARV-1901 are strongly F.E. (Holwerda in his mentioned study [Prof. B. Holwerda, "Populair Wetenschappelijke Bijdragen", the article "De Nieuwe Vertaling" (The New Version)] calls Greijdenus an example of F.E. translating in the Korte Verklaring).

D.E.: translation of the original text in the language of the modern reader; the translator asks himself: how do we say today in our language what the original authors meant to say in their language. Luther's Bible translation in the German language in the 16th century was very much D.E. Among the modern versions the New Testament in Modern English by J.B. Phillips is an extreme D.E. version. The Van Gelderen in the Korte Verklaring a D.E.-translator.

We could say: F.E. is more literal, and D.E. is more free. We are reminded of Holwerda's remark, that a free translation can be more exact than a literal translation. So a D.E. translation need not be unfaithful to the original text; on the contrary.

With the last remark I can agree. And who cannot? But I would like to stress the word "can", when it is said that "a free translation can be more exact than a literal translation". When the New International Version (N.I.V.) translates "Jews from every nation of the world", (Acts 2:5), while K.J., R.S.V., and N.A.S.B. translate literally "Jews from every nation *under heav-*

en", I cannot see that the more free translation is more exact. And the same can be said about the translation of N.I.V. in Acts 2:14, where we read how Peter said to the Jews in Jerusalem: "let me explain this to you". However, when we translate literally Peter said: "this must be known to you". Again the more free translation of the N.I.V. is not more exact. It is further remarkable that time and again in Acts 2 the words "and" and "for" at the beginning of sentences in the original text are simply omitted in the N.I.V. translation. In my opinion it is a matter of reverence for the original text as the inspired Word of God, even in its little words, to translate as literally as is possible. Therefore I was thankful when I read the literal translation of the Greek text in Luke 2:1, 6, 15 in the N.A.S.B. a few years ago; namely the words "and it came about", so that also the English reader can notice in the translation, how Luke divides the first twenty verses of chapter 2 into three parts instead of into two. I think the N.I.V. is too free for official use in the church. And although the N.A.S.B. is not a perfect translation either, I prefer it above the other new versions because of the more literal way of translation. The reader can conclude that in my opinion the decision of the Australian churches is a wise one. And I hope that our next synod as yet can decide to have the N.A.S.B. examined also.

* * *

In UNA SANCTA of Dec. 6, 1975, the closing words of the president of the synod, the Rev. K. Bruning, were published. From them I quote:

We pray for the Lord's blessings on the work that was finished by this Synod. At this point we fully realize the very restricted capacities, wisdom and influence we, human creatures have.

It is therefore our hope, wish, and prayer that the Lord may use for His cause all that was good in the task which has been completed. It is our prayer and faith that He may forgive us all that was wrong and incomplete. . . . Really, this is our comfort, hope, and confession: the Lord will not forsake His own work. . . . Let all of us be loyal and faithful, and treat His gifts (also the bond of churches) carefully and in a pious way.

We also wish our sister churches in Australia the blessings of the LORD, a being used by Christ for the coming of His Kingdom, and in all things His peace.

J. GEERTSEMA

Perspectives in Teaching

TEACHING AND DISCIPLINE

I am the true vine, and my Father is the vinedresser. Every branch of mine that bears no fruit, He takes away, and every branch that does bear fruit He prunes, that it may bear more fruit. (John 15:1, 2)

The father and mother who proclaim not to have any discipline problems in their family are probably bad parents, and the teacher who prides himself with meeting no resistance in his class is not teaching in the Christian way toward a Christian goal. Education and discipline are not two different and opposing entities. The notion that there must be discipline in order to teach effectively is a misconception. Discipline is not the shadowside of teaching, the necessary evil that a teacher has to put up with; it is a very essential part of teaching, inseparably linked and interwoven with it.

The misconception may partly be due to the troublesome word 'to teach', as that word has two distinct meanings which may be confused. One may teach a certain skill or subject, and one may teach a child or pupil. In the first case we are mainly concerned with the passing on of information, whether it is accepted by the child or not; in the latter case we are instructing the child and insist that the child accept and digest our instruction. With the teaching in the second sense of the word we are concerned in the home, in the church, and in the school; parents, (preaching) elders, and teachers want their pupils to accept their teachings, and that's where the resistance starts. In this connection it may be relevant to know that the word discipline is derived from the Latin disciplina, which means instruction, tuition. God has charged us to instruct the child, and such instruction implies discipline.

In the Bible we read how God, the Father par excellence, instructs His children; He chastises them and causes them to be afflicted in order that they may lift up their eyes to Him and serve Him. In the time of judges, kings, and prophets, it becomes an almost wearisome refrain.

Psalm 66 speaks of it, "Thou hast tried us as silver is tried. We went through fire and through water." Psalm 123 sings of it, "Have mercy upon us, O LORD, have mercy upon us." (I am afraid that the versification in our Book of Praise is not right in its interpretation of the first part of that psalm: the man-servant does not look up to his master because he is neglected, but he hopes his master will cease to strike him!) The prophet Malachi speaks of the LORD of hosts as a refiner and purifier of silver (Mal. 3:2 and 3). In the New Testament it is not different. The Lord Jesus speaks of His Father Who does not only cut out the dead wood, but also prunes the branches that do bear fruit; the Lord cuts into our lives and may cause sincere grief and pain, not to tempt us, but to bring us to fuller growth and more perfect service. We all have had to contend with illness and pain, with loss through death and loss through unfaithfulness; the LORD chastises those whom He loves. Modern man is afraid to suffer and efficiently eliminates all pain through painkillers and drugs; the Christian knows the positive value of suffering and is able to give thanks also for affliction and discipline. The Christians should not be too keen on comfort and ease, but eager for God's comfort and solace.

