



THE BIBLE
is our only infallible guide
TODAY
and every day

THE BIBLE TODAY

44th Year

OCTOBER, 1950

Vol. 44, No. 1

10¢ a copy

Published by SHELTON COLLEGE, New York City

50¢ a year

JESUS saith unto them, My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work. Say not ye, There are yet four months, and then cometh harvest? behold, I say unto you, Lift up your eyes and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest. And he that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal: that both he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together.

JOHN 4:34-36

THE BIBLE TODAY, published monthly from October to May, inclusive, and one issue from June to September, inclusive, by SHELTON COLLEGE, formerly the National Bible Institute, 340 West 55th Street, New York 19, N. Y. DON O. SHELTON, Founder, President and Editor, 1907-1941; J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., President and Editor. Entered (or reentered) as second-class matter, September 15, 1937, at the post office at New York, N. Y. under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Announcements



As this issue of *The Bible Today* goes to press, we are anticipating a larger enrollment than ever before. The school has been growing steadily in the

past years. The offering of a B.A., in addition to the curricula previously offered, is likely to bring about a considerable increase.

Friends of the school will realize that none of the Bible courses or curricula are being discontinued; in fact, far more Bible is being taught in Shelton College than ever before in N.B.I. The new program is deeper as well as broader.

We anticipate a great time of blessing during the Day of Prayer all day Friday, September 22nd.

The Faculty Reception for students and friends on Monday evening, September 25th, will be a time of delightful fellowship.

All of our friends are invited to the special Missionary Conference Tuesday through Friday, October 3-6. The Rev. Harold Commons, D.D., and Rev. J. Gordon Holdcroft, D.D., secretaries respectively of the Association of Baptists for World Evangelism and the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions, members of the Board of Directors of Shelton College, have arranged a program of unusual interest and inspiration.

You are especially urged to take advantage of the Tuesday evening Popular Bible Hour, 8:15-9:00 every week.

Plan now to attend the Thanksgiving Concert, November 21st, and *The Messiah* December 12th.

J. O. B., Jr.

The Philosophies of F. R. Tennant and John Dewey

By J. OLIVER BUSWELL, JR., PH.D.

A book of approximately 450 pages to be published this fall by *The Philosophical Library* of New York City. Advanced orders at \$6.00 per copy may be placed with the author, 340 West 55th Street, New York 19, New York.

Write a post card saying, "Please send me Dr. Buswell's new book by mail, collect." Give name and address. Postage will be pre-paid if your order is pre-paid.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Geneva	3-9
On Religious Freedom.....	10-13
Psychology	14-19
Book Reviews.....	19-27
Dr. Hall's Article	28
John Calvin's Works	29-31

Geneva, for the Faith;

Karl Barth Questions the Truth

By PRESIDENT BUSWELL

THE second plenary congress of the International Council of Christian Churches which met in Geneva, Switzerland, August 16-23, was in every respect a mountain-top experience. The full report will be found in the *Christian Beacon* to which I suppose all the readers of *The Bible Today* are subscribers. Mr. James E. Bennet, vice-president of Shelton College, Dr. G. Douglas Young, our Dean, three Shelton College students, Mr. John Dorsey (also of Faith Seminary), Mr. Robert Enslin, and Mr. William Ditty, and I were among the more than four hundred in attendance.

A MIGHTY REMNANT

My chief impression of the entire gathering was a feeling such as I imagine Paul had when the Lord said to him, "I have much people in this city" (Acts 18:10), or such as Elijah must have felt when God said, "Yet have I left me seven thousand in Israel" (I Kings 19:18). I did not know there were so many people in the world who discern that the truth of God is true, and that the contradiction of God's truth is false; yet here were their representatives from forty-two nations. I heard man after man, delegation after delegation say, "Our people

thought we were standing alone. We feared that the testimony of Bible Christianity might die out with us; but here are the representatives of a multitude 'who have a like precious faith' in 'our God and Saviour Jesus Christ'."

REMARKABLE INCIDENTS

Many delightful incidents took place. A native Nigerian, a bright student with five years of work in social science in the University of Paris, wandered into the meetings. A native pastor, a delegate from Nigeria, met him and led him to Christ. The student, whose father is employed by the French government, had a scholarship entitling him to two years of study in Moscow. After he was saved he no longer wished to study under the Soviet regime, and applied for admission to Shelton College.

Pray that he may be able to secure the necessary visa, and that we may be given wisdom in guiding him. Think how much he has to unlearn, as well as to learn! But God might make him a Saul of Tarsus among his people in Nigeria.

