Pro Rege

Volume 9 | Number 4 Article 3

June 1981

Creation and Sphere Sovereignty in Historical Perspective

McKendree R. Langley
Dordt College

Creation and Sphere Sovereignty in Historical Perspective

McKendree R. Langley
Associate Professor

McKendree R. Langley holds the Abraham Kuyper Chair in the Studies Institute of Dordt College. He is a Ph.D. candidate in history at the Free University of Amsterdam and formerly taught at Barrington College (R.I.), the Free University, Gordon College (Mass.), and Reformed Theological Seminary (Miss.).

The year 1873 was very important for Abraham Kuyper for some basic religious reasons which are of lasting significance for the entire Reformed tradition. In that year more than a century ago Kuyper published both a spiritually revealing autobiographical fragment and a series of important articles on sphere sovereignty. Kuyper's conversion and Christian growth were basic to his attempts to articulate a Christian theory of society.

In the autobiographical fragment entitled *In Confidence*, Kuyper explained his spiritual struggle with modernistic theological unbelief, his conversion to the Christ of the Scriptures, and the development of his Reformed world-view during the previous years. At the time, he was a pastor of the large New Church in Amsterdam. He was greatly alarmed by the general abandonment of ethical norms in church and society. The orphanage sponsored by his local church received spiritual guidance from both modernist and orthodox pastors. Kuyper was disturbed by this and by other manifestations of growing

*As the editorial to this *Pro Rege* issue indicates, this essay will serve as the basis for an introduction to the section of the Reader on societal pluralism that approaches the subject from the perspective of "creation and sphere sovereignty." This introduction will be followed by selections from Abraham Kuyper, Herman Dooyeweerd and Bob Goudzwaard.

theological unbelief in the Dutch Reformed Church while the defense of Scriptural Gospel of the historical Jesus Christ was declining. Likewise society was dominated by a secular liberal elite in politics, education, and business, which had no basic concern with God's standard of Scripture for belief and conduct. Kuyper then developed in this autobiographical fragment the outlines of a comprehensive Reformed alternative to the secularist relativism and unbelief in church and society. Above all Kuyper desired that the people be given the Scriptural Gospel which is normative for this life and leads to heaven.

Kuyper felt the three areas needing sustained reformation were the church, education on all levels, and politics. For this reason he had started the publication in 1872 of *The Standard* as an Anti-Revolutionary or Protestant Christian Democratic daily newspaper to articulate a distinctly Reformed position in society as a fundamental alternative to modernism and all forms of secular politics. Kuyper became a leader in the struggle to create and sustain a viable non-public Christian school system. He also provided leadership for the confessional element in the Dutch Reformed Church. On the most basic level Kuyper was committed to the spiritual antithesis between belief and unbelief in all areas of life because he wanted souls to be saved and the work of the Kingdom of God to go forward in all areas of life. With these basic Kingdom concerns in mind, this leader then decided which tactics would work in his situation. Tactics change from country to country but the underlying Kingdom concerns remain to glorify and obey the Lord in every area of life.

With these deeper concerns in mind Kuyper declared in *The Standard* during this period: ". . . a born-again person is one whose new vitality has entirely penetrated his feelings and thought including the realm of politics . . . ."[1] This statement is a clear reference to the integrative task of relating Scriptural normativity to modern life. This same concern was also expressed by Kuyper during a political campaign as recorded in *The Standard* on June 6, 1873: "The other parties campaign for *parliamentary seats*, more or less. We campaign for our *principles*!"[2] These principles were that the sovereign authority of God over all of life had fundamental implications for the way Christians think and act. Even in political campaigns Kuyper stressed that the most important goal was not winning office but witnessing to the common grace basis for life. Thus even in defeat the Christian can see spiritual advance by this means. Such concerns led Kuyper to reflect on creation and sphere sovereignty.

Kuyper's Statements

Abraham Kuyper first articulated the principle of sphere sovereignty in relation to creation between 1873 and 1880. Kuyper was aware of Calvin's contribution to this idea and he also profited very much from the initial statements on this subject by his spiritual father, Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer. Groen had related the principle to his understanding of an organic view of history.[3] Kuyper went beyond Groen in seeing that sphere sovereignty was first of all rooted in creation.