Christian instruction meets with resistance and is necessarily accompanied by discipline problems because it requires change of thought or conduct in the pupil, and man is reluctant to change and be corrected. He feels his freedom of action is threatened, and indeed it is, but only to grant greater freedom. When we think of freedom, we must never be satisfied with sloppy slogans like, "We are free," but immediately ask ourselves, "Free from what?" and "Free to what?" We instruct and discipline our children to become free from sin and evil, and to become free to do good to God and neighbour. The Lord Jesus says, "If you continue in my word, you are truly my disciples, and you will know the truth, and the truth will make you free" (John 8:31, 32). There it is in one breath: the limitation and the

freedom. True freedom can only exist within a framework of rules and laws; without laws there is no freedom, but licentiousness.

It must be clear then also that discipline in home, church, or school must be accompanied by the spoken word. God did not send afflictions and grievances to His people without sending a prophet who explained both cause and purpose of the chastisement. Parents may not punish their child in hot anger, but must lead their children via the way of punishment back to the good way of life. Teachers must make sure that their disciplinary action is perfectly understood by the student, for discipline must lead to purification and reconciliation, must open up the way to forgiveness. May God grant that in our homes, churches, and schools, discipline is exercised and valued properly, that teachers and students may pray with David, "Let a good man strike or rebuke me in kindness, but let the oil of the wicked never anoint my head" (Psalm 141:5a).

E. GOSKER



THE CANADIAN REFORMED MAGAZINE

Published biweekly by Premier Printing Ltd.
Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Second class mail registration number 1025.

ADDRESS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE

MATTERS: (subscriptions, advertisements, etc.):

CLARION, Premier Printing Ltd.
1249 Plessis Road, Winnipeg
Manitoba, Canada R2C 3L9
Phone (204) 222-5218

ADDRESS FOR EDITORIAL MATTERS:

CLARION

P.O. Box 54, Fergus
Ontario, Canada N1M 2W7

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:

Editor: W.W.J. VanOene
Co-Editors: W. Helder, D. VanderBoom

REGULAR CONTRIBUTORS:

J.M. Boersema, J. Faber, J. Geertsema,
E. Gosker, W. Huizinga, P. Kingma,
H.J. Ludwig, H.M. Ohmann,
A.H. Oosterhoff, F.G. Oosterhoff,
A.B. Roukema, C. Tenhage, C. VanDam,
G. VanDooren, H.C. VanDooren,
G. van Rongen, C. VanSpronsen,
J. Visscher, M.C. Werkman.

SUBSCRIPTIONS:

\$16.50 per year (to be paid in advance).

ADVERTISEMENTS:

\$4.50 per column inch (width of column:
one-third of page). Contract rates upon
request.

Advertising copy for weddings, anni-
versaries, meetings, etc., must be in our
office three to four weeks prior to
event.

news medley

This medley is written approximately one week after the previous one, and it will not surprise you that we do not have much news after such a short period. Those holidays throw everything into disorder, and only gradually do we get used to the normal routine again. Perhaps we shall have the opportunity to say something about a point which was touched upon quite a while ago - and quite a few times - so that this medley becomes a mixture of reporting, commenting, and article.

Let us begin with mentioning that the Rev. H. Knigge accepted the call extended to him by the Church at Langeslag, the Church which had to part with the Rev. C. Stam when the latter accepted the call from Rehoboth Burlington. It is understandable that our brother Stam is very happy with the decision of Rev. H. Knigge. It is always quite a thing when you have to leave a Congregation and when there are quite a few vacancies so that it may take a while before the vacancy is filled. Although your responsibility towards that Congregation has come to an end, yet you still feel sort of responsible and, perhaps, somewhat guilty. All that, whether justified or not (that is something we are not speaking about right now), falls away when the vacancy is filled and the former Church is provided with another pastor and teacher.

There is something which the world would call "an ironic turn of events". The Toronto Church informed us that either the same day or the day after the Rev. Knigge had accepted the call from the Church at Langeslag, he received word from the Canadian Embassy in The Hague that his application for visa for himself and his family had been approved If anywhere, then here we see the providence of our God and we see that He guides and directs everything in everyone's life. It would have been hard for our brother to decide about the calls which he received from Churches in The Netherlands if the message from the Embassy had arrived before a decision was made concerning those calls. Now the Lord guided it so that this difficulty and struggle was kept from him. Certainly a clear indication! We wish our former missionary and his family well in their new field of labour and express the expectation that a trip to here will be on the agenda for the future.

As for further news from and about the mission, we cannot tell much. Newsletters appear in extenso in our magazine and special information is very sparse. Once in a while a bulletin mentions something we could not learn from other sources. What does become evident, however, is that none has been found as yet who would be willing to fill the now existing vacancies or the upcoming one. When I speak of "vacancies", in the plural, I refer to the fact that Toronto, supported by the Ontario Churches, actually would like to see two missionaries together. The budget has shown amounts for the support of such a second missionary for some years already. When, after a little over a year, the Rev. C. VanSpronsen returns from Brazil, there will be three vacancies in the field of mission. The apparent lack of willingness to go into this

work causes some to ask whether we should not look for other possibilities, namely, train some men (there are some young couples who would gladly prepare themselves for this work) to be sent out as "evangelists" without being "full-fledged" ministers of the Word. At the moment I would say that we should never let ourselves be brought by an existing situation to a deviating from the course which we have followed thus far. If we have been wrong all the time in our conviction that missionaries should be ordained ministers, all right, let's prove that then from the Scriptures and change our practice. But if we have been right (and I still see it that way) then we should not look for another set-up because there are no such missionaries available.

