

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 36—October, 1898.

I.

DR. ABRAHAM KUYPER.*

I.

IT goes without saying that the following pages do not contain everything that might well be said about Dr. Kuyper. What

* [We depart from our ordinary custom of publishing only fresh articles written expressly for the REVIEW, in order to give our readers a translation of this, no doubt somewhat inadequate, account of Dr. Kuyper's life up to 1888 by Jhr. Mr. Witsius H. de Savornin Lohman. In Dutch it forms one of the issues of a series of booklets published by H. D. Tjeenk Willink at Haarlem, under the editorship of Dr. E. D. Pijzel, and designed to describe the *Mannen van Beteekenis in Onze Dagen*; and it appeared as long ago as 1889. This early date, of course, detracts seriously from the completeness of the sketch: for so far from Dr. Kuyper having been idle during the last decade, this is precisely the period of his greatest activity and of his greatest achievements in Church and State—including his breach with the State Church and his successful leading of a large body of "Doleerenden" (as his followers were suggestively called) out of its bondage and finally into union with the "Christian Reformed Churches," so forming the strong existing body of free churches known as the "Gereformeerde Kerken." Mr. Witsius Lohman has, however, given a fair account of Dr. Kuyper's teachings during the earlier years of his public activity, and the facts that the stress of the sketch is laid rather on Dr. Kuyper's political program than on his theological work and that it is written distinctly for a Dutch audience, we are persuaded, constitute an apparent rather than real drawback to its usefulness. For Dr. Kuyper is about to make himself known to the American public in his work as a theologian—not only in the course of "Stone Lectures" on *Calvinism* which he will deliver before the Theological Seminary at Princeton this autumn, but in the translation of a portion of his *Encyclopædia of Sacred Theology* just now appearing from the press of Charles Scribner's Sons: and there may be some danger that we should not realize that he has long been as significant a figure in the political life of present-day Holland as in its theological thought. This essay may be taken, therefore, as supplying in some sort a preliminary preparation for the knowledge of the man which we shall derive from his

Potgieter* remarked when speaking of Loots, applies here too: he who expects a complete biography may learn from this Preface how little this paper will meet his hopes—may learn from the start, if we do not deceive ourselves, how little right he has to ask such a thing from us, though several of the questions which we leave unanswered will emphasize its desirableness.

Dr. Abraham Kuyper was born at Maasluis† on the 29th October, 1837. His parents were Jan Hendrik Kuyper and Henriette Huber, a scion of a Swiss family. He obtained his primary schooling at Maasluis and at Middelburg,‡ whither his father was called in 1840; later, he attended the gymnasium at Leiden (from 1849 to 1855), leaving it on the 16th of July, 1855, to enter upon

theological work now to be brought before us. For the rest, we quote the following words, descriptive of Dr. Kuyper's position in the religious life of Holland, from the Preface (by the translator, W. Kolfhaus) to the German edition, which has lately appeared, of his Rectorial Address of 1892: "The late Dr. Gloël of Erlangen, in 1885, in his notice of *Holland's Ecclesiastical Life*, wrote as follows: 'No name certainly is so well-known to-day in Holland, as the name of Dr. Kuyper.' After twelve years, this statement still retains its truth to-day. No doubt Dr. Kuyper has lost influence in some quarters since he broke with the National Church in 1886 and was forced to establish a Church free from the State. But in the conflict with unbelief and indifferentism, with materialism and pessimism, in brief with all the elements that are undermining the health of the individual or of the people, he has still remained the leader whose forceful words strengthen the hearts of the Christians of Holland, no matter to what ecclesiastical tendency they may adhere. Dr. Kuyper's significance lies above all in this, that he does not content himself with protests, or lose himself in resultless apologetics, but confronts the science of unbelief with a science of faith. He does not attack 'the wisdom of this world' in its fruits, but exposes it in its roots; it is his life-aim to create a science on a different foundation—on the foundation of the palingenesis, and this aim he prosecutes with all his energy and talents, no less as Professor in the Free University at Amsterdam, than as a journalist and politician. He vigilantly guards against every attempt to destroy the boundaries between God and the world, between truth and falsehood, because a victorious battle is impossible so long as men feel themselves in doubt as to the boundary line that separates the kingdom of God from the kingdom of the world" (*Die Verwischung der Grenzen*, Leipzig, 1893). If one desires to know how Dr. Kuyper is really esteemed in Holland to-day, he should consult the *Gedenkboek*, published last year, commemorating his quarter-centennial of editorship of *De Standaard*. On this occasion men of all parties united to do him the honor they all felt he had most richly earned.—EDITORS.]

