

# The COVENANTER WITNESS



A CHRISTIAN MESSAGE FROM GOD'S WORD TO A MODERN WORLD

VOLUME XXIV

WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 1940

NUMBER 19

## *Christian Liberty*



Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty. II Cor. 3:17b.

The life urge of man is for freedom; but absolute freedom is both impossible and absurd. There are the rights of others and the claims of God to be considered. One may take the attitude that he neither fears God nor regards man, and yet in seeking untrammelled happiness he destroys all happiness—his own and that of those around him. Throughout human history external authority has been in conflict with human impulses. The Law says, "Thou shalt not"; human nature says, "I want to." The result has not been a high type of morality or a high degree of happiness.

This contest between natural desires and external repression has brought much unrest in society and disquietude of conscience. This is an age when the wisdom of freedom is widely challenged. Both the Fascist and Communistic theory of government regard freedom for the masses as absurd. Blood purges are the usual method of suppressing the desire for liberty of thought and action. But the desire for liberty is God-given and should be God-controlled. Liberty is of the very genius of Christianity. How can there be liberty and obedience to law? Our text answers that: "Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty." When the Spirit of God enters our lives, God's desires become ours. Since God's desires and God's laws agree, we are in harmony with God's law when we do our desires. This is how the Spirit giveth life. This is Christian liberty.—*Dr. D. W. Chamberlain.*

Rev J B Wilson  
415 31st St  
Beaver Falls Pa

Vickers or of Schneider? How could the Bremen, after being held several days by Mr. Roosevelt, slip through waiting British ships, then later dash from northern Russia to Germany through another British blockade? Was this vessel the property of the power-interests? The history of the power-system during the World War, together with the facts of the present conflict, shows that this war will be fought primarily at the expense of humanity, with the holdings of the power-system given first consideration.

When Germany tried to form a republican government, the democratic power-lords failed to cooperate; but when she came under the iron heel of Hitler, they gave him diplomatic support, lent him money, and sold him munitions, although he had already threatened democracy. While such action may seem inconsistent, it reflects the character of the power-system. To have aided the German Republic might have postponed the war, thus promoting the social welfare; but to give help to Hitler was designed to further the ends of the power-group. To lend him money meant high interest for bankers; to sell him munitions meant big profits for industrialists; and to give him diplomatic support allowed him to rearm, causing a general rearmament race. The democratic racketeers profited not only from Hitler's rearming but also from its effect upon the democracies. What chance had Germany to remain a peaceful democracy under these democratic influences?

However much the democratic power-men may argue that they did not plan for Hitler to attack humanity, they are responsible for giving him help. If they had given similar aid to gangsters within their own boundaries, regardless of their intentions, they would have been either discredited or sent to prison. To help an enemy in time of war is an act of treason punishable by death; but to aid an avowed enemy of democracy, thus hastening war, incurs no punishment. After double-crossing humanity by empowering its worst enemy, these men become the leaders in removing the menace which they helped to create. With the betrayers of humanity now acting as its saviours, what chance has democracy? Of course, propaganda covers a lot of perfidy!

Another factor in the conditions essential to the power-system is a totalitarian philosophy, signifying the subordination of the individual to the state. In theory it means the right to control the citizen in every detail of their lives; but in reality it is a principle whereby the few can the more easily control the masses. In Germany the Nazis are using the individuals for their own purposes, the sacrifice being made in the name of the fatherland; in the democracies the exploitation is done in freedom's fair name. All unchristian nations are totalitarian. If there is any difference between dictatorial and democratic totalitarianism, it is in the degree of regimentation, rather than in the right itself.

It is admitted, of course, that in the democracies there is a far better way of life than in the dictatorships. However, this does not prove that these ideologies are opposed to each other. In peace democratic totalitarianism is fairly liberal;

in war it tends to become repressive. The basis of this totalitarianism lies in three requirements. The first consists of forms of national worship, such as official, teacher, passport, and military oaths, pledges of allegiance, and flag salutes; the second includes various kinds of tribute, such as oppressive taxes, high prices, and low wages; and the third requirement is military service, with the regimentation of conscience to military orders. Whether totalitarianism is dictatorial or democratic, if unchallenged by Christians in its sinful encroachments, it moves in the direction of greater regimentation.

There are in all nations officials laboring for peace. However, their influence is over-ruled by the power-men. The determining force in democratic leadership consists, in part, of the following: democratic capitalists who helped Hitler to enslave Germany and to expand beyond Germany; democratic bankers who negotiated with the Nazis for business in the Sudetenland just prior to Munich; democratic pro-Fascists informing Hitler that Britain was not in sympathy with America's anti-aggression pronouncements; democratic officials allowing Sir A. Geddes, head of the Rio Tinto mines in Spain, to aid Franco in crushing Spanish democracy; democratic officials making secret trade agreements with the Nazis in violation of other trade agreements; democratic pro-Fascists preventing the Spanish loyalists from getting supplies abroad; democratic statesmen handing the Czechs over to Hitler in order to weaken French alliances against Germany, making France more dependent upon the above statesmen. Such is the leadership guiding the destinies of the common people in this war. If the war-machine through which the power-barons use the boys in settling their rivalries, requires them to violate God's laws, should Christians declare a holiday on morals for the duration of the war? Should they not rather support a policy of Christian isolation which challenges not only the competence of unchristian leadership but also its practice of making spiritual prostitutes of young Christians?

*(Concluded next week)*

## The American Revised Version

REV. F. M. FOSTER, PH.D.

