
Pro Rege

Volume 8 | Number 4

Article 4

June 1980

God's Ordinances: Calvinism in Revival

James W. Skillen

Dordt College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Skillen, James W. (1980) "God's Ordinances: Calvinism in Revival," *Pro Rege*: Vol. 8: No. 4, 24 - 33.

Available at: https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege/vol8/iss4/4

This Feature Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Publications at Dordt Digital Collections. It has been accepted for inclusion in Pro Rege by an authorized administrator of Dordt Digital Collections. For more information, please contact ingrid.mulder@dordt.edu.

God's Ordinances: Calvinism in Revival

James Skillen
Associate Professor of Political Science



Dr. James Skillen became a member of Dordt's faculty in 1978, having taught previously at Messiah College and Gordon College. Dr. Skillen received his Ph.D. in political science from Duke University. His dissertation is entitled "The Development of Calvinistic Political Theory in the Netherlands, with Special Reference to the Thought of Herman Dooyeweerd."

The centuries between the Protestant Reformation and the French Revolution were marked both by religious vitality and by declining Christian influence in many areas of social and cultural life. That might sound paradoxical. But the seeming paradox can be understood if we take note of what Christians were doing and how they were doing it during that time. At the risk of overgeneralization, I want to offer the following brief account or characterization.

Until the time of the French Revolution, both Protestant and Roman Catholic Christians possessed an outlook on life that was rooted in centuries of medieval tradition. Christians

saw themselves as *riding through history* on their way toward a supernatural destiny. The various social structures and patterns that defined their lives were accepted, for the most part, as the natural and God-given "furniture" of *this* world. The institutional church was the primary vehicle which carried them toward their ultimate destiny in the Kingdom of God. As Christopher Dawson explained:

... it hardly entered into men's minds that the existing order could be radically transformed. The European social order was an organic development—the result of centuries upon cen-

turies of unconscious growth. The family and the state, kingship and authority, the different orders and classes with their functions and privileges, were not artificial creations. They had always been there and had gradually changed their form under the influence of new circumstances and different environments. And thus they were regarded as part of the natural order, ordained by God, and were accepted as men accepted the changes of the seasons and the other laws of nature.¹

When the conviction began to grow toward the end of the Middle Ages that the church was corrupt and heading in the wrong direction, that brought forth tremendous internal reform efforts. The most visible of those efforts occurred in the sixteenth century and we now refer to them as the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation. The church had to be reformed, Protestants believed, so that it could continue to serve as the proper vehicle of orthodox Christian faith. Political, economic, and other social consequences flowed from the reform efforts, but those consequences were not the primary preoccupation of most Protestants. The major focus of attention in Protestant circles for the next several centuries was on the character of the church and its confession, and even that concern suffered frequent derailments into dead orthodoxy and hypocrisy.²

With what now appears to have been an almost sudden shock, the French Revolution burst upon the European scene at the end of the eighteenth century. One of the most striking revelations brought forth by the Revolution was that human beings do not simply ride through history, they actually *make history*. The Revolutionaries,

in fact, believed so strongly in their own autonomous power and freedom to make history that they thought they could start almost from scratch in doing so.

It is to Groen van Prinsterer's credit, early in the nineteenth century, that he was one of the first modern Protestants to begin to reflect with deep seriousness on the meaning of human historical shaping power in this world. He saw that Christians were mistaken in thinking of themselves primarily as members of a church that rides through history. That was part of the problem with Christianity as it had existed for so many centuries. The revival of faith during the Reformation, said Groen, "eventually expired in dead orthodoxy or hypocrisy and moral decline, and . . . room was thus made for unbelief to spread in, especially among the classes whose mental habits predominantly influence the progress of ideas. It is this

The Christian battle could not be carried on simply by preserving an orthodox church in the world, but would have to be carried on in politics and education, in journalism and science.

unbelief which brought about the Revolution."³ "What had become of the warmth and fervour of the evangelical persuasion, which earlier had borne so much fruit in deeds of faith? In its stead we find the spectacle of narrow superstition, or intolerant hypocrisy or fondness from mere tradition for forms of doctrine."⁴

Christians ought to see themselves as people called by God to *make* history according to His will, Groen believed.⁵ Only with such an attitude would Christianity truly live. As Groen gained insight into this simple truth, he then began to recognize that different, competing spirits were at work in the shaping of history. And the spirit of the French Revolution was at odds with the Spirit of Christ in all areas of life.⁶ The Christian battle could not be carried on simply by preserving an orthodox church in the world, but would have to be carried on in politics and education, in journalism and science.