* [Potgieter, a famous Dutch Romanticist of the present century, founder of the best of the Dutch reviews, *De Gids*. Cornelis Loots was a poet of the first portion of the century. Their place in Dutch literature may be seen indicated in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, xii, pp. 97, 98; while a brief account of Potgieter may be found in Johnson's *Universal Cyclopædia*, vi, 739.]

† [A town on the north bank of the Maas near its mouth, nearly opposite Brielle.]

‡ [The capital of the Province of Zeeland, situated about the centre of the island of Wa'cheren, a little north of Flushing. It contains about sixteen thousand inhabitants.]

the study of literature and theology at the university. As yet he had felt no call to the work of the ministry. The blame for this falls upon what he had seen of ecclesiastical life in his boyhood and later at Leiden. The well-known controversy over the "Orphanage" (Huiszottenhuis), which was then in full swing, "made it perfectly evident to him that for neither side was there even remotely at stake any high principle, any noble spiritual interest. The Church was no longer a Church, and his heart could no longer feel sympathy for a Church which so coarsely trod its own honor under foot, or for a religion which was represented by such a Church." Giving his attention accordingly more to literature than to theology, he came into touch especially with Prof. de Vries: of this professor alone do we find grateful mention made in the *Confidentie* of many years later. Meanwhile, however, the study of theology was not entirely neglected.

The theological faculty of the University of Groningen had announced a prize topic on the problem of the Church in the period of Calvin and à Lasco, and, on the advice of Prof. de Vries, Dr. Kuyper determined to compete. Great difficulties stood in the way: the writings of à Lasco seemed nowhere to be found; the libraries at Leiden, Utrecht and Groningen, as well as the greatest foreign collections, appeared to possess as good as nothing of the works of the Polish Reformer. The plan of competing for the prize was therefore already given up, when Prof. de Vries intervened. He advised his pupil to apply personally to his father, then minister at Haarlem, who had done a great deal of work in the sphere of Church history and possessed an extensive library.

"His urging," writes Dr. Kuyper, "was too kindly to be withstood, and I went to Haarlem; there I found the venerable man, who has since gone to his grave, entirely ready to help, with the most marked kindness and heartiest sympathy for my plans, . . . but . . . he must not conceal it from me, there was in his library of what I was looking for—nothing. Yes, there was a little book of Menno Simons' *about* à Lasco; but *by* à Lasco himself, no, he did not remember that he had anything of the kind. This outcome did not disappoint me. I had not expected anything else, and more to enjoy another beautiful afternoon in the Haarlem Woodland* than in the hope of a good find, I returned eight days later to learn the result of my inquiry.

"But how can I convey to you my feelings, when, admitted to the presence of the venerable minister and received in the most cordial way, I heard him say as if it were the simplest thing in the world: '*That is what I have found!*'—and saw him point to a rich collection of duodecimos lying ranged on the table? In truth, I could scarcely believe my eyes. How was this? To have searched through all the libraries of our land, to have gone through the catalogues of

* ["The *Hout* (*i. e.*, wood) or Park of Haarlem, on the south side of the town, is a beautiful and extensive plantation of fine old beeches, intersected by walks, enlivened by tame deer, and provided with cafés and other places of holiday resort."—*Bædeker.*]

