

---

# Pro Rege

---

---

Volume 8 | Number 2

Article 2

---

December 1979

## Witness of a World View

McKendree R. Langley

*Dordt College*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro\\_rege](https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege)



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

---

### Recommended Citation

Langley, McKendree R. (1979) "Witness of a World View," *Pro Rege*: Vol. 8:  
No. 2, 2 - 11.

Available at: [https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro\\_rege/vol8/iss2/2](https://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/pro_rege/vol8/iss2/2)

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

# The Witness of a World View

McKendree R. Langley  
Associate Professor



*McKendree R. Langley holds the Abraham Kuyper Chair in the Lectureship Center 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, Jackson, Miss.*

The preaching of the Gospel is practical even when it causes opposition. The articulation of Anti-Revolutionary truths is practical even when the Revolution principle is dominant . . . . This continual witness is itself dynamic action. The preaching of justice in the face of continual injustice is not superfluous.<sup>1</sup>

These prophetic words were uttered by forty-five-year-old Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer, the spiritual father of Abraham Kuyper, to a group of friends in his home library in The Hague in 1846. His influential Anti-Revolutionary world-

view would not have been articulated without his deep Christian faith and leadership in the evangelical movement of his day. But the Gospel witness was his prime concern.

## **Spiritual Beginnings**

As a youth Groen joined the Dutch Reformed Church but he had a rationalistic understanding of the Confession. The year 1827 marked the real beginning of his spiritual pilgrimage. He married Elizabeth M. M. van der Hoop, a convinced Christian, and he was appointed secretary of the King's Cabinet. In this official capacity the Groens took up their residence in Brussels, the tem-

porary seat of the Dutch government. It was in Brussels that Groen heard the court preacher, Jean Henri Merle d'Aubigné, the Swiss Reformation historian. Groen was moved by Merle's sermons. When the Groens returned to The Hague with the King, they came under the influence of the pastor of the French Reformed Church, the Rev. J. C. I. Secrétan, and the pastor of the Dutch Reformed Church of that city, the Rev. D. Molenaar. Rev. Secrétan's preaching emphasized evangelical piety and that of Rev. Molenaar stressed purity of Reformed doctrine. Both pastors had circles of interested Christians surrounding them. Guillaume (Willem) and Elizabeth (Betsy) Groen themselves had a spiritual friendship with Willem De Clercq, a Baptist turned Reformed, and his wife Caroline. This friendship was very important for Groen's growth in the faith. Both Groen and De Clercq, a businessman, wanted a faith that was not only for their souls but also for their work in the world. In April 1830, De Clercq wrote reassuringly to Groen that all his gifts could be legitimately consecrated to God's glory, for Christ is the center of human history, and this history is the drama of both man's apostasy and his reunion with God.

By October 1831, Groen expressed joy in his growing Christian assurance. In February 1832, Betsy joyfully wrote to De Clercq that her Willem was growing still more in his love for Christ. During a sickness in early 1833 Groen fully surrendered his life to the Lord and received full assurance of his salvation. The future Anti-Revolutionary statesman had been impressed with the Christian acts of mercy performed by his Betsy and Caroline De Clercq, especially their founding a sewing class for poor girls in 1831. Here such girls could learn a skill and be exposed to the Bible and Christian fellowship. The

Groens gradually became involved in various Bible studies and Groen finally led one himself.

This nobleman then began, as a Christian, to see various social problems such as the necessity for family devotions and a Christian environment for children, the growing need for Christian schools given the secularization of the public schools, and the social cancer of urban poverty. It was during the very cold winter of 1839 that The Hague aristocrat and his Christian friends visited the homes of the poor, bringing material help and Christian love. He also defended the rights of the Separatists of 1834 to secede from the Dutch Reformed Church without their having to suffer persecution from a largely modernistic Synod and from the theocratic intolerance of the state.