Recognizing that God by His Spirit was calling Christians out of their somewhat passive journey *through* "secular" history, Groen urged his fellow Christians to reread the Scriptures in order to understand the responsibility that the people of God have to shape the history of this world to the glory of God.⁷ Just as a declining and corrupt church in the Middle Ages occasioned the Reformation, so the shock of the Revolution was one ingredient in the revival of Calvinism in Northern Europe in the nineteenth century.

With this issue of human responsibility for shaping history we confront one of the most important challenges of modernity. It is one thing for people to try to adjust themselves to a seemingly unchanging order of nature; it is something else to be asking how they should be contributing to continuing creative changes in human life. To see themselves as the makers and shapers of history carries with it important assumptions. The Revolutionaries held one set of assumptions: human beings are endowed with certain inalienable rights including the freedom to govern themselves as they see fit. Social and political life should consist of whatever free individuals make of those areas of life. The guiding principle is the

promotion of each person's freedom and autonomy.

That set of assumptions, as we know, has become the basic framework for thought and action in the modern world. Even Christians tend to accept that view of social and political life. After all, it seems pious enough to believe that God endowed human beings with sacred worth as individuals and that each should be as free as possible to live his or her life. The problem is, however, that this view of history and human responsibility acknowledges no principles or rules for life that do not flow out of the autonomous personality. Autonomy means that the "self" claims to be the only rightful "law maker" for his or her own life. Autonomy means being a law unto oneself.

The revival of Calvinism, expressed in the life work of Groen van Prinsterer and then of Abraham Kuyper, was a fundamental challenge to that basic liberal and revolutionary outlook of modernity.⁸ True human freedom and responsibility in history, they asserted, is possible only through submission to *God's ordinances*.⁹ Human beings cannot escape the "heteronomous" character of creaturely life. The true law of life comes from outside the human will; it comes from another—from the will of God. That is what "heteronomy" means. The heteronomous character of God's will stands in direct opposition to all claims of human autonomy.

The key to human responsibility in history, then, as Kuyper saw it, is not for human creatures to try to hold on forever to seemingly unchanging patterns of social life; nor should they launch out into the future with the conviction that they are free to create social and political life in any autonomous way they choose. Rather, human beings must give shape to an ever unfolding creation by seeking to respond obediently to God's ordinances for dif-

ferent areas of life. Moreover, this kind of responsibility is not simply an option that Christians may choose to pursue if they want to do so while they ride through history on their way to another world. God, through His common grace that extends to the whole world, is calling all creatures, His people above all, to fulfill their creaturely callings. The Christian life consists of *obedience* to God's ordinances, not merely an orthodox confession *about* God's ordinances.¹⁰

such things as the burning of Servetus at the hands of the Genevan government because of his heretical convictions. This alliance was something from which Calvinism had to be set free. As Kuyper put it:

The duty of the government to extirpate every form of false religion and idolatry was not a find of Calvinism, but dates from Constantine the Great, and was the reaction against the horrible persecutions which his pagan predecessors on the imperial throne had inflicted upon the sect of the Nazarene. Since that day this system had been defended by all Romish theologians and applied by all Christian princes. In the time of Luther and Calvin, it was a universal conviction that that system was the true one

Notwithstanding all this, I not only deplore that one stake [at which Servetus was burned], but I unconditionally disapprove of it; yet not as if it were the expression of a special characteristic of Calvinism, but on the contrary as the fatal after-effect of a system, grey with age, which Calvinism found in existence, under which it had grown up, and from which it had not yet been able entirely to liberate itself.¹²

Out of this nineteenth-century revival of Calvinism in the Netherlands we get one of the most helpful interpretations of the modern secularization process. On the one hand, Kuyper, along with many Catholics and other Protestants, was a vigorous opponent of secularization, if by "secularization" we understand the outworking of the spirit of liberalism which claims that human beings have no master in

God, through His common grace that extends to the whole world, is calling all creatures, His people above all, to fulfill their creaturely callings. The Christian life consists of *obedience* to God's ordinances, not merely an orthodox confession *about* God's ordinances.