Europe's greatest collections, and nowhere, nowhere, in any corner whatever—and what was true then, is true now—to have been able to discover even a tolerable collection of Lasciana: to have read in all *Florilegia*, in all handbooks of rare books, in all literary compendiums, only one and the same thing—that à Lasco's works were recorded only by title without being seen, that his works belonged among the most extreme rarities, that the most of them were certainly hopelessly lost, and that with the exception of two or three no one in the last two hundred years had had them in his hand: and then all at once as by a divine miracle to see a collection of Lasciana before you, richer than any library in the whole of Europe could boast of, or can boast of yet! To find this treasure (for me the most important point, relatively to my prize-topic), in the hands of a man, to whom I had been directed by a faithful friend, who knew nothing whatever of the treasure hidden with him—who himself only a week before had remembered the name of à Lasco only cursorily, and could not say whether he had gathered among his *preciosa* anything by this Polish Reformer. Surely to be met with such a surprise in our experience must teach us what it is to encounter a miracle of God in our path.

“I say it now with an immeasurably deeper feeling of grateful adoration, but even then it took hold upon me—so forcibly that it was the occasion of my renewing the long suspended habit of returning thanks to God, and I could no longer conceal from myself that to speak of the ‘finger of God’ was no old wives’ tale or even a matter of opinion. An instrument is needed for your work. It lies hidden in one place only in the world. But no one, not even its owner, knows that it is there, that he has it, that it exists—and God brings you, almost against your will, to the place where it must be discovered. Immediately it is in your hand. If we may not call this providential direction, what is it? Now I know very well that such a conviction is not conversion, but it is nevertheless an encountering of the living, working, directing God in the pathway of our life, and the impression made on my heart by this almost incredible experience was so deep and abiding that whenever I recall the seeking love of my God, I go back continually, by whatever road, to the remembrance of that marvelous providence of the Lasciana. Is there any need of further evidence that my work on the prize topic thus acquired a significance and sacredness which had before been lacking in my studies? Need I still say that when the prize was won, even my self-righteous heart ascribed a portion of the honor and thanks to another power than that of my own spirit: and is it not easy to understand how a year passed, under such influences, in the exclusive study of the Church problem proposed, still exerted an influence for good on my spirit even when the Groningen prize question had long since been forgotten?”

On the same day on which the theological faculty at Groningen awarded the prize to Dr. Kuyper's paper, the faculty of jurisprudence there granted an accessit to his present associate,* Jonkheer Mr. A. F. de Savornin Lohman. No one could then have foreseen how frequently, in later years, these two names were to be named together.

* [This is said from the standpoint of 1889. Jonkheer Mr. A. F. de Savornin Lohman a few years ago severed his connection with the Free University and ceased to cooperate politically with Dr. Kuyper. It is pleasant to be able to add that Mr. Lohman nevertheless was able to speak some strong words of appreciation of Dr. Kuyper's gifts and services to the Anti-revolutionary party, on the occasion of the celebration of his quarter of a century of work as editor of *De Standaard*. See the *Gedenkboek*, p. 89.]

About the same time Dr. Kuyper read Miss Yonge's well-known romance, *The Heir of Redclyffe*. The narrative made a powerful impression on a spirit already deeply moved by the occurrence at Haarlem. What Miss Yonge pictured as occurring in the case of Philip de Morville, the chief character of the romance, he felt in his own heart. Every word of self-accusation which the author placed on the lips of the broken-down Philip, he applied to himself, and pierced him to the soul as a sentence upon his own aspirations and character. "Ah, what my soul lived through at that time I have only later fully understood; but yet in that hour, from that very moment, I despised what I formerly admired, sought what I formerly held in no esteem. Enough. You understand how permanent is the impression of such an experience, how what the soul wrestles through in such a struggle belongs to that eternal element which is present to the soul after long years as freshly and powerfully as if it had occurred only yesterday."