By 1840 Groen van Prinsterer was a recognized leader of the growing evangelical movement, not only in The Hague but throughout the country. In that year he served briefly as a Member of Parliament defending the rights of private Christian schools before the nation. In November of that year the King appointed him to a Royal investigative commission on primary education. It was at this point that Groen met the Rev. O. G. Heldring of the village of Hemmen. The two men had the same concerns about the unhealthy direction public primary education was taking. Both leaders made the Dutch evangelical movement conscious of public affairs.

In 1841 Groen and six other evangelicals sent an address to the Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church. It appealed to the Synod to enforce the Confessional Standards in cases of unbelief among pastors and theological professors. It demanded the maintenance of the central truths of the

Gospel and certain revisions in church government. Groen and his friends, such as Rev. Heldring, also began to become involved in visiting prisoners, helping alcoholics, founding Protestant nursing homes, and in establishing an explicitly Christian anti-slavery society in 1842. On August 26, 1845, Groen chaired a meeting of leading Dutch evangelicals in Amsterdam. The group agreed with him that, on the basis of the Bible and Confession, Calvinists needed a sense of evangelical identity and common action. The results were meetings of the "Christian Friends" twice a year from 1847 to 1854 and the publication of the monthly *The Society of Christian Voices*. Rev. Heldring was the founder-editor of this journal. From 1847 to 1875 it was a forum for theological, ecclesiastical, and philanthropic discussion and news from all over The Netherlands and Europe.<sup>2</sup>

Thus Groen van Prinsterer became an evangelical believer with Reformed convictions that were both pious and public.

### **Unbelief and Revolution**

The publication of *Unbelief and Revolution* in 1847 was the culmination of a long spiritual, academic, and political process in Groen's life. The following dates should be kept in mind to clarify this process. In 1823 he received doctorates in both law and classical studies from the University of Leiden. The young nobleman worked closely with the powerful King Willem I from 1827 to 1832. With the royal appointment as Archivist of The Netherlands, he edited and published, in many volumes, the papers of the House of Orange which related to the Reformation and post-Reformation period. Not only did this great accomplishment make Groen the father of

modern Netherlandic historiography, but it also enabled him to study the impact of Calvinism on the formation of the Netherlandic state. The result of this research was his *Handbook of the History of the Fatherland* (1846). In this *Handbook* he articulated his Calvinist historical perspective on the documents. But in mid-1845, just as he was about to write a concluding chapter on the period after the French-supported Batavian Republic of 1795, he decided to end his *Handbook*. In its place the historian decided to give a series of lectures on the theme of "Unbelief and Revolution." Fifteen lectures on this subject were given between November 1845 and April 1846 in his home library in The Hague across the street from the Houses of Parliament. The twenty individuals who came to this lecture series included Evangelical notables, leading Conservative politicians, and important Liberals (including the provincial governor of South Holland and a former assistant director of the Royal Library). They all had in common a friendship with Groen, an interest in the lecture topic, and an apparent commitment to the Christian faith. Yet Groen also wanted their critical comments. These lectures were published as *Unbelief and Revolution* in 1847. This masterpiece is a mature statement of the Dutch and European evangelical movement and the key to the Christian position of Groen van Prinsterer. *Unbelief and Revolution* is the foundational statement of the revival of Calvinism in The Netherlands both in the Anti-Revolutionary, Christian historical perspective and in the confessional orthodoxy of the Reformed churches.<sup>3</sup>

### **Groen's Hermeneutic**

*Unbelief and Revolution* begins and ends with the blood of Jesus. It is the

product of a man whose life was immersed in the Scriptures and who had a concern for the salvation of souls. Numerous are the Biblical allusions throughout the work. Groen presented a certain Reformed hermeneutical approach to the Bible and therefore a distinctive perspective on the Christian life.