Abraham Kuyper believed with Groen that biblical Calvinism could make a major, systematic contribution to life in the modern world.¹¹ But Calvinism itself would have to be continually reforming. Reformed Christianity was not a pure and clean package that could simply be protected and handed down through an otherwise corrupt and changing history. Calvinism had to be liberated from various unbiblical chains that still held it in check. Not the least of the bondages in which Calvinism found itself in Kuyper's day was the old Roman and medieval view of politics which did not allow for the legitimate unfolding of political life in accord with God's ordinance of public justice. In Calvin's day the unhealthy alliance of church and state had led to

history, no ordinances from God to bind them, and that they are autonomous in their freedom to shape politics, art, science, education, and all of culture. But unlike most Catholics and many Protestants of his day, Kuyper was a strong promoter of the secularization process if by "secularization" we mean the freeing of different life spheres from ecclesiastical control.¹³ Kuyper believed that politics, art, science, education, and other areas of life should be free to unfold in obedience to God's ordinances. Each sphere of life had to be free of direct control by any other so that each could learn obedience to God's special ordinances for that area of life. Artists must be free to obey God's norms for art; they must not be locked up into obedience to what ecclesiastical officials believe to be good art. Teachers and scholars must be free to respond obediently to God's ordinances of truth for the entire creation; they must not be under orders to teach and publish only what ecclesiastical office-bearers approve as scientific truth.¹⁴

Clearly this whole framework of thought presupposes that the open field of human action is not a field without boundaries or an arbitrary openness without limits. To the contrary, the dynamic, creative, supple character of human action is always either obedient or disobedient to divine ordinances. The norms are not created by autonomous individuals. Nor can those norms be fulfilled by some central, controlling authority on earth, be it a church, a state, or a multinational corporation. The development of diverse human talents reveals the true character of creatures who are called to action, called to response, by a multiplicity of creational ordinances or norms.¹⁵ God is the author of human creatures who cannot escape family life, who cannot avoid speaking and singing in complex

languages, who would not know themselves apart from intricate economic exchanges, who are driven to build amazingly sophisticated political systems, and who do a host of other things both individually and in communities. Blindness to the full, norm-laden reality of social institutions and organizations is due to an individualistic (nominalistic) predisposition that does not allow one to see reality. From the other side, every attempt to collectivize that social diversity for the purpose of economic efficiency, or for national solidarity, or for some imagined aesthetic or social harmony, reveals blindness to the same reality. Singing cannot be economically collectivized. Thinking cannot be politically confined. Family love cannot be submerged in ecstatic worship or in cultic discipline.

It all sounds too simple. It seems so obvious. But this view of life which we might call principled pluralism has captured very little attention in the West, and it has nowhere been more systematically articulated than in the Kuyper tradition, especially by those associated with Herman Dooyeweerd and D. H. Th. Vollenhoven.¹⁶ The acknowledgement of divine ordinances as norms for a diversity of social spheres is only slightly and occasionally reflected in our North American civil, criminal, and constitutional laws. Teaching of the social sciences in most Christian as well as non-Christian colleges and universities does *not* begin and end with inquiry about the character and demands of God's ordinances.¹⁷

But, you see, the powerful import of acknowledging God's ordinances is precisely that we must work at *obeying* them. In other words, we must shape history in accord with those ordinances and not merely ride through history proclaiming that they exist. The only op-

tion besides obedience is disobedience. Justice must be *done* by us, not merely spoken as a word from our lips. Stewardship is God's demand upon our farms and shops and corporations, not simply a word to be used for rhyming our Sunday hymns. Nurturing love calls our homes and schools to account; it is not just a term to help us organize our thoughts at prayer time.

Sphere sovereignty means nothing more sophisticated yet nothing less important than the fact that God is the only sovereign of this world and that *all* of His ordinances must be obeyed.

The power behind the idea of "sphere sovereignty" is not Abraham Kuyper's genius or some Dutch philosophical peculiarity. It is rather the simple but overwhelming power of God's voice speaking forth through His Son in all His sovereignty. Sphere sovereignty means nothing more sophisticated yet nothing less important than the fact that God is the only sovereign of this world and that *all* of His ordinances must be obeyed.¹⁸ Individuals are not sovereign; the state is not sovereign; the church is not sovereign. God alone is sovereign. And that God—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—calls His creatures to a host of different tasks, most of which can be fulfilled only in communities, through institutions, by means of organized societies, each having its own proper offices of authority and accountability.¹⁹ Thus, each task, each special human community, each peculiar and

precious association, is never simply at our disposal. It is guarded by the Sovereign and granted its own subordinate sovereignty in the same way that every sparrow of the air and every lily of the field is called into existence and guarded by the heavenly Father.

