

Christian Educators Journal

Spring, 1962

Vol. 1 - No. 3

CONTENTS

Teacher Education

Sylvan Ungraded Primary
Program

A Christian Approach
to History

Book Reviews

The *Christian Educators Journal* is published by the Christian Educators Association, whose members teach in, or are committed to the idea of, Christian day schools, whether at the elementary, secondary, or college level.

The general purpose of this journal is to foster the continuing improvement of educational theory and practice in Christian schools. Therefore, its pages are an open forum for the publication of significant articles and studies by Christian educators on Christian teaching. All articles and editorials appearing in it are to be regarded as the expression of the viewpoint of the writers and not as the official position of the Christian Educators Association.

Business correspondence concerning subscriptions to the journal or membership in the Association should be sent to the Business Manager. Correspondence concerning articles or book reviews should be addressed to the Editor. Subscription price is \$2.00 per year. Association members receive the journal free.

Editor: Dr. John A. Van Bruggen, Education Department, Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan

Business Manager: Mr. Nicholas Yff, 7496 Thomas Ave., Jenison, Michigan

EDITORIAL

JOHN A. VAN BRUGGEN

TEACHER EDUCATION

A news item from Calvin College reveals that several important changes are to be made in its teacher education program. This announcement is of special interest to our readers because changes in teacher education concern all the members of the teaching profession.

Modern Ideas about Learning

Changes in teacher education are related to and usually proceed from changes that have taken place in education. A professionally trained teacher is the teacher who has a broad background of knowledge, is well acquainted with the field of education, is able to profit from the best practices in teaching, and is able to use effectively the results of research in his field. As research sheds new light on the problems of teaching, changes in approaches to or in dealing with these problems are to be expected. And as such changes occur, the teacher education program must keep pace.

This does not mean that colleges for teacher education have to change their programs at frequent intervals to keep abreast of the latest in educational research. It does mean, however, that they must follow established trends and adapt their programs to the needs of the teachers.

The changes that have taken place in teaching methodology may serve as an illustration. For many years teaching followed the assign-study-recite-test cycle. The lesson was assigned, the pupils studied, a recitation period was conducted to check progress in learning, and a test was given for the purpose of evaluating how much had been learned. In this kind of teaching the major emphasis was on the material to be learned, not on the learning process. Training for such teaching included giving the prospective teacher a familiarity with the subjects to be taught that would enable him to parcel out the materials effectively for learning, in amounts not too great and not too small. It also included training in keeping the class quiet so that pupils could study without distraction.

But research and practice produced evidence that effective teaching involves more than breaking up a subject into small and isolated areas for learning purposes. Herbart's concept of the apperceptive mass led to the conclusion that learning is a process of integrating the new with the old rather than of adding fact to fact. The pre-test teaching of Morrison pointed out the great differences in the backgrounds (apper-

ceptive mass) of individual students; the differentiated assignment method centered attention upon the differences in ability of learners; the socialized recitation method revealed that students also learn effectively from one another if the teacher gives proper guidance; and the unit method showed that learning is much more meaningful and therefore more permanent when pupils can view the material to be learned in larger wholes and in its relationships rather than in isolation, and when they are given opportunities to evaluate and organize it.

Modern Requirements for Teachers

These changes, accompanied by the shift in psychology from emphasis on the fragmentary and objective to the consideration of total patterns and depth, have led to new concepts of teaching. The teacher no longer teaches, he stimulates and motivates students to learn; and as he learns, the student views the subject matter not only part by part but also in relation to the whole subject and even in relation to other subjects.

If teaching is to follow this new pattern, teachers will have to be trained accordingly. Since they are to deal with broader areas of learning, their knowledge will have to be extensive. They will have to know not only the traditional school subjects, but they will also have to see each subject in its larger relationships. And they will have to be acquainted with the areas in which modern day students have their interests and do their thinking.

Again, since great emphasis is now placed upon the learning process and every student brings his own particular background of learning and experience as well as his own interests to the learning situation, the teacher must know his students. He must know them well enough to guide their learning. He must have knowledge of their development, needs, and interests at different age levels, and he must know how they are, and have been, influenced by the social structure of which they are a part. In addition to this, he must also have a clear conception of the learning process so that he can give adequate and proper direction.

Furthermore, in the modern approach to learning, the teacher's primary task is to stimulate and challenge students to learn. This means that the teacher must be alert, creative, and imaginative, and have the ability to use on-going activities in the classroom to motivate further learning. It is obvious that such teaching is not everyone's business. Only those who have the required abilities or can develop them should be encouraged to enter the teaching profession.

Adapting Teacher Education to Modern Needs.

Awareness of these trends has led to considerable analysis and evaluation on the part of those at Calvin College who are concerned with teacher education. The result has been a re-evaluation of the entire teacher education program as it is related to the general purposes of the college and as it meets the needs of teachers. The following changes have been recommended. Some of them have already been adopted while others are still under consideration.

First, a Coordinating Committee on Teacher Education has been appointed. This committee is composed of representatives from the various divisions of the college. Their concern is the constant evaluation of the teacher education program, the broadening of interest and involvement in the program of all staff members, and the consideration of recommended changes.

Second, changes are to be made in course sequences. All education students will be expected to take a 30 semester hour major and an 18 semester hour minor. Prospective secondary teachers are to follow subject majors and minors, while prospective elementary teachers are to take their major and minor in subject areas.

In addition, the number of required general courses will be increased to include more science, more mathematics, more psychology, and at least some sociology. And the education student will be required to devote the first two years of his college course almost exclusively to general college courses. This will assure a better background of knowledge before the student concen-

trates on his major field or on his professional courses. It will also facilitate transfer from junior colleges to the teacher education courses.