Groen affirmed the infallibility of the Bible and the sovereignty of God as the creator, sustainer, savior and/or judge of mankind (II Tim. 3:16, Ps. 46, Ps. 14). He stressed particularly the scriptural teaching that life is religious. Man is a believer either in God or in an idol. He believes in either the true religion or the false religion of some form of idolatry (Rom. 1:25). But Groen properly rejected the artificial dichotomy between the religious and the secular (religiously neutral) areas of life. The God of Scripture is the ruler over men and nations. The doctrine of man's total depravity as well as the necessity for personal faith in Christ for the new birth are then confessed (Rom. 1:18, II Cor. 4:3-4, Rom. 10:9). The full divinity of Christ, the power of the atonement and the personality of the Holy Spirit rounded out Groen's faith in the doctrine of God's sovereign grace (I Cor. 15:1-23, John 16:7-16, Eph. 2:8-9). He saw the necessity of the preaching of the Gospel to mankind as the mandate from Christ (Matt. 28:19-20). He observed that Christians have a responsibility to be stewards over the culture as part of their obedience to God (I Cor. 10:31, Gen. 1:28, Matt. 22:36-40).

Groen stressed that an independent Christian viewpoint on life was essential, in contrast to every synthesis of Christianity with humanism. Thus he affirmed that the Bible was the normative basis for all of life including legislation, ethics, human authority, political freedom and for nations them-

selves. Unconditional subjection to God's Word was the basis for both obligatory obedience to legitimate rulers and dutiful resistance to tyrants in history. Groen wanted to encourage his readers by constant references to the cloud of witnesses surrounding believers in Bible times (Heb. 11), during the Reformation and in the evangelical movement of his own day. Reformation leaders such as Luther and Calvin began to reflect biblical teachings which should be carried on and improved in the church and public life. Groen saw the Christian life as one of witnessing to God's truth in cosmic terms which would open the way for believers to present a refutation of and a positive alternative to the secular mentality overwhelming the culture. This truth begins with childlike faith in Christ and leads to humility at the foot of the Cross. Among the fruits of the Spirit are good works. The Christian is also to bring all his thoughts captive to Christ (II Cor. 10:5). In this regard Groen stressed his own task in academic scholarship and politics. He was quietly confident in calling God to strengthen him by His Word since the Lord will ultimately be victorious over Satan. So the Anti-Revolutionary statesman appealed to all believers to be faithful in their various situations.<sup>4</sup>

Concerning the question of normativity, Groen believed that God is the highest Law-Giver and King. He referred to God's laws and commandments (Ps. 119:104) as continually applicable. Reference was also made to the divine law of justice and love. But he made it clear that the Old Testament Jewish theocracy was unique and not a political model for the nations. The Gospel sheds normative light on the meaning of history, but there is an important role for the Christian conscience. Finally, Christian principles must be articulated

to bring God's truth to bear on the modern world. The clear implication of Groen's hermeneutic is an affirmation of the continuing normativity of the Ten Commandments as seen in the light of the Gospel and applied by means of Christian principles for life today. Thus full justice is done to Biblical normativity, while the complexity of modern life requiring decisions of Christian conscience is recognized.<sup>5</sup>

### **Groen's Cultural Apologetic**

Only a proper perspective on the Bible and history can be termed Anti-Revolutionary. Groen saw the Reformation of the sixteenth century as a high point of Christianity. He saw a basic relation between the evangelical preaching of the Gospel of salvation and the movement towards responsible liberty in the Reformation countries of northern Europe, as compared with the inquisitional Catholic tyrannies of southern Europe. But as historian, he did not absolutize the past, for he saw that sin permeates even "good" traditions. Many institutions that were originally beneficial were abused and distorted in later centuries. Because Groen had a realistic perception of sin in history and saw the need for reforms made in the light of the Gospel, he was not a Conservative. In addition, an Augustinian antithesis between the City of God and the City of Man was clearly present in his thought. While he repudiated the concept of the divine right of kings as practiced by the tyrannical Sun King of France, Louis XIV, the Anti-Revolutionary historian also rejected the charge that divine right was merely a hold-over from medieval reactionary political science. The biblical teaching of Romans 13 had been distorted to elevate princes to a semi-divine status. To give them unlimited power,