You should not draw up rules for election of office-bearers with a specific case in mind. Thus you should not design a new set-up of mission work because you can get some workers who are not ordained ministers and, in all likelihood, never will be. I never thought, when I started writing about the calls extended to our former missionary that I would write so much about this topic.

Thus we go to something else. From the bulletins which I did receive lately, I gathered that our Consistories have received an extensive documentation from some brethren and sisters in The Netherlands. Practically all Consistories which mentioned this "incoming mail", also took the only correct course: tell the writers of these extensive letters and evaluations that they have to address themselves to our Committee on Correspondence with Churches Abroad, and receive and file the weighty parcel. Of course, that will cause the Canadian Reformed Churches to be adorned with the epithet "false churches", but from people who are so generous with the use of that qualification we can expect that, and it does not make the slightest impression on me.

In one bulletin I read that the minister will make an attempt to wrestle through all those pages. Fortunately, it does not say that he will draw up a summary and will report to the Consistory! I wish my colleague much patience. Keep your adrenalin-contents down, will you? I value you too highly to see you get something from it.

From Smithers we report that the Consistory decided to give another destination to the collection at the table of the Holy Supper. Apparently the brethren could not bring themselves to the decision to abolish it. The bulletin mentions various reasons why the Consistory deems it more proper to keep this collection. As of January 1, 1976, however, it will not be used for the local "needy" but for those who are farther away, as for instance those in Brazil. Mission Aid will be the happy recipient, if I understood it well.

Rev. J. VanRietschoten would not be available for a few weeks, we read, since he will have to undergo treatment which is not serious (bothersome rather than dangerous, "meer lastig dan gevaarlijk") but which will prevent him from doing his work. Of course, you are all curious what that can be. Be assured that the writer of the medley knows when he should not mention something, even though he does slip once in a while! All I am going to tell you is that it is in the head but well below that part of the head which matters most! If you wish to know more, just write to Smithers. By the time you read these lines our brother will be back in full swing, I presume.

No special news is to be mentioned about the New

Westminster churchbuilding. The Home Mission Committee longs for the day when the new building can be used. They have made plans for quite a few activities. They will have a guestbook in the lobby. Further they wish to make a weekly feature what in other Churches is done on New Year's Day (see previous medley): they plan to give the opportunity to meet each other after the morning service and to invite strangers and visitors "to a cup of coffee in the church building". Further, they intend to have some introductory literature printed, to distribute invitations to the surrounding neighbourhood (if it were not surrounding, it would not be neighbourhood, would it?) and start a Sunday School for children of non-members. As for this last-mentioned point, they may have some trouble there. Usually the Sunday School is held before the morning services when I look at the various signs in front of the churchbuildings which ornament our cities and villages. However, these morning services usually start at eleven o'clock! If the service is set at 9:30 or 10:00 a.m., it will be hard to get children out by nine! I am eager to know how they visualize that and what kind of a solution they have found.

Something I never saw before I found in the Winnipeg bulletin. The report on the Consistory meeting mentions that "at the next meeting the Deacon Budget and the statements on the Building project and the Parsonage will be finalized for publication." I would love to know how they manage that, that the Deacons have a budget! Unless they mean by that that the Deacons will publish which amounts they intend to donate regularly to needy outside the Congregation, Korea, perhaps.

The Consistory decided not to proceed with the plans to pave the parking lot. The reason for this is that in the future they may have to build additional facilities for the school which the Winnipeg brethren and sisters expect to start this fall and which will use the rooms in the church basement. If the parking lot were to be paved now, it might have to be broken up again within the next few years and that would be double work and unnecessary expenses. To govern is to look ahead, right?

The congregational meeting was discussed and a few points were clarified. "At the congregational meeting support will be requested to realize the purchase of a pipe organ." Bravo! The organ fund contained some thirteen hundred dollars at the beginning of the year 1975. By the first of January 1976, this had increased to forty-eight hundred! "With more than one third of the price in cash, the organ committee suggested to order a pipe-organ, so that by next fall, it may crown the completion of the building project."

Yes, and this brings me to the point which I would like to mention. It is the point that I spoke such bad words about electronic "organs". From a sister I received a letter in which she also raised some points regarding this topic; later on she sent me a clipping from a newspaper in which Mr. Jaap Zwart (a brother of "our" Mr. Dirk Jansz. Zwart) is reported to have stated, "It is no individualism when from this place we state that we consider it to be a joy when we are permitted to accompany the singing of the congregation in a Flevo-tent, on an electronic organ." I hope that I rendered the Dutch original correctly in my translation.

In her letter, our sister asks me whether I can explain it that I called an electronic organ "un-reformed". A slight correction: It was not I who used that qualification. I



The Rev. and Mrs. DeBruin and family.

(See Letters-to-the Editor)

even wrote that I would not be able to back that statement up, since my knowledge of this field is too limited. But the reason for that statement was: everything that lacks breath is dead. That is all I can say to explain the qualification "un-reformed".

I agree: if a choice has to be made, then the more important thing must be chosen. IF a choice has to be made between a pipe-organ and, f.i., a school, then the choice is not difficult. But I still cannot see that a Congregation that can afford an electronic instrument would not be able to afford a two-manual harmonium, possibly with pedal, and then attach an amplifier to it, if necessary. Before the New Westminster Church purchased their pipe-organ, they did have such a two-manual harmonium with pedal. It was not ideal but it served the purpose well and was not by far as expensive as an electronic instrument. Besides, it was "alive", had different "voices" and not the same voice, derived from one basic vibration, which in the long run is sickening.