The young leader's concern to articulate clearly this principle was closely related to his political efforts to organize a Protestant Christian Democratic Party along Calvinist, Anti-Revolutionary and Christian historical lines. Between 1849 and 1888 the public life of the Netherlands was dominated by the liberal bourgeoisie. The Anti-

Revolutionary Party was formed to give the voteless Calvinist commoners legitimate influence on public affairs along with Liberals, Conservatives, Catholics, and, later on, Socialists. The liberal establishment resisted Kuyper's persistent attempts to create a system of genuine pluralism. But during his long career Kuyper kept working for this goal as editor of the Anti-Revolutionary daily newspaper, *The Standard*, of Amsterdam, and as the leader of his party. These efforts were crowned with success, for Kuyper became Prime Minister in 1901, and in 1917 the Dutch Constitution was revised along the pluralist lines advocated for decades by this man of action and vision. Every significant grouping in Dutch society with distinctive principles was thus able to have an impact on national life by means of separate institutions for politics, education, worship, media, labor unions, and the like.

In the beginning the secular liberal establishment was unsympathetic with Kuyper's concern to enfranchise the Protestant commoners by means of separate Christian organizations, including the Anti-Revolutionary Party. The task was a difficult one. For example, in 1875 the powerful Second Chamber of the States-General had eighty seats. There were in this parliamentary body 43 Liberals, 16 Catholics, 10 Conservatives, and 11 Anti-Revolutionaries. Thus the Liberals and their allies, the Conservatives, were able to govern without being concerned with the needs of the Catholics and Anti-Revolutionaries. During the decades of liberal dominance between 1849 and 1888, the prime ministers were either Liberals or Conservatives who differed in little more than the tempo of moderate reformism as seen in the administrations of the Liberal, J.R. Thorbecke, and the Conservative, J. Heemskerk Azn.

During this period the country had a population of three million; yet only 100,000 well-to-do men had the right to vote as part of the ruling elite. While Thorbecke recognized the existence of societal diversity given by God, he rejected the idea that Scripture gave norms for public affairs. It was on the basis of a moderate acceptance of the enlightenment principle of popular sovereignty that Thorbecke became the architect of the constitutional monarchy that emerged in The Netherlands in 1848-1849. This government emphasized ministerial responsibility, parliamentary supremacy, gradual reformism, and local rights. But Thorbecke resisted the rights of those who separated from the quasi-official Dutch Reformed Church to establish their own free churches, and he opposed the formation of Protestant free schools, favoring instead a public school system based on a "Christianity above dogma." He seriously underestimated the growing strength of the Protestant and Catholic emancipation movements. In sum, Thorbecke was a secular pragmatic pluralist with an elitist attitude.[4]

But this great liberal statesman did make it constitutionally possible for the fuller kind of pluralisms envisaged by Anti-Revolutionaries and Catholics to be realized later on. It was for this reason that when Thorbecke died in office, Kuyper's evaluation of his career was published on June 7, 1872, in *The Standard*. Thorbecke's contribution was seen as a mixed blessing in that he introduced constitutional democracy to the country without being able to see the place the Anti-Revolutionary worldview and constituency should play in national life. The liberal leader accepted the popular sovereignty idea while limiting its outworking. Because the late prime minister had the idea of a neutral sphere of public affairs Kuyper

concluded that Thorbecke was the Anti-Revolutionary Party's greatest enemy.[5]

It was in this struggle with the liberal establishment that Kuyper sought to provide a theoretical basis for his program for a social emancipation and a more genuine pluralism. As a Christian thinker of importance, the Anti-Revolutionary leader began to articulate his own position on sphere sovereignty over the years. It soon became apparent that his sphere sovereignty position was not a superficial attack on Liberalism but a fundamental statement on the structure of the creation in relation to the Creator.

But the Christian confesses that God as the Creator and Law-Giver has structured the creation with many different spheres, each of which has its God-given laws and task.

Therefore Kuyper published an important series of articles in *The Standard* during October and November of 1873 on "The Ordinances of God." The recognition that there are ordinances of God for all of life is the basic distinction between Christian and humanist views of life. The confession of these ordinances was termed the principle of the Anti-Revolution. All secular political viewpoints including Liberalism and Conservativism accept in principle the notion of popular sovereignty with man as the ultimate standard, even while they differ on the tempo of social change. But the Christian confesses that God as the Creator and Law-Giver has structured the creation with many different spheres, each of which has its God-given laws and task. Therefore he views the cosmos on the basis of Scriptural norms.