an incorrect appeal was made to the Old Testament theocracy. Groen rejected all such distortions. In its place the historian gave a more balanced interpretation of Romans 13. Both prince and people are in mutual subjection to God. The central teaching of this text concerns legal government. Groen pointed out that Christians are not obligated to obey crowned robbers. God holds all people responsible for the use of the talents He has given them. Likewise, governing is a task of stewardship with public justice as its goal. The prince must respect the rights of the people as well as assert his own. But obedience to governmental authority is limited by a prior duty to obey God's laws. A true honoring of all power as coming from God leads to real liberty and obedience; at the same time it avoids arbitrary rule. Even first-century Christians did not obey those things the tyrannical Caesars commanded, such as emperor worship or prohibitions to Gospel preaching (Acts 5:29). Groen added that the pious fathers of the Dutch Reformation would have had to prostitute themselves to their ruler, King Philip II of Spain, if they had not taken up arms against his policies of inquisition and oppression after forty years of suffering.

Likewise Groen rejected the theocratic legacy as reflected in church-state alliances in his own day. Even though the Dutch Reformed Church had been officially disestablished by the French revolutionary occupationists, financial and other ties remained. "When the church is united with the state," Groen observed, "there can be no independence in matters of faith."<sup>6</sup> In the 1840's the political secularists enabled various types of modernists to control the Synod. Groen was a strong opponent of both the Synod's theological unbelief and its financial

support by the state. He approved of the struggle of the Puritans in seventeenth century England against the pro-Catholic Caesaropapism of the Established Church and the separated testimony of the Free Church of Scotland in the nineteenth century. His guardedly positive attitude toward history and organically developed institutions such as the state, church, family, and local associations was closely related to his articulation of sphere sovereignty. The organic viewpoint has its parallels with Abraham Kuyper's concepts of the ordinances of God and common grace.

Groen also discussed the history and character of the religion of unbelief. He traced this anti-supernaturalist humanism from the skepticism of the ancient Greek sophists to its flowering in the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century. At that time these ideas were integrated into a secular world-view through publicists like Voltaire and Rousseau. The outworking of this consistent humanism was realized in the French Revolution of 1789 and in the secularization of Western society. Groen quoted Psalm 14 to show that practical atheism is foolishness from God's viewpoint and leads to suffering and perdition.

Among those publicists who started thinking about the significance of the Enlightenment and revolution were Edmund Burke, author of *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790) and one of the earliest critics of this development; the French Abbe Felicite de Lamennais, author of *On the Progress of the Revolution and the War Against the Church* (1829) and a founder of Christian Democratic thought; and Willem Bilderdijk, the Calvinist historian-poet. But while he learned a great deal from these and other opponents of the Revolution, Groen's Anti-Revolutionary position

was his own creation. For he saw that, at bottom, modern secular humanism is a *religion of unbelief* in both its revolutionary and its more democratic forms. Thus in constitutional theory, Enlightenment thinkers spoke of popular sovereignty in a country and human sovereignty over the world. Both came from the Revolution doctrine and were seen in the French Revolution, Napoleon's Empire, and in the Restoration in Europe from 1814.

It was Groen's primary concern to defend biblical Christianity against the attacks of sophisticated unbelief in society. He developed what can be called a cultural apologetic at the heart of his Anti-Revolutionary world view. He labored diligently to refute the religious attacks on Christianity in the church and theology, historiography, education, economics, governmental policy, and in public affairs and political parties. With his cultural apologetic clearly in mind, Groen focused his attention on the struggle in history and politics.

The revolutionary theories were opposed by both the Bible and a Reformed interpretation of history. For those in the secular humanist tradition exploited history for propagandistic purposes when convenient. Since they did not study the past with believing hearts but with a revolutionary bias, they distorted history's meaning and stirred up unrest. Therefore, as the believing historian studies documents, he can refute revolutionary misinterpretations of the past. Understanding the true significance of the past is very important for proper social activities in the present. Groen's cultural apologetic sought to point out that without the Christ of the Scriptures at the center of man's life, society would move in a dehumanizing direction and would blindly seek security from blind leaders. For

only the Bible truly lights the paths of men and nations.