Perhaps our readers do not fully understand the point in the above paragraphs, but they will be able to grasp it sufficiently to see some of it. If there are no other possibilities, then I shall sing with and even play such an electronic instrument (I did it in Ottawa and in other places) but I am also convinced that there are other and better solutions even where a Congregation cannot afford a pipe-organ. If there is nothing else, it is a joy, as Mr. Zwart is quoted above to have expressed himself. We even sang without accompaniment under certain conditions, and it was a joy. But we should strive for the best.

Well, folks, that's it for this time.

vO

God's Counsel Shall Stand

Before the Bible was given to man, God had a plan, and we must remember that it is to that foreordained plan that He is working. The Prophet Isaiah wrote by divine inspiration: "Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, my counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure" (Isaiah 46:9-13). Where has God declared the end from the beginning? He has told it clearly on the pages of the Holy Scriptures. Holy men of God, guided by the Holy Spirit, wrote of great world events centuries before they were to come to pass. Now, since every one who occupies himself with the prophetic Word will experience a blessing (Rev. 1:3, 22:7), why should he not examine the prophetic Scriptures with an unbiased mind? I like to make it perfectly clear that I consider myself a Canadian Reformed Premillennialist (one who believes Christ's premillennial return to the earth). I am also thankful for the given opportunity to explain this position directly in our *Clarion*. Now in these discussions our only norm is God's Word. God's infallible Word. God is infallible, a-millennialists are not, neither are premillennialists. And this brings me to my main objection over against a-millennialism. God's integrity is at stake and this comes out in different ways. God has given many promises. Some are conditional (if . . .), some unconditional. Just a few I can think of at the moment: To Adam and Eve - conditional; to Noah - unconditional (there are no if's or but's in Gen. 12:1, 13:15, 15:18, 26:4, 28:13, 35:12); to the people of Israel - conditional. In Deut. 28 God gives *His* people this principle: obedience results in blessing, disobedience in discipline. In Deut. 30:19, 20 God lays out before His people the choice between life and death. But these chapters are also prophetic (see Chapter 30:1-3, 20). Now why is this? Because the nation has never as yet taken the land under the unconditional Covenant with Abraham (cp. Gen. 15:18 with Num. 34:1-12).

This God is still bound to do (cp. Isa. 54:9; Jer. 16:14, 15; Jer. 31:35-37).

In Rom. 9, 10 and 11 Israel as the natural descendants of Jacob are compared to the spiritual Israel - the Church (see 11:28). This natural Israel is now under the curse; at the same time God is calling out a people for Christ's name: As soon as this work is completed, God will turn to His old people again. And in this way *all* Israel - the whole nation is going to be saved. How? Well, exactly as it is written: The Deliverer . . . etc. (Rom. 11:26). Why? Because of His promises to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. According to Rev. 20, Christ is going to reign on this earth for a period of a thousand years. The expression "thousand years" which occurs six times in vv. 1-7, gave rise to the term "millennium" (from the Latin *mille* meaning a thousand and *annus* meaning year). The millennium is that period of time during which Christ will reign upon the earth, a time of universal peace, prosperity, long life, and prevailing righteousness. The early church fathers, e.g. Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, interpreted this passage as referring to a future literal period of time.

The apostles also were well aware of this coming kingdom. See further Ps. 72, Isa. 9:6-7 (first and second advent), 11:1-12, 24:21-23, 35:1-10, 65:18-25, Jer. 23:5-6, Ezek. 34:28-31, 39:25-29, Joel 3:20, Micah 4:1-7, 7:18-20, cp. Zech. 3:20 with Deut. 26:19, Zech. 8:20-23, cp. Zech. 14:20 with Rev. 19:16, cp. Isa. 6:10 with Rom. 11:25, and Isa. 6:11 with Matth. 23:37-39, also Zech. 14:9 with I Cor. 15:25.

God in His Word clearly reveals that Israel's blindness and chastisement will end in restoration and conversion (Ezek. 39:25-29). In Rev. 16:13 an unholy Tri-unity is preparing the whole world for the battle of Armageddon (also Joel 3:12, 14; Zech. 14:1-15). This battle is going to be fought in the valley of Jehoshaphat. For the Jewish people very hard times are still to come, two thirds of them will lose their life in this great battle (Zech. 13:9), but then in Rev. 19:11, at the beginning of the millennium, the deliverer shall come out of Zion in His glory, and then shall the Lord go forth and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle (Zech. 14:3) to save His people (cp.

with chapter 12:8-10). The time when the "Redeemer" shall come to Zion (Isa. 59:20) is fixed, relatively, by Rom. 11:23-29, as following the completion of the Church. This is also the order of the great dispensational passage, Acts 15:14-17 (cp. with Amos 9:11-15). In both, the return of the Lord to Zion follows the outcalling of the Church. Augustine once said: Distinguish the ages and all Scriptures harmonize. And Peter writes that the prophetic Word is a "lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawn," and that we do well to heed it (II Peter 1:19). When should we heed it? When it is fulfilled and the full light shines on it? No, the prophetic Word is meant to be a lamp for the foot of the pilgrim in this dark world. Prophecy has been given to us with the prime purpose to guide our walk in the path of our Lord and to our consolation; because we see (especially in these times) that ultimately it is God rather than Man who directs all things.

It is a light shining in a dark place.

Dr. Wilbur M. Smith suggests that there are three different attitudes one may take toward the future. The first is indifference, the second is fear, and the third is hope.