It should not cause wonder that the publishers of the American Revised Version of the Bible are preparing to get out a new edition to change "*Jehovah*" to "*Lord*."

First of all the reader might be interested in a citation or two. The first is from Hodge's *Theology*, Vol. I, p. 486.—"It becomes apparent that *Jehovah* is distinguished as a person from *Jehovah*; and therefore that in the Godhead there is more than one person to whom the name *Jehovah* belongs."

Hodge Vol. I, p 495; "In the first place Christ is called *Lord* in the New Testament with the same constancy and with the same preeminence that *Jehovah* is called *Lord* in the Old Testament. This was the word by which all readers, whether in the Hebrew or Greek Scriptures, under the

old economy were accustomed to use to express their relation to God."

Note further—"All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made." (John 1:3). Alford comments—"The creation work distinctly belongs to the Logos." But this same creator is called in Genesis 1:1 "*Elohim*"—not *Jehovah*. This demonstrates that the statement by Hodge is correct.

Again—Benedict Pictet, Professor of Divinity in the University of Geneva, who lived after Calvin, and was author of a learned Theological Treatise, says of "*Jehovah*"—"The true pronunciation is unknown; hence some read—"Jahve"; some "*Jahave*"; some "*Jav*"; some "*Java*"; some "*Jhova*"; some "*Jehove*." Here are six spellings and pronunciations. Who knows which one is right? Probably "*Jehovah*" is as nearly the right spelling as can be reached; though none of the names given by Pictet has an "h" at the end. Probably it should not be there.

The publishers of the American Revised put "*Jehovah*" in the text as far as practicable. As "And Jehovah visited Sarah as he had said; and Jehovah did unto Sarah as he had spoken" (Gen. 21:1). In the King James Version, the word "*Jehovah*" is in both cases translated "*Lord*"; and, why not give the translation, instead of the Hebrew word? Other divine names are translated.

## II. Women in the Eldership

By PROF. JOHN COLEMAN, D.D., PH.D.

(Continued from last week)

As was noted a week ago, the discussion of women in the eldership has developed in some articles into an argument for the subordination of women in all spheres of life: one writer said, woman is a "social subordinate." I had resolved to stay out of this debate, but this point of view is too much for me: I must register my protest. I have been teaching in co-educational colleges for over thirty years, and can truly testify that in class the female of the species meets male competition without trailing. Also I have known preachers whose congregations said freely that the pastor's wife was both a better preacher and a better pastor than he, and I have known elders whose wives fulfilled the major portion of the husband's duties to the congregation.

But let us get back to the story of creation, where so many discussions of Biblical questions have their inevitable and proper beginning. In Genesis 2:19, 20, Eve is described as an helpmeet to Adam. The modern use of the word "helpmeet" involves subordination, as the helper of a carpenter or a plumber is a subordinate. This is not the thought in Genesis. The Hebrew, according to the literal translation given by Wm. R. Harper in the Hebrew text used in the Seminary for over a third of a century, reads "helper as-over-against-him." With this reading agree the Septuagint and Vulgate versions, both of which when literally translated read "a helper like unto him." In the English of the period when the King James Version was translated "helpmeet" was "help-

You do not read "In the beginning "*Elohim*" created." "*Al*" "*Alohim*" "*Al Shaddai*" etc., are translated. So should "*Jehova*" be. But in the American Revised it is not. This puts the Version out of harmony with the New Testament. In the Old Testament *Jehovah* is used, and for the same person *Lord* is used in the New. Children may think the reference is to different persons; and so may people older than children.

Just note how the New Testament would read if "*Kurios*" was not translated. "Come see the place where the *Kurios* lay." Or at the draught of fishes, the beloved disciple said to Peter, "It is the *Kurios*." Why not, if "*Jehova*" should not be translated?

At its anniversary, the Bible Society published a brochure with the statement, "The authorized (King James Version) will be the Bible of the English speaking people as long as the English language is spoken." Many translations have tried to displace it. They have dropped by the wayside. The King James' Version is the world standard of pure English. Its touchingly beautiful expressions and idioms are enshrined in the hearts of the people of God. However men may try, the word *Lord* will never be displaced, neither in the Old, nor in the New, Testament. The publishers of the American Revised tried it—and failed!

mate" and was used of equals. Both in Webster and elsewhere I find the word illustrated by the example of two animals hitched side by side to the same load, partners in the task in which they are engaged. One commentator observes: "The woman was *made out of a rib out of the side of Adam*; not out of his head to top him, not out of his feet to be trampled on by him, but out of his side to be equal with him . . ." Genesis finds no subordination *before the Fall*.

With the Fall came a profound change. The woman heard the prophecy: "Thy desire shall be to thy husband and he shall rule over thee." This would have been no punishment, had women already been subordinate before the Fall. There are those who look upon this penalty as a command, and feel it their duty to see that the woman is *ruled*, and endeavor to do it themselves. In the same passage it is said to the man that the ground shall be cursed for his sake and that it shall bring forth thorns and thistles instead of the crop he seeks by the sweat of his face. Is it a sin for man to seek to eradicate the thorns and thistles? Should we seek to multiply them in the world's fields? The subordination of woman to man and the subordination of wheat to thorns and thistles parallel one another. Genesis, in fact, gives more reason for maintaining the curse on the ground than for maintaining the curse on woman: for it is said that the ground is cursed with thorns and thistles "for man's sake" and it is not said that the woman is cursed with subordination for her sake.

(Continued on page 352)