### Political Spirituality

It was in the last chapter of *Unbelief and Revolution* that Groen discussed the problems of the nineteenth century. The French Revolution of 1789, the reign of Napoleon and the political Restoration starting in 1814 were all based upon the humanistic Revolution idea. Groen perceived that his age was a transitional period in European history. Many people were confused by spiritual and social uncertainty as the new era was dawning. But the Anti-Revolutionary statesman, with his analysis of the signs of the times and faith in the ultimate victory of Christ, was building the foundations for a dynamic Christian witness in national life which would have a part in shaping the new era. Groen correctly sensed that it is better for Christians to be busy influencing a fluid situation rather than procrastinating until the flux has turned into hardened structures hostile to a Gospel witness. The focus of Groen's final chapter is on the meaning (for the Christian) of the the secularization of Dutch life.

Groen provided a critique of Liberalism and an appeal for intelligent social action based upon a political spirituality.

Among the signs of the times were the rise of *status quo* secular Conservatism, the growth of the pre-Marxian socialist movement, the renewed vitality of ultramontane Roman Catholicism, and the Evangelical Awakening. The destructive impact of aggressive social revolution which up-

set the feudal land arrangements was one cause of pauperism. The tradition of radical violence was being carried on with such intense fanaticism that it would ultimately make the Revolution of 1789 look calm by comparison. The fulfillment of Groen's prophecy of terror can be seen in *The Gulag Archipelago* by Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

The major political events of the Restoration in The Netherlands were the return of the Prince of Orange from exile as King Willem I, the framing of the Dutch Constitution (reflecting Enlightenment humanism in its provisions for a centralized state) and the Belgian Revolution of 1830 in which The Netherlands lost its control over the southern provinces. Misery and humiliation, Groen emphasized, came to The Netherlands because men sought greatness and security apart from God. The Enlightenment publications had a more powerful influence for evil than the conquests of the revolutionary armies.

The vocation of a Gospel-confessor in this political context was the final concern expressed in *Unbelief and Revolution*. Groen provided a critique of Liberalism and an appeal for intelligent social action based upon a political spirituality.

Concerning the genesis of Liberal politics in the early nineteenth century, Groen observed that the value of historical perspective is lost if the Christian misunderstands the connection between European history and recent events. For non-revolutionary secular politics as well as revolutionary politics were based on Enlightenment unbelief. Groen asserted that Socialism, Liberalism, and Conservatism all received their religious views of man and society, divorced from biblical norms, from the secular (Revolution) doctrine. These viewpoints



all proclaimed popular sovereignty in one form or another. Differences between Conservatives and Liberals were only pragmatic.

The Anti-Revolutionary leader supported the attempts of the Liberals to achieve a constitutional monarchy with direct elections, parliamentary independence, and governmental responsibility. But this Liberal reformism of Premier Johan Thorbecke could not eliminate the humanistic root of social evil since Liberalism was itself based upon this humanism. The Liberal promise of liberty was not the same as its realization. Groen rejected the Liberal claim of having a monopoly on liberty, for Liberals often denied liberty to those who disagreed with them. These secular politicians were urged to work immediately for a meaningful extension of freedoms.

Strong criticism was made of royal governmental policy because a government, independent of the king but responsible to parliament, was not introduced until 1848, the year after *Unbelief and Revolution* was published. Groen felt legal reforms were greatly needed in the areas of church-state relations, education on all levels, aid to the destitute, the criminal system and electoral law. He expressed dissatisfaction with the state's reorganization of the Dutch Reformed Church and with the State's encouragement of the dominant position of the unorthodox clergy and discrimination against evangelical Calvinists. That Church Confession was not maintained was a great sorrow for the Anti-Revolutionary leader. He criticized the public school laws of 1806 because they banished the Bible from the public school and made it almost impossible for privately-financed Christian schools to be established. Groen felt that this "school question" was a key indication of the

unbelieving direction the nation would take if nothing were done to change this situation.