The individualistic and collectivistic humanists blaspheme God by shouting autonomy and turning their backs on the reality of God's creation. Christians violate God's commandments when they confess with pious voice that God is sovereign, but then cast their votes, buy their homes, sell their stocks, or run their schools and colleges by considering only the demands of the American way of life, or asking only about the requirements of a healthy profit margin, or looking only to the habits and expectations of tradition.

Dooyeweerd speaks of the power of the Word of God as the radical challenge of the basic motive or ground motive of the Christian religion. That Word "lays full claim on one's attitude to life and thought." It "moulds our view of history." It "unmasks today's dangerous community ideology and its totalitarian tendencies." The Christian ground motive of God's Word "posits the unshakable firmness of God's creation order in opposition to the so-called dynamic spirit of our times which refuses to recognize firm foundations of life and thus sees everything 'in change.'"²⁰

Consider the cost of taking this radically scriptural Christianity seriously. Ask yourself which side you must join in the tense spiritual battle of our times. Compromise is not an option. A middle-of-the-road stance is not possible. Either the ground motive of the Christian religion works radically in our lives or we serve other gods. If

the antithesis is too radical for you, ask yourself whether a less radical Christianity is not like salt that has lost its savour. I state the antithesis as radically as I do so that we may again experience the full double-edged sharpness and power of God's Word. You must experience the antithesis as a spiritual storm that strikes lightning into your life and that clears the sultry air. If you do not experience it as a spiritual power requiring the surrender of your whole heart, then it will bear no fruit in your life. Then you will stand apart from the great battle the antithesis always instigates. You yourself cannot wage this battle. Rather, the spiritual dynamic of the Word of God wages the struggle *in us* and pulls us along despite our "flesh and blood."

My effort to impress upon us the scope of the antithesis is also directed at committed Christians. I believe that if Christianity had held fast to the ground motive of God's Word, and to it *alone*, we never would have witnessed the divisions and schisms that have plagued the church of Christ. The source of all fundamental schisms and dissensions is the sinful inclination of the human heart to weaken the integral and radical meaning of the divine Word.²¹

The basic thrust of Dooyeweerd's comment is that Christians can overcome their accommodation to medieval traditionalism and to liberal/conservative or socialist radicalisms only by taking God's Word seriously. And that Word illuminates and spotlights the

creation ordinances for social life which we must then heed. His point, put very simply, is that there is no way to develop or preserve principled, structural pluralism in social and political life without practicing creative, communal, self-critical responsiveness to God's ordinances. Protection of private property and a free press is not sufficient for public justice. Advocating the rule of law, or seeking human rights for individuals, or pressing for educational freedom is not enough. There is no common secular tradition to which we can pledge our troth as Christians and still hope to have truly principled pluralism. It is not enough for us as a Christian community to work at developing our homes, churches, and Christian schools in response to God's Word while merely learning to adjust to the major political, economic, and media decisions being made in our society according to other principles.

The liberal/conservative tradition tries to build society and politics in obedience to a norm of freedom and sovereignty for individuals. It ends up with unresolved tensions between its sovereign individuals and its powerful governments.²² It ends up, for example, with both state and family claiming prior rights to educate children.²³ It opens the way for the moneyed classes to control most of the public law-making powers. It can find no way to give significant public room to small groups such as American Indians. It finds itself unable to clarify in public law the substantive identity and tasks of such basic institutions as family, school, church, business enterprise, and the state itself.

Just as pragmatically, the socialist and statist traditions attempt to build the social order in obedience to norms of communal solidarity, economic equality, or national security. Contradictions in these systems also abound. National unity is bought at the expense

of individual lives and social diversity. The diversity that does exist exists by the grace of the central government or ruling party. National progress as defined by the central authorities becomes the standard that qualifies and directs every occupation. The self-established norms of both traditions are blatantly substituted for the ordinances of the Creator.

It is not enough for us as a Christian community to work at developing our homes, churches, and Christian schools in response to God's Word while merely learning to adjust to the major political, economic, and media decisions being made in our society according to other principles.

The people of God cannot simply ride through a history that is being shaped by these spirits and traditions. And they certainly must not continue to accommodate themselves to these tension-filled systems and expect that God's ordinances will still shine through in their deeds to brighten a dark world. Christians have only one healthy option, and that is to take God's Word so seriously that they refuse to live by any other ordinances or by any other hope than the ordinances of creation and the hope of the Gospel.