Third, students will have to apply for admission to the teacher education program during the latter part of their second year in college. This will permit more careful screening of candidates for teaching and more effective counseling by members of the Education Department.

All of these changes are being pro-

posed for the purpose of staffing our schools with better teachers, teachers who have a broad enough background of knowledge for directing learning in today's complicated world, who understand the learning and teaching processes and the needs and interests of students well enough to stimulate learning, and who have enough creativeness and alertness to guide learning effectively.

Children need good teachers. We must do all in our power to meet this need.

THE UNGRADED PRIMARY PROGRAM

at The Sylvan Christian School Grand Rapids, Michigan

*WILLARD VAN ESSEN

Sylvan Christian School inaugurated the Ungraded Primary School in the fall of 1961. This program covers only the first two years of school after kindergarten. We will probably add the third grade next year. It was developed because we as administrators and teachers have felt for many years that there was something lacking in the traditional graded system in our primary grades.

1. With classes ranging from 25 to 30 pupils it was impossible for a classroom teacher to cope with all the individual differences of the boys and girls.
2. All children were expected to master the same curriculum regardless of chronological age, mental maturity, or state of readiness.
3. Children were different in their rate of learning, but no allowances were made for the slow learner or the superior child.
4. Children beginning the first grade were found to vary greatly in physical growth, mental development, and in their readiness for school work.
5. We felt we were not properly enriching our curriculum; every youngster was not working up to his ability; and we still had undue pressure on our students, parents, and teachers.

We were looking for a broad program through which we could meet all these needs. Thus, after considerable research and study of numerous plans used throughout the United States, we at Sylvan felt the Ungraded system had the most merit. We would like to present our plan for the Ungraded Primary School.

The Philosophy of the Ungraded Primary School

We as educators all fully realize that children coming from the same neighborhood, regardless of chronological age and similarity of background, may be quite

*Mr. Willard Van Essen is principal of the elementary grades of the Sylvan Christian School in Grand Rapids. He received his A.B. degree from Calvin College and his A.M. degree from the University of Michigan. He has been in the teaching profession for 10 years.

different in their learning potential, their interests, and their general attitude toward school. These children need an opportunity to grow continuously with SUCCESS in a school program that will adjust to their spurts and lags in growth patterns.

The basic educational philosophy underlying the Ungraded Primary School is that a child's learning program should be continuous and free from all pressures in the early formative years when continued success is so important and so basic to learning. We feel it is the obligation of the school staff to provide a program and a curriculum so that every God-given talent that these youngsters possess may be developed to the fullest. In our particular plan, failure and promotion are completely abandoned for a philosophy of continuous progress and growth. We eliminate any classification by grades and discontinue promotion at the end of the year. Each child moves along at his or her own rate of speed by way of levels of learning achievement. The basic props which these eager learners need and expect are time, freedom from tensions and pressures, space and materials for educational stretching exercises, and the complete understanding of teachers and parents. The basic foundation upon which these youngsters build their future depends upon these primary years of exploration, and absorption and enrichment of curriculum. These children cannot be sacrificed for an artificial scheme of rigid grade standards, traditional markings, and the lack of understanding on the part of teachers and parents.

We as teachers also feel that fixed standards and grade groupings which divide education into rigid steps are a barrier to continuity of learning in the primary grades. Often arrangements required by the school have made it more difficult for children to take the next steps in learning for which they are ready.

Also in practicing the continuous learning philosophy, it becomes clear that children should not repeat what they did learn last year, nor stand idly by waiting for others to catch up. Each child should pick up where he left off and move forward just as rapidly as he is able. In light of such thinking, the graded system of school organization becomes a hindrance to pupil progress and an impediment to good teaching.

If a school is interested in providing experiences for every pupil through which he may acquire essential knowledges, fundamental habits and skills, and right attitudes, and if this development is to occur normally and naturally in each pupil, then some compensation for individual differences must be made.

The Ungraded Primary Program

The first and immediate effect of the Ungraded Primary Program is the flexibility it provides in the placement of children. Children entering this program are given temporary placements according to their social and emotional maturity, and readiness for beginning reading. The decision as to the placement of the children is made by a joint conference of the kindergarten teacher, the first year teacher, and the principal. Professional judgment, anecdotal records and other pupil records all help us in determining the child's placement. If a child comes into the primary program from another school, placement is determined on the basis of a placement test and other observations of the child's readiness. This placement, however, is a temporary one and is subject to change if it produces results less promising than reasonably expected.

There is no predetermined span of time a child will work with one teacher, and the membership of a group will vary as the work of the group varies.

The educational program of the Ungraded Primary School is no different from the educational program which was normally carried on in Sylvan's traditional grade arrangement insofar as the content of the curriculum is concerned. We realize that there are certain areas in which we must expect mastery—certain fixed aspects of the curriculum that every child has to know or know how to do.

The Ungraded Primary Program is not a particular method of teaching or a departure from established methods long used by the Sylvan teachers. For the average children this arrangement is almost the same as a graded school would be. It is different, however, insofar as the rate of learning and length of time spent in the

various content areas are concerned. Certain demands that are made on a child because he is a certain chronological age or certain grade level are eliminated and are replaced with a continuous program of sound learning experiences.

The Ungraded Primary Program is definitely advantageous for the child who makes slower or faster progress than the average child. If a child appears to be a slow learner, he may need extra time in his level of ability in the Primary School before he is ready for the next level. His program then is extended. The child is never asked to repeat what he has already learned, but he is helped to adjust his learning to his own slower growth pattern. He is given tasks within his own ability so that he may achieve with success. Slow learners need more experiences with concrete materials and more meaningful repetition than is necessary with the average or fast learners. All the emphasis is put on what they can do, so it may be necessary for the child to take an extra year to complete the program, but they do it without frustration, embarrassment, discouragement and the loss of continuity which so often accompanies the "repeating of a grade" in a traditional graded setup.