Under such influences, he was promoted to the doctorate of theology on the 20th of September, 1862, with a thesis on "Joannis Calvini et Joannis à Lasco de Ecclesia Sententiarum inter se compositio;" and being admitted that same year as a candidate for the sacred ministry by the provincial consistory of South Holland, he was installed as minister at Beesd, on the 7th of August, 1863. The congregation which the new minister found was composed of "indifferentists, moralists and stubbornly orthodox folk or 'malcontents,' who made trouble for every domine." For the last the new minister came to have the closest sympathy, although they, however ready they were to recognize in him their superior, rejected his dogmatic opinions with emphasis. This, however, did not exasperate or wound him; on the contrary, what they said seemed to him "just what he had heard taught at the university, by his talented teacher, Prof. Scholten, with only the sympathy reversed." He was soon mixing pleasantly with them and exchanging thoughts with them, although the toleration with which he met their opinions, which were in his view not always tenable, was not responded to with the least consideration on their part. They knew nothing, no doubt, of arrangement and order; but their conversation became in the end necessary to him. "The Sabbath-day preaching went better after a conversation with the 'malcontents' which were so ill-esteemed by me at first." "Their tenacious perseverance became to me the blessing of my heart, the rising of the morning star of my life. I was no doubt convicted, but I had not yet found the word of reconciliation. That they brought me with their faulty speech, in the absolute

form in which alone my soul can find rest."* So he came to Calvin. The new theologians from this time on left him unsatisfied. In the Genevan reformer he found, only in philosophical form and in other language, the conceptions of his simple parishioners; the cold Latin of the *Institutes* taught just what had attracted him so much in them. "Calvin"—now he for the first time understood it—"had established a Church, and knew how, by means of a strong church organization, to spread blessing and peace among simple souls throughout all the nations of Europe and beyond the sea, in town and village, down to the poorest and least esteemed."†

His residence at Beesd, however, did not last long. Called in 1867 to Utrecht, he was installed there in the Cathedral (Domkerk) on the 10th of November, delivering a discourse on "The Incarnation of God, the Principle of the Church's Life." Immediately after his coming to Utrecht, Dr. Kuyper opened the struggle against the existing organization of the Reformed congregations. The occasion was the visitation of the churches. In the Reformed Church of the Netherlands, by virtue of a commission from the classical government, there takes place every three years in person, and in the interval by letter, an inquiry into the condition of the congregations, the orderly execution of the ecclesiastical decrees, and the proper and Christian walk of the members of the congregations. When the inquiry takes place by letter, the relevant questions are sent from the classical authorities to the consistory, arranged in three separate tables. They had been so sent to Utrecht on the 20th of April, 1868. The consistory there, however, determined to leave unanswered these questions issued "in the name of a Synod with whose office-bearers (waardigheidsbekleeders) it had no communion of faith in the Confession." The

* [In his address on the occasion of the celebration of the completion of his first twenty-five years of editorial work on *De Standaard*, Dr. Kuyper says: "In the shade of that quiet village where I was minister of the Word, a beam of light fell upon my soul, which came from higher than this world. From that time on, everything was overturned by that higher light, even my political ideas, and through innumerable conversations with the simple, pious folk of that village and especially through my conversations with the head-teacher of the public school, a lovely Christian, . . . I gradually came to see that my former views were wrong and that on the contrary the names of Groen van Prinsterer and Keuchenius must become my loadstar" (*Gedenkboek*, etc., p. 68).]

† [In the Preface to his *Encyclopedie der heilige Godgeleerdheid*, Dr. Kuyper says of himself: "Brought up under the teaching of Scholten and Kuenen, in an entirely different circle of theological ideas, and later not less strongly influenced by the 'Mediating Theology,' he found rest neither for his heart nor for his mind, until his eyes were opened to the depth, the correctness and the beauty of the Reformed Confession, which has come out of the spiritually rich days when Calvinism was still a world-power, not only in the theological but also in the social and political realms."]