A clearer explanation of the diversity of the spheres was published in *The Standard* during the same period. The first series of spheres concerned the social areas of personal activities: the person and his conscience, family, city, and province. The second series concerned the spheres of personal expression: church, educational institutions, art, agriculture, industry, and trade. Kuyper emphasized, "Each one of these spheres has its own laws and terrain having a claim to rights and freedoms not granted due to good will but as required in order to obey its God-given internal laws."[6] (my translation)

In the series of articles on the "Ordinances of God" Kuyper developed his argument for sphere sovereignty in a simple yet logical way. He contrasted these creational ordinances with the betrayed idealism of liberty and equality of the French Revolution which caused peace and toleration to be replaced with war and intolerance. He made the point that in politics men must recognize that the fall into sin had made man unable to find the real truth about himself or society. But the creation has not been thereby destroyed:

> The recognition that man—the whole human race—was created by God leads to the inescapable conclusion: at the creation all the data concerning human nature was present which determines the political relations of the nations. Presuming that man had developed naturally we would have no quarrel with our opponents that the gradual progression of humanity would have enabled men to discover the Ordinances of God by themselves.
>
> We also admit that there are two stages (to this discovery). First, men think and then they discover the laws of thought. At first people are involved in politics and then

> they discover its laws. This distinction cannot be denied. Life comes first and then reflection about life.[7] (my translation)

This early perception of the distinction between naive experience and scientific analysis later became an important aspect of reformational philosophy.[8]

Due to the fall into sin the Christian statesman must engage in his on-going integrative task:

> It is the same God who reveals Himself both in the life of nations and in His Word. For each statesman the knowledge of the ordinances of God must be the result of a thorough study of the nations as well as a basic understanding of God's Word, not in a dualistic fashion but in an integrated manner resulting from his reflection, controlled by his conscience and influenced by his faith.[9] (my translation)

Thus the basic principles for life concerning the nature of men, of authority, and of the state are found in Scripture which then casts the proper interpretive light on the creation structures. But Kuyper emphatically pointed out that Scripture in itself is not a universal handbook for politics. Likewise he dismissed the theocratic legacy as an illegitimate appeal to the Old Testament. Hence he concluded that the churches should refrain from political involvement since it is not their task.

Kuyper was always concerned to distinguish this Christian social viewpoint from the popular sovereignty idea of would-be autonomous man:

> Authority, [according to the Christian statesman], does not originate in a human act but comes from God and demands obedience to God's will and not to a free contract. That authority is entrusted to the father for his family, to the rich man for his employees, and to the state for its citizens . . . . Yet God's authority remains and all those who exercise it are in themselves only common creatures and sinners as we are.
>
> That authority has no other limit than itself. Never can earthly authority detract from the obedience due unto God. But this authority can never negate the internal authority of the spheres. The state authority cannot interfere with the father nor the prince with the rights of the lower levels of government and the people on the spheres of their own competence. Outside of these two limitations, authority is absolute.[10] (my translation)

When Kuyper opened the Free University of Amsterdam on October 20, 1880, he addressed a gathering of many important public officials, clergy, and academics on "Sphere Sovereignty." This speech was a masterpiece of a logical yet passionate rationale for providing rights for various groups. The same basic concern to glorify God seen earlier is again powerfully present. It is one of Kuyper's most famous addresses and rightly so. His remarks were divided into three parts: the national, the academic, and the Reformed significance of this important teaching. The opening of the Free University was a milestone in the long struggle of this leader to introduce genuine pluralism. An independent Christian university symbolized the effect of such pluralism.