This program is so designed to help not only the slow-learner but also the exceptionally mature and fast-learning child. Most of the children in this latter category are given enriching experiences to help their intellectual growth. These enrichment levels are so designed that they provide new and added experiences instead of being allowed to think of enrichment as being just "more of the same." Many of the enrichment experiences are centered around creative activity within the group.

Evaluation of the Ungraded Primary Program

Since we at Sylvan have been in the program for approximately six months, it is difficult to make an accurate evaluation. We have noticed, however, some factors of importance:

1. The Ungraded Primary is not a cure all. It will not solve all of our problems. But we do feel we are better meeting the needs of all of our pupils.
2. It is more difficult to teach in this homogeneous setting, and it is also more challenging. Our teachers are working harder and are more interested in the individual student.
3. Our students are relieved of many undue pressures and are happier and more relaxed.
4. Our students are scoring higher on the reading achievement tests.

In a recent questionnaire sent home to the parents of children in the Ungraded Primary Program the following results were tabulated. Of the 204 questionnaires sent home we had 163 returns:

What is your opinion of the Ungraded Primary Program?

Excellent	Favorable	Unfavorable
68	89	6

Do you feel your child is under pressure now?

Yes	No
7	156

Would you prefer to have Sylvan go back to the traditional graded setup?

Yes	No	Undecided
6	145	12

We as a staff are very pleased thus far with the results of the Ungraded Primary Program. We definitely feel we are saving more boys and girls from becoming learning problems. This program is another attempt to give our boys and girls the very best Christian Education possible.

A Christian Approach to History

*HOWARD RIENSTRA

The following article sets forth a particular view of history. With Prof. Rienstra's permission we have asked four individuals, known for their interest in the subject, to submit comments. Their contributions follow the article. — Editor.

In 418 A.D. Paulus Orosius, a young Spanish presbyter, completed writing a history of the world. This history, *The Seven Books of History Against the Pagans*, was written in response to an appeal from his teacher, St. Augustine. Augustine was then writing his monumental defense of Christianity, *The City of God*, and, since the talents of the master lay in theology and philosophy, he called upon Orosius to give the arguments from history. The result of the pupil's efforts, *The Seven Books*, merits our attention because it is the first Christian textbook on world history.

The historical event which prompted the work of both master and pupil was the sacking of the city of Rome in 410 A.D. Rome, the once proud mistress of the world, was now the humiliated victim of barbarian invasion. This calamity provoked the remnants of Roman paganism into a final attack upon Christianity. They argued that the Christian's refusal to worship the gods, the gods that had led Rome to imperial greatness, was the root cause for their present difficulties. The Christians were said to be irreligious and unpatriotic. Augustine and Orosius, however, were also loyal citizens of the Roman Empire, and they too lament the sacking of the city. They acknowledge that they were irreligious in the pagan sense, but they resent and defend themselves against the charge

that they were unpatriotic. Religion and patriotism were separate for the Christian of this time; the realms of Caesar and Christ were not yet confused.

Augustine and Orosius were loyal Roman citizens, but *more than* Romans, they were also Christians. *More than* citizens of a historical state, they were citizens of an eternal kingdom. This "*more than*" formula is the key to their understanding of past and present historical circumstances. The "*more than*" formula gives to Orosius's study of history that perspective which is radically different from that of his predecessors and contemporaries. The classical, and some not so classical, historians of the ancient world had a view of history limited by their own temporal circumstances and political loyalties. They celebrated the virtues and the destinies of an Athens, a Hellas or a Rome. They were without exception patriotic and nationalistic. Orosius is different. Orosius is properly called the first universal historian. His universalism is both possible and necessary because he has received a glimpse of the revealed will of God, because he has a notion of eternity⁽¹⁾, and because he knows that salvation, man's most dire need, has been accomplished in Christ. Thus he is freed from his particular place in space and time. Patriotism is no longer the highest virtue to which man can aspire. Morality is no

⁽¹⁾Christian universalism is assured by an approach *sub specie aeternitatis*. I have recently found the phrase *sub specie perennitatis* used to indicate the approach of modern non-Christian universalism.

*Mr. Howard Rienstra is Assistant Professor of History at Calvin College. He received his A.B. degree from Calvin College and his M.A. degree from the University of Michigan. He spent the 1956-57 school year in Italy on a Fulbright scholarship and is on leave this year to complete his requirements for the Ph.D. degree.

longer merely civic humanism. Political, economic and social systems are insignificant in themselves (Orosius's survey of the rise and decline of the ancient empires reveals the changeableness of all such systems). Even the Roman Empire was "good" only because it was chosen to receive the Christ, and not because its army was more powerful, its economy was more prosperous, its law more just or its roads better built than anything up to that time. In fact Orosius and other early Christians have shown us that the "goodness" of this Roman world was its "badness." Christ, the hope of salvation, came to an age which was confused and despairing. The intellectual and religious crisis, the hopelessness of the times came to be expressed in the gross immorality on both a social and personal level. The world was prepared for the coming of Christ by the "badness" of its condition at the moment of the Incarnation. The gospel flourished in a world which needed it so badly, to a world in which it was light in the midst of darkness. The distinction between Christian and non-Christian, between the realm of Caesar and the realm of Christ, between the secular and the eternal was consciously affirmed by the early Christians.