The world is preparing the way for the Antichrist; the huge ecumenical W.C.C. becomes a significant sign of the times. But the Christian with an understanding of Bible prophecy can face the future with confidence and comfort (Rom. 15:4). The day of God's wrath is at hand, however (Thess. 5:9).
Maranatha.
Wm. SALOMONS

* * *

GOD'S COUNSEL SHALL STAND,
INDEED!

Under the title "God's Counsel Shall Stand" an article written by br. Wm. Salomon appears in this issue. Because this article is supposed to run counter to my five articles on "And All Israel Shall Be Saved", I was given the opportunity to make some remarks regarding Biblical proof that br. S. thinks he has for his premillennialist stand. Prof. Ohmann wrote in much more detail and he will certainly like to react to br. S.'s O.T. references.

My remarks will be brief.

The first one is the decisive one. When my first article was published I met br. Salomons at the Church in Thornhill. He asked me whether he would be allowed to write about and defend his opinion re: Millennialism. My answer was, I think so (I am not editor of *Clarion*) but, I continued, why do you not wait till all five articles have been published, and then try to point out where I went wrong in my handling of what

I called the three main principles of Bible-interpretation?

The reader could see that br. S. did not even touch my articles. We were supposed to have a discussion, a 'pro' and 'con' regarding this point of view. But the way br. S. reacted (by not reacting at all; he writes as though he did not even read my, or better: Prof. Ohmann's articles), I see hardly any possibility for a 'debate'. If, in such a debate, we give proof of not even having listened to what the other had to say, you can't have an exchange of views! There is no bitterness in this remark, only disappointment, when I say: on these terms I am not going into a discussion. Show me first where I went wrong.

But - life is stronger than theory . . . - just a few remarks to point out that br. Salomons' letter has completely failed to make even the slightest impression upon me - however many texts he, in the millenarianist way, sprinkles upon his remarks.

Acts 15:14-17 (-18, vD) is presented as a "great dispensational passage". Really? In this chapter we get a report of the meeting in Jerusalem, where Peter reported on what had happened in Cornelius' home. Then James rises to the occasion, saying: did you all hear it? Cornelius c.s. was a "first" but this is only a beginning; the prophets foretold this! God would first rebuild the dwelling of David (which was done by Jesus Christ, vD) "that the rest of men may seek the Lord," etc. You better read this passage for yourself, and ask, where is there a single word to make this a "great passage" for Millenarianism (and don't ask me now what this millenarianism involves: a second but earthly coming of Christ; 1,000 years of universal peace, rebuilding of Jerusalem and temple, etc., etc., etc. - see Prof. Ohmann's and my articles). But not a word about that in Acts 15!

Br. S. also refers to II Peter 1:19 to demonstrate that his premillenarianist view is like a lamp shining in a dark place. I was waiting for his reaction to what I had written about the same Peter, that full-blooded Jew. If anyone, then he would have held out to the Jews a future glory. But this Peter calls the christian congregations "the exiles of the Dispersion", "chosen and destined by God the Father . . . etc." (I Peter 1:1, 2), and then continues to give all the names which Moses gave to Israel, to the Church of Jesus Christ (2:9), "But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people" - and . . . God has only *one* such people, the holy, catholic or universal church. Finally, the same Peter in his second letter, ch. 3, speaks about the coming Day of the LORD, about new heavens and a new earth. If ever, then here Peter would have had a wonderful opportunity to fit in some (pre-)millenarianist words, but not a word! On the contrary, the only "future" Peter knows about is judgment-day and then the new heaven and the new earth!

As to Revelation 20 with its mention of

"1,000 years", so much has already been said that I need not repeat. Only this: the last book of the Bible is filled with symbolical numbers; why all of a sudden take this one 'literally'? Then: where in this chapter is any mention of *Jews* reigning with Christ as is the basic idea of any form of millenarianism? No mention. Those who will reign are the ones who have received the first resurrection, vs. 5, which - considering that only the resurrection of the body will follow as the "second resurrection" - means that they are with the Lord, sharing in His glory. Third, I cannot discover any justification for what br. Salomons says: that those "1,000 years" will be "a period of time during which Christ will reign upon the earth(!), a time of universal peace, prosperity(!), long life(?) and prevailing righteousness". My brother does not read that here in Rev. 20. He reads it *into* this chapter.

Finally, to end on a positive note in which my brother and I wholeheartedly agree: We should not live in fear, let alone in indifference, but *in hope*: Maranatha!

G. VANDOOREN

* * *

GOD'S COUNSEL SHALL STAND (Remarks concerning an Article)

As for the article of br. W. Salomons under the title "God's Counsel Shall Stand", I wholeheartedly subscribe to the title - as is to be expected from a Canadian Reformed theologian, since the words are borrowed from the Bible. I could have given it as a title to my series of articles on Israel.

A question arising in this respect however was: What has our br. in mind in emphasizing this Biblical truth? As far as I am concerned, I was and still am always deeply impressed by texts like this, since the magnitude, the greatness of the LORD Yahweh, the only true GOD over against the pagan idols, as well as the intrinsic power of His revelation is brought out. Among the "gods" it is only the God of Israel who can do so, to the praise of His glory and the salvation of His people.

So my first question is: Did you, br. S., realize, did you form a clear idea of what your article was going to be, in giving it this very heading? Would that you had studied this text *in its proper context*. And do not say: "I am not an exegete by profession"; for I reply: You are a confessing member of God's Church and called to read and study your Bible to the utmost of your power. Lots of handbooks and commentaries are available. If you have not unlearned your Dutch (which some immigrants apparently have done) I can recommend to you "De Korte Verklaring op Jesaja" by Prof. Dr. J. Ridderbos, who was, apart from objections I have, generally speaking a well-balanced exegete. I for one would like to elaborate on the text under discussion, but the Editor of *Clarion* asked me to be as brief as possible in my reaction. But I will consider writing an article on this text now.