What Kuyper presented in this speech was the cosmic significance of the Lord Christ, the sovereign God over heaven and earth. The great crisis of every age is the struggle for and against

the universal Lordship of Christ. In antiquity it was Caesar versus the King of the Jews. In the modern world Christ stands against the secular humanism flowing from the ideas of the French Revolution. Thus the antithesis can be seen as the modern sovereign state challenging the sovereign Christ. Yet Christ protects true human responsibility by means of the creation order which He renews. He gives partial sovereignty to spheres such as home, society, church, state, science, ethics, nature, and the person. Kuyper put great stress on the coordinating function of the state, comparing the state to a complicated machine with many cogwheels. When one cog breaks loose it damages the proper functioning of the entire machine. The broken cog must be repaired and restored to its proper place. Kuyper added,

> Thus this State Sovereignty, as the power which protects the individual and determines the mutual righteous relations of the visible spheres of life because it has the right to command and compel, rises far above all of these. But it does not apply within any of these spheres.[11]

The state is not to repress the freedoms within the spheres but is to make possible the free expression of life within them.

Kuyper then turned his attention to the sphere of academic learning. Scholarship is a means to oppose the limitations to liberty. It involves reflection, a realistic perception of the cosmos and a coherent summary of what has been learned. Such scholarship is to increase wisdom, benefit practical life, and, above all, to glorify God. Thus, universities such as the Free University, should be independent of the state and the church, and should be supported by the pennies, prayers, and the love of the Calvinist people.

Concerning the Reformed aspect of the question, the speaker declared that the Free University was founded on the principle of sphere sovereignty, which was declared to be a Reformed principle based on the Bible and Calvin. Sphere sovereignty in scholarship contradicted the notion of academic and religious neutrality. He firmly embraced the infallible Scripture and the necessary work of the Holy Spirit as the bulwark against such humanistic neutrality. He called for the working out of the implications of the Christian faith for all areas of scholarship including theology, medicine, logic, natural science, literature, and history. He then uttered the famous words: "There is not an inch in the entire area of our human life of which Christ, who is Sovereign of *all*, does not cry: 'Mine!'"[12]

Dooyeweerd's Contribution

The Anti-Revolutionary Party faced another great challenge to its *raison d'être* at the end of the Second World War with the rise of the new form of personalistic socialism, which sought to replace the pre-war confessional parties with a large non-doctrinaire democratic socialist party modelled after the British Labour Party. Such a movement rejected the Kuyperian notion of the antithesis in favor of a pragmatic synthesis of all progressives to rebuild and socialize Dutch public life. Those who favored this "Breakthrough" were the Dutch National Movement, the Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church, the Dutch Labor Party, the Leiden professor Willem Banning, and the Amsterdam pastor Jan J. Buskes. Rev. Buskes put forward a powerful argument against the conservative line of the Anti-Revolutionary Party in the 1930s which was under the leadership of Prime Minister Hendrikus Colijn. Likewise

Buskes objected to the way Christian politics appealed to the Gospel to justify its goals. The Amsterdam pastor, a graduate of the Free University, disliked the association of Christianity with political reaction and conservatism. He advocated his own form of religious socialism and joined the Labor Party.[13]

It was in this stormy context of political controversy and the need to rebuild the nation that Herman Dooyeweerd, professor of law at the Free University, became the editor of the weekly *New Netherlands* in August, 1945. He remained in this post until May, 1948. During this time he wrote a long series of articles in defense of the Christian antithesis position embodied in the Anti-Revolutionary Party. Dooyeweerd had been associated with the party since 1922 when he became the Assistant Director of the Abraham Kuyper Foundation in The Hague, the party's research center. He had worked with Colijn and then, while a professor at the Free University attempted to construct a comprehensive Reformational philosophy for politics and all of life. At the end of the war Dooyeweerd correctly sensed that the "Breakthrough" movement was a fundamental challenge to the entire Kuyperian-Reformed tradition. He correctly detected the basic attack on the spiritual, academic, and political manifestations of the antithesis position.

With this "Breakthrough" in mind Dooyeweerd took up his pen in *New Netherlands* to examine the "roots of Western culture." A central part of his discussion concerned sphere sovereignty. He attempted to build on the basic Kuyperian perspective, purify it, and give it more philosophic coherence. He began the discussion about sphere sovereignty with the following words:

> The scriptural ground motive of the Christian religion—creation, fall, and redemption through Christ Jesus—operates through God's Spirit as a driving force in the religious root of temporal life. As soon as it grips a person completely, it brings about a radical conversion of his life's stance and of his whole view of temporal life. The depth of this conversion can be denied only by those who fail to do justice to the integrality and radicality of the Christian ground motive. Those who weaken the absolute antithesis in a fruitless effort to link its ground motive with the ground motives of apostate religions endorse such a denial.[14]

The antithesis was then linked with the creational realities of sphere sovereignty, which emphasized the distinctiveness of each aspect of life, and with sphere universality which referred to the total coherence of this diversity.