The clarity and simplicity of such distinctions have been lost to the Christian tradition since the time of Orosius. Distinctions which were obvious to Christians in a hostile, antagonistic environment were lost as Christianity came to predominate in society. In the Holy Roman Empire, for example, the Christian loses his sense of distinctiveness because his faith becomes a part of the social fabric and is enforced by the machinery of politics.⁽²⁾ Where would an Orosius fit during the years 500-1300 A.D.? This question is unanswerable, but certainly the things that made him distinctive and universal in the Roman Empire would now be the very reasons for his conformity to the secular and for his provincialism. The fusion of patriotism and religion, of the secular with the eternal, of the realms of Caesar and

Christ make it redundant to speak of a Christian historian during the Middle Ages. The scandal of the Cross has become social conformity.

The Renaissance and Reformation serve to reintroduce the distinctions found in the early Christian world. The revival of an explicit paganism put Christianity on the alert again and broke the bond between religion and patriotism. The political and social order was radically divorced from Christianity. There was not yet a hostility, but there was a mutual aloofness. Further, the Reformation reinforced this aloofness by urging all the distinctiveness of early Christianity and by recalling to man his essentially religious calling in life. Thus, both movements serve to reaffirm a concrete antithesis, and both thus allow for a distinctively Christian approach to history.

The French Revolution transformed aloofness into hostility. In the environment of the French Revolution and its offspring, Liberalism, there could no longer be any confusion about the necessity for distinctiveness for the Christian. The extreme and violent secularism of the French Revolution was clearly antagonistic to Christianity. But what of the relatively mild secularism of the American and English Revolutions? There is clearly an important difference between these revolutions and the societies which develop out of them. This difference called for a theory, and a theory is found in the idea of *neutrality*. The political and social order in England and America is called *neutral*. The antithesis remains for Christians on the continent of Europe, but not for those in England and America. The positively Christian political and social order was the now dead Medieval way. The positively secular is the now current way of Liberalism. That which is other than these is neutral.

Two separate groups of thinkers, Groen van Prinsterer, H. Dooyeweerd and H. Van Riessen in the Netherlands and R. H. Tawney, V. Demant and T. S. Eliot in England⁽³⁾, have been warning

the Christian that this presumed neutrality of the political and social order in England and America is a false idea. The place of 19th century Liberalism has been taken by Communism in our times, and nowhere is the correctness of the warning of these men more eloquently revealed than in the current wave of anti-communism. The distinctions of an Orosius are now blurred through compromise with the "only mildly secular," the neutral. That which has been called neutrality now reveals itself to be little more than a partial antithesis or a partial distinctiveness. The Christian is anti-communist, but pro-capitalist. The Christian is anti-Russian, but pro-American. He is both anti and pro for the same reason; i.e., because he is a Christian. The Christian detaches himself from one form of secularism, from one form of evil, only to attach himself to another! What is most often advocated by the anti-communists is not Christ primarily, but Christ as the servant of a particular political and social order. The distinctively Christian historian has again become an impossibility. What can an Orosius say? To be religious is to be patriotic, and to be patriotic is to be religious. There is no room for antagonism, for an antithesis, because the basis of it has been lost in giving religious sanction to the secular.

As Christian historians and teachers we must struggle to discover again the

distinctiveness of our calling. We are Americans, but *more than* Americans, we are Christians. We are capitalists, we are advocates of freedom and democracy, but *more than* all these we are Christians. We may even be anti-communists, but more than anti-communists we must be Christians. We must not allow the antithesis to be reduced to a competition between contemporaneous political and social systems. The existence of an Orosius depends upon a religious, not a secular, commitment. Perhaps the clue of Orosius is valuable here. He saw the "goodness" of the Roman world to be its "badness." His understanding of the revealed will of God, of the purposes of God in history, gave him this insight. Perhaps we would do well to see the "goodness" of communism to be its "badness." Its denial of God, its uncompromising materialism, and its annihilation of man are clearly antagonistic to Christianity. Christianity is the "scandal" it professes to be in the environment of communism. But then also the "badness" of Americanism becomes its very "goodness." The seductive freedoms and comforts of the American way of life may well be a greater danger to Christianity than is communism. The Christian historian and teacher must transcend the secular, and must establish a view of history and current events in which religion and patriotism, Caesar and Christ, "goodness" and "badness" are kept properly distinct.

It seems most appropriate to me that an article such as Professor Rienstra's "A Christian Approach to History" appears at this time. Indeed, the wonder is perhaps that it has not appeared before. This is precisely the area in which I believe Christian teachers generally—and I know myself particularly—are least adequately prepared and informed. This article is a fine springboard toward that end.

Here is not an article for the casual reader, nor can it be digested at one short sitting. It is the kind of writing that requires concentration and thoughtful consideration as well as many re-readings. This is writing that stimulates, that raises questions, that provokes thought.

I hope we shall soon have more from Prof. Rienstra on this subject, not only because of the high quality and timeliness of the article, but because I have had difficulty in understanding some of the ideas presented here. The difficulty may well be one of semantics or faulty interpretation, but I would welcome light shed on my darkness. Therefore, consider these comments as seeking for light rather than criticism.

In the first place, I do not see how the Reformation brought about a divorce of religion and patriotism. Were not the church and state very closely connected in

⁽²⁾ That this is an exaggeration is the fault of practice, not of theory.

⁽³⁾ Eliot's *The Idea of a Christian Society* and Van Riessen's *The Society of the Future* are convenient introductions.

Calvin's Geneva? And where, more than in Lutheran Germany, was there a bond between prince and pulpit? "Cuius regio, eius religio," said the Peace of Augsburg. The prince shall choose the religion of his state. It seems to have been more of a synthesis than an antithesis.