However, I did already write an exten-

sive series. In the opinion of some too extensive, in the opinion of others not lengthy enough, whereas there is still a third group that is pleased to neglect or ignore it or consider it as having been not written at all, since it was not a substantial contribution. They have a right to do so, but I wish they had notified me. In the 9th article (*Clarion*, April 19, 1975) I asked: "If anyone among the subscribers of our magazine is interested in some more details about a specific text and its exegesis, please let him write a letter and let me know so that either in this series or in another I can go further into the matter." I would have liked and I still like reactions, but nobody showed up, not even br. S. That is why I would ask him especially: Why this continued absence of any reply? I would have liked to read and ponder your arguments and to deal with them in all seriousness. The more so, since the subject is not all that easy. Introducing yourself as "Canadian Reformed Premillenarianist" you must have felt hit or hurt by the position I took.

"God's integrity is at stake", you write. Right! That is what I would like to bring out when writing an article on Is. 46:9ff. However, I would ask you: By whom is this part of our confession challenged? I think by him and others who write: "God has given many promises. Some are conditional (if. . .) some unconditional . . . Just a few I can think of at the moment: To Adam and Eve - conditional; to Noah - unconditional (rainbow); to Abraham - unconditional (there are no if's or but's in Gen. 12:1" etc. You can know what I think about this.

May I refer br. S. and all the readers to that which I have written in my articles, all the articles, for I was harping on the same string throughout the series, but especially in the 5th and 6th articles (*Clarion* of Feb. 8 and Feb. 22, 1975). And again I would beg and request not only br. S. but everyone who takes an interest, but differs from my view, which I think is in accordance with the Scripture, please show me where I was wrong or not clear enough or maybe beating about the bush in some respect or other. Perhaps you've learnt from me; I for one like to learn from my brother(s and sisters). If you are to the point I can go farther into the matter. Therefore: so far this time.

Yours in the LORD's service,
H.M. OHMANN



Church News

Called: by the Church of Lincoln, Ont.:
REV. J. GEERTSEMA
of Carman, Manitoba (by acclamation).

* * * * *

REV. W. HUIZINGA

of London - Watford, Ontario, declined the call from the Free Reformed Church, Armadale, Australia.

school X crossing

IT'S GETTING COLD

While perhaps the schoolchildren in British Columbia may disagree with the statement above, the students in Manitoba will probably agree wholeheartedly. After all, it all depends on where you live. However, the children in the 'banana belt' in southwestern Ontario will agree this winter that it is indeed getting colder than normal. Fortunately they also have more snow this winter which lasts longer than normally. And the Edmontonians of course are more or less used to 50 degrees below zero once in awhile. Although if you listen to the oldtimers, it used to be a lot worse in the years long past. But it is a fact which the Lord Jesus teaches us in Matthew 24:12, that it is getting colder in the world. And there is a definite reason for it.

LAWLESSNESS IS MULTIPLIED

Jesus makes clear in this chapter what it will be like at the close of the Messianic age and at the same time what it will be like at the end of the world, before the final destruction.

The King James Version uses the word 'iniquity', while the Revised Standard Version uses the word 'wickedness', I think the New American Standard Bible gives the correct translation by the word 'lawlessness'. For that is exactly the word the Lord uses here. Law-less-ness. This lawlessness will abound or increase or more correctly: will be multiplied!

Lawlessness is not just sinfulness or iniquity or wickedness. Of course all that is included as well. But in all this wickedness it is the lawlessness that becomes more evident.

People will simply despise the Law. They just can't be bothered with it. They want to be completely free and therefore do away with the laws of God as well as with the laws of man. They want to throw out anything that ties them down and binds them. They are like the people of Psalm 2, who take counsel against the Lord and His anointed, saying: let us break their bands asunder and cast away their cords from us.

They estrange and alienate themselves from God more and

more. They do not want to take God into consideration anymore in their life. God simply does not belong to their world anymore. They have put Him out of the door. He is absent from their world and is declared dead. Years ago I read in an old book the following poem that expresses this lawlessness very pointedly:

The laws of God, the laws of man
He may keep that will and can;
NOT I: let God and man decree
Laws for themselves and not for
me;
And if my ways are not as theirs
Let them mind their own affairs.

Well, that is how lawless men will become more and more. Lawless: without the law of God and man. They will not only break the law, do things against the law, but they will despise it and totally ignore it! They will simply tell God to mind His own business! That is the lawlessness of man.

Now the Lord Jesus tells us in Matthew 24 that this lawlessness will be *multiplied!* Children will understand that easily. When the teacher asks them to *add* 5 and 5, they will answer: 10. Then 5 is increased by another 5 and makes 10. But with multiplying it is different. When you multiply 5 and 5, what answer do you get? 10? 15? No, much more than that. You get 25! That is a lot more than just adding 5 and 5. Well, Jesus teaches us that in the last days lawlessness will be multiplied. When lawlessness is multiplied with lawlessness there will be a whole lot more lawlessness. In other words; when there are 5 lawless people and another 5 then you will have 25 lawless people and not just 10! That is how lawlessness works. It grows and grows and multiplies all the time. People will despise the law of God. But when they do so, they affect and infect many more people. It spreads like a contagious disease.

Before the Lord returns there will be a growing *anarchy* in the world.