Dooyeweerd defined the spheres as follows:

> Created reality displays a great variety of aspects or modes of being in the temporal order. These aspects break up the spiritual and religious root unity of creation into a wealth of colours, just as light reflects into the hues of the rainbow when it passes through a prism. Number, space, motion, organic life, emotional feeling, logical distinction, historical development of culture, symbolic signification, social interaction, economic value, aesthetic harmony, law, moral valuation, and certainty of faith comprise the aspects of reality. They are basically the fields investigated by the various modern special sciences: mathematics, the natural sciences (physics and

chemistry), biology (the science of organic life), psychology, logic, history, linguistics, sociology, economics, aesthetics, legal theory, ethics or moral science, and theology, which studies divine revelation in Christian and non-christian faith. Each special science considers reality in only one of its aspects.[15]

After noting the difference between the ordinary concrete perception of reality and then the scientific analysis of the various aspects, Dooyeweerd referred to the social spheres including the family, the state, the school, and the economic enterprise. He noted that only the creational principle of sphere sovereignty provides the principial resistance to modern totalitarianism by exposing how it absolutizes some aspect of the creation. For the apostrate heart and humanist political movements seek to eradicate the boundaries between the creational spheres established by God. He cited the tragic experience his country endured during the German Occupation between 1940 and 1945. Later on he added:

> I venture to say that whoever ignores the revelation of creation understands neither the depth of the fall nor the scope of redemption. Relegating creation to the background is not scriptural . . . . Whoever holds that the original creation ordinances are unknowable for fallen man because of the effects of sin, does basic injustice to the true significance of God's *common grace* which maintains these ordinances. Sin changed not the creational decrees but the direction of the human heart. Man's heart turned away from the creator.[16]

Concerning the unity between the spheres Dooyeweerd emphasized that it was

> . . . the *religious root community of mankind* which fell in Adam but was restored to communion with God in Jesus Christ. This community is the foundation of all temporal, societal relationships, and on its basis the Christian religion stands in absolute antithesis to every view of society that absolutizes and deifies any temporal societal form.[17]

Some of the dangers which threatened this Christian view of society were historicism, Biblicism, and Barthianism. Dooyeweerd declared that historicism, which relativised truth, was the current idolatry. It was the idea behind the "Breakthrough" and a basic belief in the Western world. Biblicism was the misguided attempt to use Scripture as a handbook for politics while ignoring the creation. Barthianism was a theological movement which tried to deny the coherence between creation, fall, and redemption.

Some of the dangers which threatened this Christian view of society were historicism, Biblicism, and Barthianism. Dooyeweerd declared that historicism, which relativised truth, was the current idolatry. It was the idea behind the "Breakthrough" and a basic belief in the Western world. Biblicism was the misguided attempt to use Scripture as a handbook for politics while ignoring the creation. Barthianism was a theological movement which tried to deny the coherence between creation, fall, and redemption.

It must also be pointed out that Dooyeweerd was aware of weaknesses in his own tradition. This is evident from his critique of Groen van Prinsterer, of Abraham Kuyper, of the historicizing and conservative trends in the Anti-Revolutionary Party, and of the European Christian tradition in general. All in all, Dooyeweerd used the "Breakthrough" to demonstrate with vigor that its acceptance would lead to a "breakdown" of the public perception of the Biblical antithesis as the radical dividing line in all of life. Such an insight by Dooyeweerd is of universal significance. Even in the Netherlands the "Breakthrough" led to the secularist "breakdown" since the Anti-Revolutionary Party and the other Christian parties received wide popular support.

Goudzwaard's Perspective

This brief survey of the history of sphere sovereignty concludes with the work of Bob Goudzwaard. This important leader has had a long experience in economics and politics in association with the Anti-Revolutionary Party. Like Dooyeweerd he also worked in the Abraham Kuyper Foundation. He then served as an economics advisor to the party's parliamentary delegation. From 1967 to 1971 he served as a Member of Parliament for the Anti-Revolutionary Party. He then was appointed Professor of Economics at the Free University. All during the decade of the 1970s Goudzwaard served as an adviser both to his own party and to the new federation of the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA). Serving as the chairman of the CDA program commission was one of the most important and influential activities in his political career. In this post he was responsible for the development of the CDA election program for the period 1977-1981, "Not By Bread Alone." Goudzwaard was widely recognized as one of the most influential architects of the CDA political perspective and program. It should also be noted that following the elections in 1977 the CDA leader, A.A.M. van Agt, became Prime Minister of The Netherlands.