Likewise, it seems that in Europe today there remains more of this togetherness of the sacred and secular, at least officially. There are no state churches, supported by taxes of all citizens, in the United States, but in Europe.

There is also a question in my mind as to what Prof. Rienstra means by the term "secularism." Does he mean to equate "secularism" with "evil"? Is being pro-American or pro-capitalist secularism and therefore "one form of evil"? I would not have Christ made the servant of any social order, but is it not true that democracy's greatest bulwark and real defense lies in the Christian emphasis on the worth of every individual because he is created in the image of God? Is it a form of evil to be in favor of such a system?

The main points of the article are summed up in a very meaty final paragraph. We are reminded that Christianity is a positive something in itself, a system of its own, and not just an argument in defense of something else. It is a system demanding a commitment, in faith, of one's life to God; it is not a system demanding a commitment of one's life to the cause of democracy or capitalism. I do not believe, however, that this means we may not defend our free way of life on the basis of Christianity.

The call is made for the Christian teacher to "transcend the secular, and . . . establish a view of history and current events in which . . . Caesar and Christ . . . are kept properly distinct." I wonder if this complete detachment from our milieu is possible. Is it reasonable to expect of the historian of today what was easy for a Christian in the days of the Roman Empire?

I do not pretend to have completely understood Prof. Rienstra's article though I have read it many times, nor do I think many people will be able to do so. Herein lies one of its virtues, probably intentional. It ought to serve as the basis of many discussions, the initiator of fresh, sound conclusions about our subject.

Mr. Arnold Koekkoek, A.B., Teacher of Social Sciences at Ontario, California, Christian High School.

Insofar as my colleague and friend, Professor Rienstra, is saying that Christian anti-communism must be rooted in commitment to our living Lord rather than in commitment to any economic or political system, we are of course in hearty agreement. This is the thrust, as I understand it, of his article; and the point merits emphasis.

But the doctrine of antithesis on which he constructs his conclusions raises questions which I do not think he answers. And this combined with his tendency, as an historian, to enshroud his thrust in (what is for me) a haze of historical generalization, puts me in mind of Mr. C. S. Lewis' famous Screwtape, who advises: "Now if we can keep men asking, 'Is it in accordance with the general movement of our time? Is it progressive or reactionary? Is this the way that History is going?' they will neglect the relevant questions." Which I think Professor Rienstra, falling victim not to his basic intention but to the complexities of his super-structure, does.

Granted, then, that we cannot over-emphasize the importance of keeping our anti-communism free from selfish interests, this point can be made, I think, quite without Professor Rienstra's saying that the ". . . presumed neutrality of the political and social order in England is a false idea." Nor need he add, "That which has been called neutrality now reveals itself to be little more than a partial antithesis or a partial distinctiveness." For such assertions leave "relevant questions" dangling high off the ground. What this "little more than" can measure, in practice or in theory, is *one* such relevant question; and to whom this truth is now "revealed" is

another. What a "partial" antithesis can be is a *third*; and a *fourth* lands him, it seems to me, in at least verbal tribulations. Read this: "The Christian is anti-communist, but pro-capitalist. The Christian is anti-Russian, but pro-American." Do you agree? Yea, so do we all. But read on: "The Christian detaches himself from one form of secularism, from one form of evil, only to attach himself to another." So, indeed? Think back, now: from what forms of secularism, of evil, does the Christian *detach* himself? I take Professor Rienstra to be saying: from communism and its Russian expression. Good. But, to what other form of secularism, of evil, does he then *attach* himself? I take Professor Rienstra to be saying: to capitalism and Americanism. Now in the climate of opinion under which we presently live, I make no insinuation. You will wish to re-read his paragraph for yourself perhaps.

And, then, if you come to the same conclusion, go back to his preceding paragraph for an explanation. Professor Rienstra is not bitten by subversion, but by consistency. For in this preceding paragraph he has said that the American political and social system is "secular" though of a "relatively mild variety." But "relatively mild secularism" is no less secular for all that, and when Professor Rienstra casts his lot against "neutrality," as he does, then he is obliged to take a dubious view of "secular" (which he equates with evil) American capitalism. Consistency is often acclaimed a virtue.

Perhaps he regrets, however, too rigid a consistency, for in the last paragraph he is asserting: "We are capitalists, we are advocates of freedom and democracy, but more than all these we are Christians." Yes, indeed, but if "more than all these," then at least no less. He must inquire, however, if here he is making statements of fact, perhaps to be lamented, or statements of approbation not quite consonant with what he has said before.

Professor Rienstra, and those who think like him in this matter, may hope that by the verbal concession of a "relatively mild variety," they can avoid facing directly and without equivocation the simple question: if American capitalism *is* secular, is the Christian then basically at odds with it? If so, then another very "relevant" problem would be the delineation of the theoretical and practical consequences for American Christians which are involved in this antithesis between themselves and their own political, economic, and social institutions. For it is not, then, the "seductive freedoms and comforts of the American way of life" which the Christian should oppose, but that "way of life" itself.

I judge that apart from the super-structure of Professor Rienstra's article, we agree that one can be anti-Marxist and thus pro-capitalist; that one can be anti-Russian and pro-American, *as a Christian*. That neither capitalism nor democracy is simon-pure Christianity in practice is a common-place these institutions share with all other human constructions—including also sharply anti-theological doctrines of history. The political "neutrality" which we all enjoy is simply a practical expression of that fact. How else, in this "mildly secular" America of ours does Professor Rienstra get leave freely and safely to teach, advocate, and publish his views?

Lester DeKoster, A.M., Assistant Professor of Speech and Director of the Library at Calvin College. Author of *Communism and Christian Faith*.