Such a response will mean facing up to the shocking fact that the liberal/conservative and socialist traditions are facing a crisis of immense proportions today. The faith of French Revolutionaries in their own autonomous power to shape history by "starting from scratch" is a faith that is now turning sour for many. The

humanistic confidence that progress can forever be made on earth without obedience to God's ordinances is a confidence that is turning into despair. Bob Goudzwaard explains that:

. . . the theme of progress has penetrated western society so profoundly because it was able to present itself as a *faith* in progress, as a religion of progress. That is also why the present-day crisis of the idea of progress has the depth of a crisis of *faith*. There is more at stake than a somewhat reduced confidence in "progress" on the part of western man. His whole life perspective has undergone a shock. The unfulfilled promises of progress have brought about an emptiness, a vacuum, with respect to the *meaning* of life and society. Many among us even experience the demise of the idea of progress as a kind of divine betrayal. The very thing in which we had placed all our trust is turning against us to devour us. And what does one have left when one's gods betray him?

If this observation is correct, then we find ourselves at a very critical juncture in the development of western civilization. No society or civilization can continue to exist without having found an answer to the question of meaning. The emptiness created by the death of the god of progress must be filled with something else. But what will that be? It seems that we have two choices: either the vacuum will be filled by a new, awe-inspiring myth, possibly built around the leaders of a central and large-scale world authority,

who are authorized by their populations to direct all available technical, economic, and scientific means to new objectives with which to assault both heaven and earth; or else there will take place a turnaround of Christians and non-Christians together, a turnaround which directs itself to the Torah or normativity which the Creator of heaven and earth has given to this world as its meaning from the beginning, and which points forward to a new earth, coming with the return of the crucified One. Without such a turnaround I can hardly imagine a real and permanent disclosure of our western civilization.

Therefore our deepest choice appears to lie between an enslaving autonomy and a liberating heteronomy, or, to put it another way, between restricting utopias and the inspiring openness of the biblical *eschaton*.²⁴

It is not a matter of simple scholarly professionalism, therefore, that is leading those of us in the Dordt College Lectureship Center to explore the contemporary significance of principled pluralism for our society and for the contemporary world. Nor are we pursuing this project merely as a propaganda ploy to give visibility to some largely unknown heroes. The work of Groen van Prinsterer, Abraham Kuyper, Herman Dooyeweerd, Bob Goudzwaard, and many others in that line is no more finished and complete, no more sufficient and normative for us today than was the work of Calvin for Kuyper or of Augustine for Calvin. Groen was too much caught by historicistic traditionalism. Kuyper never resolved problems in his under-

standing of the relation between an organic nature and God's ordinances, between common grace and special grace. Dooyeweerd created more problems than he solved in his interpretations of the historical unfolding process and the relationship of time to eternity. Goudzwaard admits the tentative and uncertain character of his proposals about the responsibility of modern economic enterprises and the relationship of government to the economy.

But the question is not whether we must become disciples of Kuyper and his followers. The question is, will we take up the historical struggle of our day in the spirit of biblical revival? Will we become self-critical about our illegitimate accommodations to the spirits and traditions of our time? Will we quit trying to ride through history and begin trying to shape history in obedience to divine ordinances? This is our only calling—to serve God and neighbors according to the Creator's ordinances fulfilled in Christ. This is also the only way that we can contribute to a healthy unfolding of a just society—one that will be respectful of the true plurality of God-given associations, institutions, and social relationships.

What we have called the Kuyper tradition holds a wealth of insight and creative wisdom that can help us in our work here at Dordt in all disciplines. And it can help us not only in a specific educational way, but also in the wide range of our responsibilities in this world as we dialogue and struggle with liberals and conservatives in America, with socialists and Christian Democrats in Europe and Latin America, with liberation ideologues in the Third World, with secularized Confucians in China, and with reviving Muslims in the Middle East. The world, we say, is the Lord's! But who is shaping history?

Notes

¹Christopher Dawson, *The Gods of Revolution: An Analysis of the French Revolution* (New York: Minerva Press, 1972), pp. 10-11.

²This is the charge of Groen van Prinsterer and other revived Calvinists in nineteenth-century Holland about whom we will see more below.

³From the translation of part of Groen's *Ongeloof en Revolutie* by Harry Van Dyke and Donald Morton: *Lectures VIII and IX from Unbelief and Revolution* (Amsterdam: The Groen van Prinsterer Fund, 1975), p. 39. The edition of the complete Dutch volume to which I will be referring is *Ongeloof en Revolutie*, edited by H. Smitskamp (Franeker: T. Wever, n.d.).

⁴Groen, *Lectures VIII and IX from Unbelief and Revolution*, pp. 7-8.