TANGIBLE RESULTS

There was definite tangible evidence of the accomplishments of the International Council of Chris-

tian Churches in breaking the awful monopoly of the World Council and its affiliates. Denominations from South America said, "If your representatives had not come to us, we should have been led blindly into the World Council, and into that socialistic World Church movement which flirts with the darkness of Rome. In some British colonies Biblical missions have been told that they must work with, or under, the World Council affiliates, or be eliminated. The British colonial administration office sent a special message to the Geneva congress saying that they are revising their policy so as to give fair opportunity to the Bible believing missions which will not work in conjunction with the affiliates of the World Council. This was largely due to the splendid work of Chancellor Arie Kok and his associates in the European office of the I.C.C.C.

The difference between the World Council of Churches and the International Council of Christian Churches may be summed up in a word: The former is socialistic and totalitarian in its tendencies, social, economic, and religious. It endeavors to amalgamate all protestant denominations into one ecclesiastical machine, and then hopes to unite with Rome and the eastern churches to form one World Church. It is for the "social gospel" endeavoring to save the individual by saving society first. The I.C.C.C. is founded squarely upon the Bible. It is against socialism economically, politically, and religiously. We would not, if we

could, dissolve important denominational lines; rather we defend our liberty to maintain our protestant convictions. Supremely we believe in salvation of individuals through the churches, as the Bible teaches. Only thus will society be really benefited. The I.C.C.C. does not take the place of the churches; it is a council of Christian Churches. If the Lord tarries, this will be a freer world for the preaching of the Gospel in the next generation, because of the efforts of the International Council of Christian Churches.

A SIDE TRIP — KARL BARTH

Dr. Young knew that I had hoped to see Karl Barth, but had thought it impossible. By considerable effort he secured an appointment with Barth for five of us for the Saturday morning which was free for sight-seeing. We have been warning against Barthian theology for years. I, for one, had just published an extended review of Barth's latest book in English (See *The Bible Today*, June-September 1950, pp. 261ff). I try to be especially careful and accurate in reviewing books with which I disagree. One may say, "We can read;" yet there is always a possibility of a misunderstanding, a slip, in some aspect of the author's thought. Therefore I welcomed the opportunity for a direct personal conference.

Nothing could have been more cordial than Barth's attitude during the two hour chat. We toiled up the steep road to the Pestalozzi cottage overlooking Lake Zurich

where Barth spends the summer. He was waiting for us nearly a half mile down the road.

"I have read in the paper of I.C.C.C.," he said, "But what *kind* of Christian churches?"

"We are called fundamentalists," I said.

"Fundamentalists!" he exclaimed in somewhat broken English (far better than my poor German), "Fundamentalists, you would like to eat me!"

"No," said Francis Schaeffer, "That would defeat our purpose; we wish to talk with you." And we all had a good laugh.

For brevity I summarized my questions under four headings, all matters referred to in my recent review of his "Dogmatics in Outline": The Doctrine of (1) the Trinity, (2) time, (3) truth, and (4) the infallibility of the Bible. In all these fields we were convinced that we have *not* misunderstood the man or misrepresented his theology.

It should be stated that in the following report, and above, words in quotation marks are given freely from memory. They are accurate in substance.

THE TRINITY

On the Trinity, Barth: "The eastern church had a tendency toward tritheism, while the western church, as in Augustine, had a tendency toward Sabellianism [the view that there is only one person in the Godhead]. So my theology could be called Sabellian."

Dr. Peter Stam: "Then when Jesus prayed to the Father, and spoke objectively of the Spirit, you hold that God was talking to Himself?"

Barth: "Yes. In the nature of God the difference between subject and object disappears."

Buswell: "But when we lose the distinction between subject and object we predicate nothing, we cease to think. Is your view not a form of mysticism?"

Barth: "You may call it mysticism; in God the subject-object distinction ceases to exist."

Schaeffer and Buswell: "Is the historical Jesus then numerically identical with Deity, the Second Person of the Godhead?"

Barth, very positively: "Yes."

In his writing he says things quite inconsistent with this, distinguishing between the historical Jesus and the Christ (see the review afore referred to), but he cares little for consistency and he had just committed himself to Sabellianism, which holds that the man who died on the cross was numerically identical with God the Father.

Buswell: "How then could you say that Christ is produced by the Father, and that the Spirit is produced by the Father and the Son? Is that not Arianism?"

Barth: "Athanasius [the great defender of the Deity of Christ] taught that the Son is begotten in eternity by the Father."