The Christian approach to history can never be discovered apart from the only antithesis in history, and which God Himself has brought about. It is the antithesis of Genesis 3:15, where God declares, "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, between thy seed and her seed . . ." History, which we rightly define as the unfolding of God's plan, makes sense only when it is viewed as a constant, fierce struggle between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent, a battle between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan, a conflict between the realm of light and the realm of darkness.

This antithesis cuts into every phase of life and the Christian considers it to be his all-comprehensive duty to "conquer" every domain of life for the Lord,—the personal, social, recreative, economic, political. For this he has been taught to pray,

"Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done *on earth* as it is in heaven." In short, he prays and works for a "heaven upon earth." He knows, of course, that God's kingdom will never be fully established in this world, any more than he will ever attain unto personal perfection in this life, but he strives for this, nonetheless.

the article of Prof. Rienstra fails to give due consideration to this divinely-wrought antithesis. He tends to set up another antithesis, one which exists between the realm of Christ and the realm of Caesar, between religion and patriotism. This is expressed in his "more than" formula. The same idea is expressed by the same writer in the September issue of the *Federation Messenger* (page 50) under the "in but not of" formula. But this idea is foreign to the Holy Scriptures. It is a false antithesis, one which in fact does not exist, and which can only lead to wrong conclusions.

Both the realm of Christ and the realm of Caesar are of God. There is no antagonism between them. Christ never considered Caesar to be his rival. The Christian must render to Caesar the things that are his, and to God the things that are His. Nor is there any division between true religion and true patriotism. The Christian, seeking to be a leavening influence in all of society, will be a true patriotic citizen. The conflict, the antithesis is always between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan. And the Christian wages battle for God's kingdom in all domains, the social and political included.

When one accepts the antithesis invented by Prof. Rienstra, the Christian's relation to government and society becomes both inevitable and simple: withdrawal, aloofness, isolation. What would a John Calvin and an Abraham Kuyper say about this? Alas, for too long a time Christians have been slow in bringing God's kingdom to the social and political realms. Shall we increase our failure with a subtle, separatistic "more than" formula?

Prof. Rienstra declares that "political, economic, and social systems are insignificant in themselves." Where is the Scripture text for this view? Is a political system that usurps the freedom of the individual insignificant to the Christian? Is a social system that destroys the family an insignificant thing? Indeed not. It may be so for Prof. Rienstra, because his "antithesis" is real only when the government lashes out against the church, when society persecutes the Christian.

The saved sinner is not indifferent. He strives for a *Christian* government, a *Christian* economics, a *Christian* society as much as a *Christian* family, a *Christian* school, and a *Christian* life.

The article becomes more confusing when Prof. Rienstra passes judgment upon both capitalism and communism. He expressly declares that both of these are evil, and he renders this judgment as a Christian. (Here he violates his own "more than" formula.) Without entering into a criticism of this judgment, we merely want to ask, And what does he advocate? Could it be some brand of socialism? (What else could it be?) What system has his religious sanction? He does not expressly tell us. Perhaps with good reason.

The Christian is an anti-communist, not because he makes Christ the servant of a particular political structure, but because communism is "the devil's doctrine, spawned in hell." It is the philosophy of Satan's kingdom, and the member of God's kingdom must wage war against it.

Rev. Harold Sonnema, Pastor, Franklin St. Christian Reformed Church in Grand Rapids.

I, as a Christian teacher, guiding my students in their study of earlier and contemporary history, am first of all a member of the Kingdom of God. I am not primarily pro-America; anti-Russia; pro-democracy, anti-totalitarian; pro-capitalist; anti-communist. Neither am I pro-Republican, anti-Democrat. Rather, I am pro-Christ and His kingdom, anti-Satan and his kingdom.

Therefore, as a Christian teacher it is not my task or my responsibility to indoctrinate my students in a democratic way of life. It is rather my mandate to guide my students in applying the teachings of Christ in analyzing history whether we are studying Communism, the American Revolution, the rise of big business, the John Birch Society, the American form of government.

Does that mean that I as a Christian teacher am not anti-Communist or pro-American? No, I am anti-Communist because Communism is diametrically opposed to Christianity and the Kingdom of God. I am pro-American because I think in the American system we have the greatest freedom to live our lives for God's honor and glory. I am a law-abiding American because I find the basis of my allegiance in the Bible. But I am frequently critical of American policy, past and present, because I find it to be in conflict with Christian principles.

I, then, as a Christian teacher understand that God's Providence is operative in this world, that it is in His inscrutable Providence that the world today is divided into two hostile camps of nations, those under Communist domination and those opposed to the spread of Communism and each side contending for the neutral nations. I understand also that empires and nations on this earth rise and fall, but the Kingdom of God endures to all eternity.

Kathryn Schuringa, A.M., Teacher of Social Studies, Illania Christian High School

Book Reviews

After the long day of teaching, with its countless incidentals, I enjoy the relaxation that a concise, readable book can give. Most of the books I shall mention can be read in a pair of 10 P.M. to 12 A.M. sessions.

Slavomir Rawicz, a Pole living in England, tells of his 3,000-mile escape, on foot, from a Siberian slave camp, across the Gobi Desert (living on snakes), over the Himalayan Mountains (without climbing equipment), to reach India and the agonies of slow recuperation. Four of eight escapees survived the epic trek. The book is entitled *THE LONG WALK* by Slavomir Rawicz, as told to Ronald Downing (Harper, 1956).