After his days in the Kuyper Foundation Goudzwaard became associated with the "radical-evangelical" wing of his party which was introduced by Dr. W.P. Berghuis who served as party chairman from 1956 to 1968. This "radical-evangelical" wing advocated the fusion of the three Protestant and Catholic parties (CDA) and a progressive political line in cooperation with the progressive secular parties.[18]

It is important to note that Goudzwaard's many articles and books over the years, including *A Christian Political Option* and *Capitalism and Progress*, articulated this "radical-evangelical" position. He has also advocated the continuing validity of the concept of sphere sovereignty, while warning against misusing it in a rigidly authoritative manner. He emphasized sphere sovereignty's call for stewardship that is mutually normative for both employers and workers.

It is in this context one must understand his "Norms for the International Economic Order" delivered at the Second International Conference of Institutions for Christian Higher Education at Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan, during August, 1978. This document advocates progressive renewal in Christian social and economic thought. Working from the perspective of sphere sovereignty, Goudzwaard has tried to radicalize the reformational philosophy and make it more critical of social ills. But in this document as well as elsewhere he is primarily concerned with the Christian view of economics.

Central to his concerns is the

growing gap between the rich and the poor nations, the problems of Western affluence and waste, the poverty in the Third World, the revolutionary movements, the questionable policies of international corporations, and the growing problem of limited world resources. He notes:

> Contemporary western society has developed as it pursued goals that have become ends in themselves. This becoming ends in themselves —among others in the form of serving the continuous growth of prosperity, the progress of an (autonomous) technological development, and an unhindered development of science—is somewhat related to the secularization of western culture and the accompanying loss of the awareness of norms.[19]

The goals of Western prosperity and efficiency then develop into self-protecting ideologies. Goudzwaard adds,

> Ideologies are forms of norm awareness that are goal-oriented above all. In an ideology norms and values derive their content from a pre-selected practical goal, whether this be the security of an existing society or the creation of a new, completely differently-oriented society.[20]

Goudzwaard then turns his attention to the economic sphere itself:

> From the perspective of the Christian conviction, it can even be posited that this world, as created world, is intended for listening to norms as the core of its responsibility. Only in and through the response of justice, of love of neighbor, of caring for nature entrusted to us does this created world reach its destination. When these norms are negated—which means that power, technology, prosperity do not "open up" to the service of God and the fellow man, but are given an independent existence as supposedly meaningful in themselves—this created world is bound to react adversely. Societal-distorting phenomena, such as the pollution of the environment, malnutrition, loneliness, and long-term unemployment, ought therefore, not to be interpreted in terms of fate that has struck, but in terms of failing human responsibility. They are signs on the walls of this creation that we ourselves have been weighed in the balances and found wanting. That implies at the same time the possibility of an appeal to ourselves and others. There are norms, and they are valid for everyone—for all men and for all cultures and societies.[21]

He then presents the norms for three spheres: the economic, judicial, and social. The economic norm demands stewardship which involves conservation, avoidance of waste, and urgency. Conservation means protecting the creation for the future. Avoidance of waste means saving. Economic urgency refers to acting only when necessary. The judicial norm, addressed to both the powerful and the weak, involves emancipation and the use of property to bring people together rather than to alienate them. Both the rich and the poor need co-responsibility. Emancipation restores the oppressed, enabling them to fulfill their callings. Property is subject to the rightful claim of the neighbor.

Basic to the social norm are participation and cooperation. Participation means that those to be affect-

ed by economic decisions should be able to influence those decisions. This participation has an element of co-responsibility because all people are created in God's image. Cooperation is necessary to bring harmony rather than discord and misery in economic relationships. At the end of his paper Goudzwaard applies these norms to the current Western attitude and practice concerning the Third World. He ends by discussing South Africa as a microcosm with all the problems between the developed and underdeveloped countries.