Lawlessness will be multiplied also in the *families!*

Let me use an example most parents will agree with. When one child in your family rebels against

father and mother, disobeys his parents and rejects the authority which Christ has given to the parents, then other children will soon follow his example. Then lawlessness is multiplied. Then parents lose their authority over their children. Is that not a big problem in the world?

LAWLESSNESS IN OUR FAMILIES AND SCHOOLS?

We may look at what happens in the world, but is this lawlessness, alas, not also a multiplying problem in our own families and perhaps in our schools? I cannot really answer this question for I do not know all our families or our schools, but I just raise the question as such. Do we as parents have authority over all our children?

Or do we give in to their lawlessness? Do the children have their way? And do they get away with it? Do we as parents let them get away with it? And let us not think that this starts only when a child runs away from home. It begins already with the small children when they do not (want to) listen to father and mother. When they do not want to abide by the rules of the parents. Should we as parents not give this more attention?

Boys and girls (you also read the School Crossing, don't you?), do you realize what you are doing when you disobey your parents? When you pay no real attention to what they tell you? Then you had better remember that the Lord Jesus says: lawlessness is multiplied!

You will not stop at your disobedience but will go from bad to worse. You then will become more and more disobedient. But that means really that you want to live more and more *without* the Law of God and without the law of father and mother!

When children do not care about what the teacher says and simply disregards and ignores his or her authority in the classroom, then we have the lawlessness in our schools as well. Our teachers *have* authority over the children. Not because they are scholars or have certain degrees or qualifications, but because all authority in heaven and on earth has been given by God to our Lord Jesus Christ. That means that also the parents and the teachers have received their authority from the Lord. Children who disobey their parents,

mission news

Meeting of the Board of Foreign Mission of the Canadian Reformed Church of Toronto with delegates of the cooperating churches, held on November 1, 1975, in Burlington, Ontario.

Represented were the Churches of Brampton, Burlington E., Burlington W., Chatham, Guelph, Hamilton, Lincoln, Orangeville, and Smithville.

1. After the singing of Psalm 96:1, 2, the chairman Rev. VanderBoom opened the meeting with the reading of Luke 5:1-11 and prayer.

2. In his opening words, the chairman gave a brief report of the developments at home. Contacts with the Netherlands regarding finding a missionary to replace Rev. Knigge have so far been unsatisfactory.

All students in our college in Hamilton have also been interviewed.

The Knigge family has applied for entrance to Canada as immigrants, but so far the Canadian Embassy in the Netherlands has not made a decision. Although we have no definite indications, the problem seems to be centred around the medical history of two of the children. For this reason it may not help Rev. Knigge too much if he were to receive a call to a Canadian Church.

Rev. Knigge himself feels that the entrance to Canada might be blocked and that he should consider the possibility of receiving a call from a Church in the Netherlands.

It was suggested that regardless of the outcome of Rev. Knigge's request for entrance into Canada, we should invite him

SCHOOL CROSSING — Continued

reject the authority of the Lord. Students who disobey the teachers, reject the law of the Lord. Of course, not only the children and the students must be aware of this. The parents and the teachers must be fully aware of this fact as well. For they are the ones who by the grace of the Lord may instruct the children in the good Law of the Lord. In this sense they may and they must 'lay down the law' for them. The Law of our Gracious God and Saviour. And that Law is a law to Life. At home and in our schools.

Let us all take this law to heart and live!

Then we will not grow cold in love to our parents, to our children, to our teachers!

M. WERKMAN

over for some time. This will be considered by the Board.

3. On motion it was decided to dispense with the reading of the report of the Spring meeting. This report had given the inaccurate impression that after January 1, 1976, we would be able to withdraw our support of Rev. Knigge. However, at the Spring meeting, it had been agreed that we would remain responsible for Rev. Knigge till he has found a Church to serve.

4. Mr. J. Boot gave a brief report regarding the situation on the Mission field. From Butiptiri not much news was available except from a report of Rev. Versluis, who made an extensive visit in May, and from Rev. Knigge's last visit in June. Both these reports gave favourable impressions about the congregation in Butip.

Rev. Knigge had made several trips to Manggelum; on his more recent trips he reported finding a greater concentration of people in the area, which is a very promising fact. A school has been established, manned by teachers from Kawagit.

The Central Bible School in Boma, established and supported by the Z.G.K. and us, is to provide training for people that are to give leadership in the churches.

5. A discussion developed concerning the pros and cons of combining the Mission and Mission Aid meetings into one. The chairman ruled that since at a previous meeting a decision had been made to have separate meetings we have to abide by this decision and a further discussion had no validity.

Rev. VanDam remarked that if any churches desire to raise the question again of combining the Mission and Mission Aid, this would have to be done by bringing a proposal before the Boards prior to the next meeting and informing the cooperating Churches of this proposal.

6. In the absence of the treasurer, Mr. Boot introduced the Budget for 1976. The various questions asked raised the following points:

a) 1 or 2 Missionaries

It was felt by some delegates that we should be looking for 2 missionaries and that this should be reflected in the Budget. It was the Board's opinion that we should first concentrate on finding one and then make a decision regarding a second. However, the Board will give this matter further consideration and come with a proposal to the churches if necessary.

b) Pension and Life Insurance Rev. Knigge.

Rev. Knigge's pension is built up in a private life insurance policy which had been taken out because at that time "Winnipeg" could not supply the desired coverage. Any Church calling Rev. Knigge would have to

take over the insurance or have it converted. These matters would have to be discussed with the calling Church.

c) The work of the M.A.F. and our contribution to it.