Then followed a discussion in which we endeavored to show that the word "only begotten" as Athanasius used it simply denotes the eternal filial relationship, and does not in any sense denote that the Son was "produced by" the Father,—a thought which Athanasius strongly denies. But Barth clung to a literal use of the word "begotten," in the sense of "produced."

THE DOCTRINE OF TIME

On the doctrine of time, question: "We seem to read in your writings that God created the world in the first century A.D. Did you mean that? Or did we misunderstand?"

Barth: "Certainly. God created the world in Christ in the first century A.D."

In his "Dogmatics in Outline" he even says that the church looks forward in hope to the return of Christ, which took place long ago in history. Those who remember the Hegelian *Negativitat* will remember that, for Hegelian absolute idealism, what we common mortals call "time" is unreal. Barth's theology is properly called "dialectic" in the Hegelian sense.

Question: "We seem to read that the sinner does not exist in God's time. Is that really your opinion?"

Barth: "Certainly. The sinner could not exist in God's time."

Question: "Then how can the Atonement of Christ, which took place in God's time, apply to me, the sinner?"

To this there was a shrug, but no answer.

THE DOCTRINE OF TRUTH

On the doctrine of truth, Barth: "Christ is the truth."

Answer: "That sounds well, but does the word 'truth' mean anything? Or might you as well say 'Christ is X' or any unintelligible syllable? Can you give us your definition of truth?"

Barth, emphatically: "Christ is the truth."

Schaeffer: "But it is not the same Christ. The Christ of the Bible came 'to bear witness unto the truth.' The truth is something objective to Him."

Buswell: "If anyone said that there could be a Euclidian circle of which the circumference does not equal 2 pi r, we should say he does *not* speak the truth. Would you agree? For us the truth is derived from the character of God, not something external, to which He is subject, but of His character, so that 'it is impossible for God to lie.' (Hebrews 6:18) If one declares that c does not equal 2 pi r, he denies the truth, denies the very character of God. Is that your view?"

Barth: "No. Euclidian geometry is to be regarded as a social convention, not necessarily true."

THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE BIBLE

Barth: "Christ is the Word of God; how could the Bible be the Word of God?"

Buswell: "That is punning! Christ is the Word of God, *Logos Theou*, as a person; the Bible is the Word of God, *Rema Theou*, as a book."

Barth: "Oh, I see, two different senses of the word. But how is the Bible true? It tells of Christ; Christ is the truth [still a meaningless word]; so it is true. But you do not believe that a rabbit chews the cud?"

Bennet: "The word translated 'hare' is used only twice, and we are not certain that it refers to a rabbit."

Young: "Moses does not refer to the animal's stomach, but to the way it chews, the motion of its jaws."

Buswell: "We might say that a rabbit chews the cud in Hebrew, but the English translation is misleading. We must recognize truth in its context in discourse. 'Twelve-thirty' is true, out in the fields; 'twelve-thirty one and a half' is required if one is just running for a train; but anything short of the hundredth part of a second would be untrue in an astronomical observatory. Every part of the Bible is true in its grammatico historical setting."

Barth: "Oh, I see, you are bibliocists; you know everything!"

Answer: "No, we know nothing in ourselves, but we know that this book is true."

NATURAL EVIDENCES

Question: "You seem to reject the ordinary evidences from nature

for the existence of God. This appears to us to be contrary to Romans 1:18-22. Do you reject natural evidences?"

Barth: "After the first chapter there is no further reference to natural evidence in the Epistle to the Romans."

Answer: "Yes, in the tenth chapter Paul says 'But have they not heard?' and then quotes the nineteenth psalm, 'The heavens declare' and so on."

Barth: "Oh, yes, the tenth chapter."

Answer: "It seems to us that throughout all the Pauline epistles there are many references to natural evidence for theism."

SOUL SAVING WORK

Mr. Bennet described the work of the McAuley Cremorne Mission and told of the many souls saved, homes reunited, lives reconstructed, characters rebuilt, through the preaching of the Bible. He concluded, "And Professor Barth, the 'liberals' are not doing that kind of work."

Barth, very thoughtfully: "I know it."

POSTLUDE

We parted in the most friendly manner. Mr. Bennet promised to send him tracts on the salvation of souls; Mr. Schaeffer, to send his paper on Barthianism; and I, my review of his recent book.