The appeal for intelligent social action was based upon the necessity of believers assuming their full rights as citizens, patriots, and Christians. True political emancipation must include a place for Christians in national life. Groen's own calling—and that of the evangelical community—was to intelligently refute fundamental humanistic errors and to apply a Christian reformism on the basis of the Bible and Christian experience. The great need of the day, he emphasized, was to articulate a Christian political science. The Anti-Revolutionary position must warn against practical dead-ends and provide a Christian political option as an alternative to secular "solutions." Likewise the articulation of Christian principles was of crucial importance. This Anti-Revolutionary position was seen as very practical. "The preaching of the Gospel is practical even when it causes opposition. The articulation of Anti-Revolutionary truths is practical even when the Revolution principle is dominant . . . This continual witness is itself dynamic action. The preaching of justice in the face of continual injustice is not superfluous."<sup>7</sup> Groen urged each Christian, including those in academics and politics, to be faithful at his own post. *Unbelief and Revolution* ended with Groen's desire to bring every thought captive to Christ (II Cor. 10:5). His prayer was, "God be merciful to me a sinner" (Lk. 18:13) and "revive me according to thy word" (Ps. 119:25).

Political spirituality was also related to Groen's evaluation of the Reformation. The Tri-Centennial of John Calvin's death was celebrated in 1864 by the Reformed Churches of Switzerland. For this occasion Groen wrote

a pamphlet in French on Calvin's influence on The Netherlands, which was published in Amsterdam, Paris and Geneva. This influence in the sixteenth century was very great, as seen by the leadership of William of Orange which resulted in the creation of both the United Dutch Provinces and the Dutch Reformed Church. The defeat of Philip II and the Spanish Inquisition was the victory of unlimited submission to God's Word. Groen spoke of Calvinism as Reformed orthodoxy, Presbyterianism and Puritanism. This Puritanism in England, Scotland and The Netherlands, while far from perfect, did seek first the Kingdom of God and His justice. The result was a growth of popular liberties, national independence and prosperity. Groen honored the contributions of John Calvin, John Knox and William of Orange to this Puritanism.<sup>9</sup>

### **Groen's Witness in Later Years**

In 1849 Groen was elected to parliament and served, with several interruptions, until 1865. He was an outspoken representative of the Anti-Revolutionary voters in parliamentary debates, articulating his world view as it related to the need for Christian education, the strengthening of constitutionalism and a more just development of democracy in a pluralist political system. This pluralist system included Christian Democratic parties (Anti-Revolutionary and Catholic) along with Conservatives and Liberals.

Once Groen retired from active politics in 1865, he gave more attention to historical studies and the future of the Anti-Revolutionary movement. It was during this period that the young pastor Abraham Kuyper began a correspondence with him. The two men were soon exchanging confidential

views on the future of this political movement.

On July 7, 1869, Groen unburdened his heart to his young friend concerning the advisability of starting a daily newspaper. The elder statesman was not convinced that this was a good idea. Since 1829 there had been an Anti-Revolutionary party in the country but it lacked a commonly recognized perspective. Thus Anti-Revolutionaries had many different opinions about their national task. This Christian Historical and thus Anti-Revolutionary movement had struck a responsive chord in the hearts of many believing commoners but had not been accepted by the middle and higher classes. A daily paper would publicize such disharmony and weaken what strength there was, unless, Groen continued confidentially, Kuyper became the editor.<sup>9</sup> (Kuyper became the editor of *The Standard* daily in April 1872 and it did strengthen party unity.) The reference made here to the various shades of opinion among Anti-Revolutionaries was a reference to the fusionists—those politicians and voters who claimed to uphold Groen's viewpoint but who sided with the Conservatives on all the critical issues. On December 30, 1869, Groen wrote that he felt it best to break with the Conservative party and his fusionist friends in order to maintain the integrity of the Anti-Revolutionary party.<sup>10</sup>