Concluding Remarks

From this brief survey on how the principle of sphere sovereignty developed, we should see its significance for Reformed Christians more clearly. If we perceive created structures of reality through the spectacles of Scripture, we can understand the task of the Christian in a secular world.

Abraham Kuyper had an intuitive perception of the reality of sphere sovereignty, Herman Dooyeweerd gave this perception philosophical coherence, and Bob Goudzwaard radicalized the Christian understanding of the economic sphere in order to make this Kuyperian perspective relevant to the problems of the world economic order.[22] Such development of sphere sovereignty occurred because Christians responded to fundamental problems at crucial turning points in the history of the Anti-Revolutionary Party. Such a maturing of the understanding of the implications of sphere sovereignty is of world importance.

Notes

[1]Abraham Kuyper, *Confidentie* (Amsterdam: Hoveker, 1873), pp. 3-89; *De Standaard* (Amsterdam), October 23, 1874.

[2]*De Standaard*, June 6, 1873.

[3]J.D. Dengerink, *Criticisch-Historisch Onderzoek naar de Sociologische Ontwikkeling van het Beginsel der "Souvereiniteit in Eigen Kring" in de 19e en 20e Eeuw* (Kampen: Kok, 1948), p. 93.

[4]P.J. Oud, *Honderd Jaren: een eeuw van staatkundige vormgeving in Nederland, 1840-1940* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1971), pp. 1-147; *De Standaard* (Amsterdam) May 11, June 1, June 3-29, July 28, 1875; L.W.G. Scholten *Voetstappen van Thorbecke* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1966), pp. 27, 46-49.

[5]A. Kuyper, *Ons Program* (Amsterdam: J.H. Kruyt, 1879), pp. 1231-34.

[6]Kuyper, *Ons Program*, pp. 214-15.

[7]Kuyper, *Ons Program*, p. 120.

[8]J.M. Spier, *An Introduction to Christian Philosophy*, trans. David H. Freeman (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1954), pp. 11-14.

[9]Kuyper, *Ons Program*, p. 125.

[10]Kuyper, *Ons Program*, p. 128.

[11]A. Kuyper, *Souvereiniteit in Eigen Kring*, trans. G. Kamps (Kampen: Kok, 1930), pp. 11-12.

[12]Kuyper, *Souvereiniteit*, p. 32. Kuyper later developed the exegetical and theological side of these principles in *De Overheid; Locus de Magistratu* (Kampen: Kok, n.y.), and the three volumes of *Pro Rege* (Kampen: Kok, 1911-12).

[13]J.J. Buskes, *Hoera voor het Leven* (Amsterdam: W. Ten Have, 1963), pp. 227-238; J.A. De Wilde and C. Smeenk, *Het Volk ten Baat: De Geschiedenis van de AR Partij* (Groningen: Jan Haan, 1949), pp. 734-37.

[14]H. Dooyeweerd, *Roots of Western Culture*, trans. John Kraay (Toronto: Wedge, 1979), p. 40.

[15]Dooyeweerd, pp. 40-41.

[16]Dooyeweerd, p. 59.

[17]Dooyeweerd, p. 47.

[18]C. Bremmer and M.G.N. Kool, eds., *Klein Eeuw Kleine Luyden* (The Hague: ARP, 1975), pp. 76-77; speech by B. Goudzwaard "Niet Bij Brood Allen," in *Vernieuwing en Samenspraak* (The Hague: CDA, 1976), pp. 11-19; P.F. van Herwijnen, "Dr. W.P. Berghuis," *Anti-Revolutionaire Staatkunde*, August, 1968, pp. 169-91.

[19]B. Goudzwaard, "Christelijke Politiek en het Principe van de Souvereiniteit in Eigen Kring," in *Anti-Revolutionaire Staatkunde*, March, 1977, pp. 63-70; "Norms for the International Economic Order," in *Justice in the International Economic Order*, ed. Aileen Van Beilen (Grand Rapids: Calvin College, 1980), pp. 227-28.

[20]Goudzwaard, p. 228.

[21]Goudzwaard, p. 231.

[22]Dengerink, pp. 159-61, 227-28; "Gerede Twijfel," in *Anti-Revolutionaire Staatkunde*, August, 1974, pp. 187-212.