The following correspondence is disappointing, but it shows the nature of the controversy in which we are engaged. On the one hand,

we believe that God's truth is objectively true, factually verifiable. On the other hand, Barth and his numerous followers reject logic, accept contradictions, and resist historical factual verification. It is passing strange for the party who wishes no more conferences to accuse the party seeking further conferences of having closed his window shutters. Professor Barth's letter is reproduced exactly as typed, except that the letters in square brackets were missing in my copy at the ends of lines at the edge of the paper.

Bergli, Oberrieden, sept. 3. 1950
Rev. Francis A. Schaeffer
Châlet des Frênes
Champéry

Dear Mr. Schaeffer!

I acknowledge receipt of your letter from August 28. and of your paper "The new modernism". The same day your friend J. Oliver Buswell wrote to me from New York, enclosing a review (*The Bible Today* p. 261s.) "Karl Barth's Theology". I see: the things you think of me are approximately of the same kind as those I found in the book of van Til on the same subject. And I see: you and your friends have chosen to cultivate a type of theology, who consists in a kind of criminology; you are living from the repudiation and discrimination of every and every fellow-creature, whose conception is not entirely (numerically!) identical with your own views and statements. You are "walking on the solid rock of thruth". We others, poor sinners, are not. I am not. My case has

been found out to be hopeless. The jury has spoken, the verdict is proclaimed, the accused has been hanged by the neck till he was dead this very morning.

Well, well! Have it your own way: it is your affair, and in doing, speaking, writing as you do, you may shoulder your own responsibilities. You may repudiate my life-work "as a whole". You may call me names (such as: cheati[ng] vague, non-historic, not interested in thruth and so on and on!) You may continue to do your "detective"-work in America, in the Netherlands, in Finland and everywhere and decry me as the most dangerous heretic. Why not? perhaps the Lord has told you to do so.

But why and to what purpose do you wish further conversation? The heret [ic] has been burnt and buried for good. Why on earth will you waste your time (and his time!) with more talk between you and him? Dear sir, you said, that you are feeling your-selves nearer to the "old modernists" and to the Roman-catholics than to me and to men like me. Just as you like! But why then not try the effectiveness of your "apologetics" in some exercises with these "old-modernists" or with these Roman-Catholics — both of whom you will find quit a great lot here in Switzerland and everywhere? Why bother your-selves anymore about the man in Basle, whom you have finished off so splendidly and so totally?

Rejoice, dear Mr. Schaeffer (and you calling your-selves "fundamen-

talists" all over the world)! Rejoice and go on to believe in your "logics" (as in the fourth article of your creed!) and in your-selves as in the only tr[ue] "bible-believing" people! Shout so loudly as you can! But, pray, allow me, to let you alone. "Conversations" are possible between *open-minded* peopl[e] Your paper and the review of your friend Buswell reveals the fact of your decision to close your window-shutters. I do not know how to deal with a man who comes to see and to speak to me in the quality of an detective-inspector or with the beheaviour of a missionary who goes to convert a heathen. No, thanks!

Yours sincerely

Excuse my bad English. I am not accustomed to write in your language. I am sending a copy of this letter to Rev. Buswell!

Dear Mr. Buswell!

I have read your review together with the paper of Mr. Schaeffer. Every word in my letter refers also to you. Sorry, but it can not be helped!

Yours

(Signed) KARL BARTH

New York, September 12, 1950

Dear Professor Barth

I am much concerned over your letter of September third to Mr. Schaeffer and me. First let me say we are protestants and agree with you in opposing all kinds of religious persecution.

Further, we believe that God's truth is objectively true and verifiable, and that what contra-

dicts God's truth is false. We spend far more time in reading and listening to men who disagree with us than those who agree. Thus we believe we may correct our own errors, and apprehend God's truth more accurately. Though we believe that the truth is really true, yet *we* are very likely to err. For this reason I should be glad to walk half way 'round the world if necessary in order to talk with an important scholar who disagrees with me. It is not we who have closed our window shutters.

Of course, we shall not disturb you further personally, but the "let me alone" attitude is impossible in the world-wide field of Biblical scholarship. You have invaded our theological class rooms all around the world. Your views on religious liberty are, we believe, sound and good and stimulating. But your views on theology are, we are convinced, leading young ministers astray in serious and important doctrines. We are very anxious not to misrepresent you, for the truth is really true, and if we bear false witness against our neighbor, we are false! Therefore, we came to talk with you.

We do appreciate your kindness in talking with us.

Very sincerely yours

(Signed) J. OLIVER BUSWELL, JR.
President

* * *

Next month, an article by Dr. Young on his European trip, including a report on the Dutch Society for Old Testament Study at Leiden, Holland, and visits to several European universities.