⁵See especially the closing pages of *Ongeloof en Revolutie*, pp. 322-327.

⁶Groen, *Lectures VIII and IX from Unbelief and Revolution*, pp. 17-18.

⁷Groen did not entirely free himself from the older attitude which accepted past historical patterns and institutions as a revelation of the will of God. For a criticism of the "historicism" and "organicism" in Groen see the excellent article by Herman Dooyeweerd, "Het Historisch Element in Groen's Staatsleer," in H. Smitskamp, et al, *Groen's "Ongeloof en Revolutie": Een Bundel Studien* (Wageningen: N. V. Gebr. Zomer en Keuning's, 1949), pp. 118-137.

⁸Regularly Kuyper criticized the spirit and consequences of liberalism and the Revolution. See Dirk Jellema, "Abraham Kuyper's Attack on Liberalism," *Review of Politics*, 19 (1957), 472-485.

⁹This language is everywhere in Kuyper's writings, but see especially the section, "Ordatiën Gods," in his *Ons Program* (Amsterdam: J. H. Kruyt, 1879), pp. 116-129. Also see Kuyper's *Lectures on Calvinism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961), pp. 70-71.

¹⁰Kuyper's most systematic treatment of common grace is in his three-volume work *Gemeene Gratie* (Amsterdam: Hoveker and Wormser, 1902-1904). The best article on this subject is S. U. Zuidema's "Common Grace and Christian Action in Abraham Kuyper," in *Zuidema's Communication and Confrontation: A Philosophical Appraisal and Critique of Modern Society and Contemporary Thought* (Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1972), pp. 52-105. See also Henry R. Van Til, *The Calvinistic Concept of Culture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964).

¹¹See especially Kuyper's *Lectures on Calvinism*, pp. 9-40.

¹²Kuyper, *Lectures*, p. 100.

¹³Kuyper, *Lectures*, pp. 46-54, 59-66.

¹⁴Kuyper, *Souvereiniteit in Eigen Kring* (Amsterdam: J. H. Kruyt, 1880). On this subject of "sphere sovereignty" and also on some other important themes see the two articles on Herman Dooyeweerd's philosophy by Jacob Klapwijk in *The Reformed Journal* (February, 1980), pp. 12-15, and (March, 1980), pp. 20-24.

¹⁵On the meaning of historical, cultural responsiveness to divine norms or ordinances in the sense in which I am discussing it here, see Herman Dooyeweerd, *Roots of Western Culture: Pagan, Secular, and Christian Options*, translated by John Kraay and edited by Mark Vander Vennen and Bernard Zylstra (Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1979), pp. 66-72. See also Bob Goudzwaard, *Capitalism and Progress: A Diagnosis of Western Society*, translated and edited by Josina Van Nuis Zylstra (Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation; and Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), pp. 186-189, 204-214.

¹⁶An excellent introduction to Dooyeweerd's Kuyperian Calvinism is his *Roots of Western Culture*, noted above. See also L. Kalsbeek, *Contours of a Christian Philosophy: An Introduction to Herman Dooyeweerd's Thought*, edited by Bernard Zylstra and Josina Zylstra (Toronto: Wedge, 1975).

¹⁷Especially valuable on modern social thought is Chapter 8 of Dooyeweerd's *Roots of Western Culture*, "The Rise of Social Thought," pp. 189-218, and the first five chapters of Goudzwaard's *Capitalism and Progress*, pp. 1-54, where he discusses the emergence of secularized rationalism in the West between the Renaissance and the French Revolution.

¹⁸On the different meanings of sphere sovereignty see Dooyeweerd, *Roots of Western Culture*, pp. 40-60.

¹⁹Dooyeweerd's detailed, philosophical exposition of this Kuyperian social philosophy is in Vol. 3 of his *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought*, translated by David H. Freeman and H. De Jongste (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1957). For a brief introduction, see my "Herman Dooyeweerd's Contribution to the Philosophy of the Social Sciences," *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation*, 31, No. 1 (March 1979), 20-24.

²⁰Dooyeweerd, *Roots of Western Culture*, pp. 108-109.

²¹Dooyeweerd, *Roots*, p. 109.

²²See the especially helpful discussion of this tension between freedom and self-imposed bondage in the liberal/conservative tradition in Goudzwaard, *Capitalism and Progress*, pp. 142-161.

²³See the position paper "Justice for Education," published by the Association for Public Justice, Box 5769, Washington, D.C. 20014.

²⁴Goudzwaard, *Capitalism and Progress*, pp. 248-249.