As the election of 1871 neared, Groen wrote to Kuyper on April 10, 1871, suggesting that he himself devote his energy to questions of long-term party principles and that Kuyper strengthen his practical leadership in journalism by suggesting candidates for parliament. Groen saw this division of labor as teamwork undertaken by colleagues. His concern was to promote debate in the country to strengthen ethical consciousness, not merely to

win parliamentary seats.<sup>11</sup> Groen and Kuyper worked together in this capacity for the next four years. In early June 1871, Groen publicly endorsed three independent (non-fusionist) Anti-Revolutionary candidates: the educator Van Otterloo, the colonial expert Keuchenius, and Kuyper. This final break with the fusionists in 1871 was the fulfillment of Groen's statement in *Unbelief and Revolution* in 1847 that the Anti-Revolutionaries must assume an independent Christian position, thus opposing any synthesis with humanism. It was this courage that led to the greatness of the witness of the Anti-Revolutionary Party during the next century. During this period Groen also seemed to indicate that Kuyper was his heir as party leader, as seen in his letters of September 1 and October 15, 1871.<sup>12</sup>

On May 20, 1876, the day after Groen died, *The Standard*, the Anti-Revolutionary daily, carried a long obituary. While many Christians mourned his passing, they were also thankful for his great labor for church and society. Groen was first of all a Christian who confessed the reality of sin and the glory of God's free grace. This Christian consciousness dominated his world view. Thus the Gospel-confessor was a truly integrated, Christian statesman. He had the courage to despise temporary success in favor of the demands of Christian conscience in serving the spiritual interests of the people. As a politician, Groen worked under the constant testing of the Gospel. For his slogan was "The Gospel versus the Revolution" or as one might phrase it today "Christianity versus secularism." *The Standard* obituary concluded by expressing thankfulness to God for all He enabled Groen to do for the Divine Lord and the Dutch people.

In sum, Groen's world view included an independent Christian position, a Reformational hermeneutic, a cultural apologetic, and, finally, a political spirituality. On Groen's casket there was a silver plate engraved with his name, his dates and a Bible reference. The reference was I Corinthians 15:55-57: "O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting? The sting of death is sin, and the power of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, who gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." For Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer such personal faith in Christ flowered into the witness of a world view.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>G. Groen van Prinsterer, *Ongeloof en Revolutie*, ed. H. Smitskamp (Franeker: T. Wever, 1951), p. 323 (my translation).

<sup>2</sup>M. Elizabeth Kluit, "Groen van Prinsterer en het Geloof," in *Een Staatsman Ter Navolging: Groen van Prinsterer Herdacht, 1876-1976*, ed. C. Bremmer and M. N. G. Kool (The Hague: ARP, CHU, and KVP, 1976), pp. 105-109; and Kluit, "Groen van Prinsterer en het Reveil," in *Een Staatsman*, pp. 110-120.

<sup>3</sup>H. Smitskamp, "Het Boek Ongeloof en Revolutie," in *Groen's Ongeloof en Revolutie: Een Bundel Studiën*, ed. L.W.C. Suttorp, Z.W. Sneller, and J. Veldkamp (Wageningen: Zomer en Keuning, 1949), pp. 11, 17, 12.

<sup>4</sup>van Prinsterer, pp. 14, 130, 28-29, 325-327.

<sup>5</sup>van Prinsterer, pp. 318, 51, 44, 29, 47, 315, 44, 320, 315, 322.

<sup>6</sup>van Prinsterer, p. 56 (my translation).

<sup>7</sup>van Prinsterer, p. 323 (my translation).

<sup>8</sup>G. Groen van Prinsterer, *La Holland et l'Influence de Calvin* (Amsterdam: Hoveker; Paris: Mayrueis; Geneva: E. Beroud, May 27, 1864).

<sup>9</sup>*Briefwisseling van Mr. G. Groen van Prinsterer met Dr. A. Kuyper, 1864-1876* (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1937), pp. 37-38.

<sup>10</sup>*Briefwisseling*, p. 74.

<sup>11</sup>*Briefwisseling*, pp. 123-124.

<sup>12</sup>Groen's endorsement was published in *De Heraut* on June 2, 1871, and reprinted in *Briefwisseling*, p. 139. For Groen's remark to Kuyper ("you are the heir of my politics" [my translation]), see *Briefwisseling*, pp. 156 and 166.