THE DEVIL'S ADVOCATE by Morris L. West (Dell, 1959) is a memorable narrative centered around the Roman Catholic method of beatifying and canonizing. Blaise Meridith, aging priest dying from a carcinoma, learns charity during his investigation of a claim to sainthood. This novel has very convincing characterization; it is as sympathetic and sensitive as Graham Greene's portrayal of a cowardly, drunken Mexican priest who, nevertheless, serves God — *THE POWER AND THE GLORY*.

All the worst connotations of the word puritan — pettiness, prudery, intolerance, severity, hypocrisy — are incisively exposed by Alan Paton in *TOO LATE THE PHALAROE* (Signet, 1961). Police lieutenant Pieter Van Vlaanderen of South Africa is destroyed as much by the arrogance and falseness of his background as by his own wrong choice: he is a powerfully-wrought tragic hero, and this novel has even more of the intensity and economy of the drama than Paton's other poetic masterpiece *CRY, THE BELOVED COUNTRY*. It reminds me of another work by Greene, a tragedy of pity also, *THE HEART OF THE MATTER*.

Arthur Koestler traveled India and Japan in search of spiritual realities. His resulting observations, *THE LOTUS AND THE ROBOT* (MacMillan, 1961), is the most fascinating and example-filled book I have yet read on Oriental cultures, customs, and cultus. But Koestler returned, disillusioned, to Europe: "... the hubris of rationalism is matched by the hubris of irrationality, and the messianic arrogance of the Christian crusader is matched by the Yogi's arrogant attitude of detachment towards human suffering." He concludes "that neither Yoga, Zen, nor any other Asian form of mysticism has any significant advice to offer."

THE CUP OF FURY by Upton Sinclair (Channel Press, 1956) is autobiographical experience. Sinclair has written more than sixty books; one of his best as a social propagandist is *THE JUNGLE*, which deals with the corruption of the Chicago meat-packing industries, and resulted in corrective legislation. *The Cup of*

Fury highlights his lifelong crusade against alcohol — the curse that destroyed seventy-five of his friends and associates, including Stephen Crane, Theodore Dreiser, Scott Fitzgerald, Jack London, Sherwood Anderson, Hart Crane, and Dylan Thomas.

A 1960 compilation of essays by C. S. Lewis is *THE WORLD'S LAST NIGHT*. A few titles are: "*Lilies That Fester*," "*Good Work and Good Works*," and "*The Efficacy of Prayer*." One quotation from the last-mentioned essay: "It is not really stranger, nor less strange, that my prayers should affect the course of events than that my other actions should do so."

Mass evangelism and mechanized techniques may defeat personal witness. *THE GOSPEL BLIMP* by Joseph Bayly (Vanguard Press, 1960) is a highly amusing, yet profoundly sobering satire on means of introducing one's neighbor to Christ the Savior.

Finally, it is time to re-read George Orwell's frightening anti-communist novel 1984, and his delightfully satiric fantasy, *ANIMAL FARM*.

Merle Meeter, M.A., Teacher of English, Lynden Christian High School.

* * *

Grace Irwin, *IN LITTLE PLACE*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1959.

Grace Irwin's first two novels, *LEAST OF ALL SAINTS* (1957) and its sequel, *ANDREW CONNINGTON* (1958), are noted for their sincere consideration of Christian living in a contemporary world. In these novels Miss Irwin presents the spiritual life of her characters convincingly and realistically, not sentimentally. Miss Irwin's third novel, *IN LITTLE PLACE*, is written with similar conviction and honesty.

The subject of this novel is centered in education, an area of life that is very dear to Miss Irwin, Head of the Classics Department at the Humberstone Collegiate Institute in Toronto. Miss Irwin considers teaching in a way that is interesting and informative, enlightening and educational. In her preface to *In Little Place* Miss Irwin admits that resemblance of persons and actions in the book to those in real life is not purely coincidental, and her voice in the novel, Aran Waring, is a teacher not unlike Miss Irwin in interest, background, temperament, and talent.

Aran Waring teaches in a large Toronto high school, and her experiences of a few months form the plot of the novel. Her reactions to joys, sorrows, challenges, and frustrations make her believable and likeable. She is presented realistically, not idealistically, although she does have strong ideals and often voices them. Aran's convictions on teachers and teaching, educationalists and education, pupils and people, life and love reflect thought and in turn demand thought.

Miss Irwin weaves an interesting story around Aran Waring. However, this novel is more than an interesting story, for from her little place Aran expresses sound philosophical thought concerning education as well as sincere emotions and feelings about teaching. Miss Irwin, through Miss Waring, is concerned about a trend toward conformity in modern education, and a lack of traditional values in contemporary life. Her concern is heightened by the conflicts of a former pupil who confides both weak ambitions and strong ideals to Aran; contrasts are noted between status seekers on the staff and dedicated teachers; the conflict is openly aired in a panel discussion where Aran expresses her views of education. She lashes out at democracy in education if it means "lowering standards, raising marks, providing substitute subjects, indefinitely lengthening the period of time during which credits can be obtained." She suggests that "in the sciences, the humanities, it is almost sacrilege to say that methodology is of any importance at all compared with love of one's subject and a warm desire to impart it." And with feeling she adds, "I teach: because the subjects I teach have enriched my life and I want to pass on that enrichment. And the teachers for whom I thank God are those who knew and loved what they taught and transmitted that feeling, together with much that was not on the curriculum." Aran resolves the conflicts in her own life by the decision she makes with respect to her little place of teaching, and the reader feels that Aran will continue to be more than concerned about the conflicts of education.

Miss Irwin presents her feelings for traditional education emphatically in this novel. Yet, she speaks sincerely and with conviction. The reader, and especially

the reader who is vitally interested in education, will find himself thinking through her thoughts, agreeing or disagreeing with her principles, responding violently, enthusiastically, or calmly to her ideas, but responding.