We feel that presently we pay our fair share for the use we make of M.A.F. planes. However, the Churches in the Netherlands are presently engaged in study to determine the sufficiency of the aid and our contributions. If this will show that our contribution is insufficient we will make up the difference.

More information was requested about the work of the M.A.F. Previously a short résumé had been published in June 1975. On motion it was decided to adopt the budget as presented.

7. Question period:

a. Burlington - Ebenezer Church informed the delegates that they are considering withdrawing from the co-operation of Churches in order to send out a missionary of their own. However, the work being done presently would not be endangered by their withdrawal.

b. Hamilton Church would like to see the Board stimulate in Canadian youth people the desire to do missionary work.

8. Closing:

The meeting is adjourned after prayer by Mr. Endeman.

* * *

COMMUNICATION FROM THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSION, TORONTO

On January 7, 1976, a telegram was received from Rev. Knigge in Holland informing us that he had accepted the call extended to him by the congregation of Langeslag. When speaking to Rev. Knigge on the telephone later on that day he mentioned that after his decision was taken at the Canadian Embassy in The Hague phone him to say that a visa for Canada had been granted. We regret very much that our missionary, who has become so close to us during the many years that he worked in Irian Jaya, and also when he was on furlough in Canada, could not come in our midst as minister of one of our congregations. However, the Lord has guided his way in a different direction and we are very thankful for his faithfulness and patience in the work of spreading the glorious Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Let our prayers continue that another minister may be found to take his place.

OUR COVER

The new church of Winnipeg, Manitoba. (Courtesy of Premier Printing Ltd.)

our little magazine

Hello Busy Beavers,

It's time for Birthday Greetings.
 Time for birthday cake and games and songs!
 Time for PRESENTS and maybe a birthday dinner!
 Oh, birthdays are fun!
 Time, too, to be thankful for the Lord's care for another year.

Thankful, too, for His countless blessings.

And also time to remind ourselves to live everyday as thankful children of our heavenly Father.

We wish all these Busy Beavers a very happy birthday indeed!

Frances De Boer	Feb. 1	John Wendt	Feb. 12
Diane Doesburg	1	Marian Onderwater	12
Judy Peet	2	Rosemary De Gelder	16
Brenda Beukema	4	Clara Barendregt	18
Greta Paize	6	Yvonne Van Amerongen	19
Sonya Van Overbeeke	6	Betty Aikema	22
Jeannette Bouwman	10	Irene Van Grootheest	24
Cathy Post	10	Jackie Vanderwoerd	25
Gary Sandink	11	Monica De Vries	28
Joyce Jansen Van 't Land	12	Shirley Veenema	28

* * * * *

It's still winter, Busy Beavers and Busy Beaver *Debbie Knol* has a real winter poem to share with you. Thank you, Debbie.

Whirly, twirly

Whirly, twirly in the snow
 Here the snow plow comes to blow,
 Blowing you up in a pile.
 Hope you stay here for a while
 So we can have some fun -
 Running up and sliding down,
 Rolling, sliding, having falls,
 Making snowmen, snowforts and snowballs!



From the Mailbox

Welcome to the Busy Beaver Club, *Cynthia Dam*. Of course you may join us! We hope you will really enjoy joining in all our Busy Beaver activities. Write again soon, Cynthia.

Thank you for your letter and the nice poem, *Henrietta Stieva*. I will keep it for next Christmas, if that's all right with you. Thank you too, for your good wishes, Henrietta.

Hello, *Greta Bosscher*. It was nice to hear from you again. It sounds to me as if you've been having a very good time! Are you still skating on your rink?

Thank you for your letter and quiz, *Leona Dam*. It was nice to hear from you again. Tell me, Leona, have you had some fun with your glass staining kit?

I see you are enjoying lots of winter fun, *Corrie De Boer*! Thank you for your letter and story. Did you try today's quiz already?

Thank you for your letter, *Jenny Bosscher*. I was glad to hear you liked your book. And I want to thank you for your good wishes. Keep up your writing, Jenny.

QUIZ TIME

Busy Beaver *Leona Dam* has a word search puzzle for you. But watch out Busy Beavers! Some of the answers are shaped like boomerangs!

Kings and Queens

Answers:

Ahasuerus	Darius
David	Solomon
Saul	Esther

A	E	M	B	A	C
H	S	D	A	V	N
A	T	Y	R	I	O
S	H	S	I	D	M
U	E	A	U	L	O
E	R	U	S	O	L

A Scriptural Cradle Roll

Who are the members of this Bible Cradle Roll?

1. Who was the first baby born to Adam and Eve?
2. What baby, related to Jesus, later baptized Him?
3. What baby owned a manger cradle?
4. What baby was adopted by an Egyptian princess?
5. What baby was born to a woman who believed she was too old to bear a child?
6. What baby had Eunice for mother and Lois for grandmother?
7. Hannah's baby ministered in the temple with Eli. Who was he?
8. These babies were twin sons of Isaac and Rebekah. Who were they?
9. This baby orphan became a queen of Persia and a saviour of the Hebrew people.
10. Name the eleventh son of Jacob.

Could you figure out the answer to last time's brain teaser? Well, here's the answer: 56 chickens, 3 cows, 41 sheep.

And how did you do on the Anagrams? Let's see!

1. d	4. h	7. l	10. b
2. k	5. j	8. i	11. f
3. e	6. a	9. c	12. g

Did you get them all right? Some of them were tricky, weren't they?

You're waiting, I know, for the results of our "Best Day in 1975" story contest. The stories I received are very good, and next time we will announce the WINNER!

Bye for now, Busy Beavers. Keep up the good work!

With love from your
Aunt Betty.