One responds to the novel because Miss Irwin is an artist and is able to arouse interest, stir imagination, and provoke thought. Moreover, since the novel *In Little Place* is a quality novel by a Christian, it gives a unique and deeper insight into the concrete nature of the relationship between a Christian and his world.

Mrs. Marie Hook, A.B., Teacher of Grade 5, Seymour Christian School.

* * *

Cornelius Jaarsma, *HUMAN DEVELOPMENT, LEARNING AND TEACHING* Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

A commendable effort to synthesize current personality theory, research in educational psychology, and pedagogical theory and practice has appeared in the latest work from the pen of Calvin's Dr. Jaarsma. It is especially commendable in that no one previously has made as thorough an attempt to evaluate what is usable in current research in the light of a Biblical approach to human nature with relevance to the area of Christian teaching. It is gratifying to find the author making clear the philosophic and religious criteria under which he proposes to proceed. It is equally gratifying to find him using these criteria as the basis of his criticism of personality theories, educational theories and practices.

The book is intended as a student text, and many of its features are peculiar to that purpose. The use of but few footnotes makes reading easy. There are some 10 diagrams and four tables, a useful glossary, brief bibliography, and an index. Each chapter concludes with questions for study and discussion, except chapters 11-16, and chapter 18. There are a number of case studies, some too brief to be really meaningful. All in all this book is well designed for its stated purpose as a textbook, although one could wish for a more adequate bibliography and an amplified index.

In a task that is already probably somewhat too wide in scope I suppose that one should not chide the author for omissions but rather one should concentrate on his positive contributions. However it is a somewhat serious gap in Dr. Jaarsma's approach, if he is going to posit a biblical anthropology, that more reference is not made to a number of current theories of human nature. I refer here to the work of Mowrer, the group largely represented in the magazine, "Pastoral Psychology," the logotherapy of Frankl, and the existentialists. The same general criticism would apply also to the bibliography. I feel that the brevity of his discussion of varied personality theories is too confusing unless there is some previous sophistication with respect to the field.

However these are minor criticisms of a work that makes a very serious effort to bring together the acceptable results of varied disciplines. It is my conviction that Dr. Jaarsma has done the cause of Christian education a real service. To evaluate his postulates would require a lengthy review. Suffice it to say that Biblical Christianity shines through his constructions, and no serious student of personality and education from a Christian standpoint will want to be without this book. It will be very valuable to the classroom teacher and the pastor as well.

G. Roderick Youngs, Ed.D., Principal, Timothy Christian High School.

—o—

Letter to the Editor

"I do want to make a comment on your last editorial. Along with the continued reminder for raising the standards of professionalism in the ranks of teachers, which is no doubt in place, it seems to me we should add a note of encouragement. This note sounds from the fact that during the ten years of Recruitment Committee activity, the total number of full-time teachers in our schools increased from 925 to 1,867 — an increase of over 100%. Besides doubling the teacher supply in ten years' time, the percentage of teachers without regular certificates has been reduced by 2% of the doubled number. This is actually phenomenal achievement . . . Even though we have not yet arrived, we have gone a long way in ten years."

Mark Vander Ark, Superintendent, Holland Christian Schools.

Comments by the Editor:

1. Your letter is greatly appreciated. It reveals an interest in the Christian school movement and in the success of this journal. Your letter, like a question or comment raised by a student in class, provides an opportunity to clarify what has been stated and to correct erroneous impressions.

2. The editorial was intended to encourage our Christian school people. The statistics you quoted were cited. The statements, "This growth is encouraging" and "Another encouraging trend" were used. But the editorial was also intended to warn that growth in numbers must be accompanied by improvement in quality. If we are satisfied with a two percent increase in the proportion of adequately trained teachers for a ten year period, it will take us more than 150 years to staff our schools with fully certificated teachers. We cannot wait that long. There are two reasons:

- a. Christian school supporters make great sacrifices for the education of their children. They are entitled to quality education. They would be neglectful of their duty as parents if they did not demand it. We must give their children adequately trained teachers.
- b. The Christian schools, like parochial schools, face a crisis. Federal aid to education seems inevitable. It will mean that more money will be spent for public education, and consequently the costs for Christian education will also increase to maintain proper standards. The Christian school supporters will then have to pay more taxes for public schools and they will also have to increase their payments for Christian schools. If our schools are to survive they will have to participate in Federal Aid.

We cannot make legitimate claim to Federal Aid, however, if our schools are staffed by a large percentage of sub-standard teachers. The antagonism against participation by non-public schools is already strong and vehement. Unless our schools maintain high standards in every respect, we aid the opponents.

Sad as it may be, the image of parochial schools that has been created is unfavorable. For example, in "How Catholics Feel about Federal School Aid," in *The Reporter* of May 25, 1961, Daniel P. Moynihan states: "By and large the local Catholic school is weaker than the local public school." And in an article entitled, "Protestant Parochial Schools," which appears in the Jan. 20, 1962 issue of the *Saturday Review*, Willoughby Newton warns against the free establishing of Protestant Schools because so many of them are of poor quality.

Our Christian schools, by and large, still enjoy an enviable reputation. This has very likely been gained as the result of parental interest in and support of the education of their children and of the conscientious efforts of teachers. But our schools must continue to merit this reputation *in every respect* especially during this time when they will be carefully scrutinized by enemies.

PAGE SIXTEEN

CHRISTIAN EDUCATORS ASSOCIATION
7496 Thomas Avenue Jenison, Michigan

Sec. 34.65(e) P. L. & R.

U. S. POSTAGE

PAID

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

PERMIT No. 93