classical authorities of Utrecht were not, however, satisfied with that. They continued to insist upon an answer, but received a renewed refusal on June 8. Brought to desperation by this firmness, the classical authorities sent up the matter to the provincial ecclesiastical authorities of Utrecht, who despatched two of their members not merely to make inquiry into the condition of the Utrecht congregation, but also to bring to trial those who were considered the leaders of the movement. The Utrecht consistory nevertheless continued to stand by its act: on the 21st of September it decided not to receive the delegates, and it set forth its reasons for so doing in an extended memoir, known to be from the hand of Dr. Kuyper. The tension was naturally increased by this, and many were awaiting the issue with concern, when the Synod determined to remove the difficulties out of the way. In the Utrecht consistory there was but little objection to the answering of some of the questions submitted to it. With reference to the Confession, the conduct and the performance of official duties on the part of the members of the consistory and ministers, it would not make response; it had no more desire to refuse to answer the remaining questions than to oppose any other administrative measures. The Synod now determined that the inquiry as to Confession and conduct should be presented only when a desire for it had been expressed to it by one of the members of the consistory: accordingly every consistory, and thus the Utrecht consistory also, had opportunity to leave unanswered the questions which it did not wish to answer. It seems that thus there remained no further difficulties for the Utrecht people. In the proceedings of the Synod of 1869 at least, we find merely a short account of this matter, at the end of which we read: "We close, then, after having added here that from the accounts received lately from the ecclesiastical authorities of Utrecht, it seems that at Utrecht the questions issued by the personal or written Church visitation were answered; and we find the express declaration of the said ecclesiastical authorities that the consistory of Utrecht had returned to the path of obedience to the ecclesiastical ordinances, and that it now considered that the occurrences of the past year ought to be overlooked."

But very shortly after this there arose another dispute. To commemorate the hospitality which our fathers had experienced three centuries before at Wesel, Dr. van Toornenbergen and certain other Dutch theologians determined to issue an invitation to the German theologians to a meeting to be held at Zeist in 1868. Mindful of the fact for the commemoration of which they were assembled—the convention at Wesel was held on the 3d of

November, 1868—Dr. Kuyper desired that the conference should bear a Reformed character. To the fervent disciple of Calvin the idea was unendurable that this meeting, called together to commemorate how, three centuries ago, the Dutch Calvinists came together at Wesel in order to take measures for their churches, as they expressed it, “that they might decently govern themselves, both in matters necessary and in matters profitable,” should take an anti-Calvinistic character. From the side of Holland, however, the direction fell into the hands of the Utrecht and Groningen party. This Dr. Kuyper strongly opposed: the direction of the conference, he thought, must either represent the whole Church, in which case, along with the adherents of Utrecht and Groningen, the Reformed and Moderns too should have a right to seats; or else the standpoint of the Scriptures must be adopted and then the adherents of Groningen must give way before the Reformed. He defended this demand when the conference was opened, and thus drew upon himself a flood of indignation. He was interrupted with hissing and stamping; men called out that “that is from the Devil,” and quiet was restored only when ds.* Fabri and Kögel proposed that the Committee on Rules should, in conference with Dr. Kuyper, seek to remove the cause of controversy. Matters so resting at Zeist, Dr. Kuyper untiringly prosecuted the struggle elsewhere. In *De Werking van Artikel 23* he sought to emphasize that, although improved, the system of representation in our Church was not perfected; in *De Kerkelijke Goederen*, he defended free administration and attacked the college of inspection; and in *De Vrijmaking der Kerk*, finally, he attacked the present organization of the Dutch Reformed Church, already at that time declaring it to be the duty of the Government to give to the Reformed Churches the opportunity to decide for themselves in what ecclesiastical communion they should live. At Utrecht also acquaintance was made between Dr. Kuyper and Mr. Groen van Prinsterer. Thus far he had stood on his own political platform. In 1869 began the coöperation of the two men which only came to an end with the death of Groen. Shortly after this Dr. Kuyper was called to Amsterdam. On the 31st of July he took leave of his congregation with a discourse on *Conservatism and Orthodoxy*. Two happy years, according to their own testimony, he had spent in their midst.

On the 10th of August following he was installed at Amsterdam. The greatest congregation in the country, where the contest between Arminius and Gomarus broke out, where Plancius had seen the burgomasters of Amsterdam, then the highest civil

* [That is, “dominus,” (“domine”) the official title of the Dutch clergy.]

authorities, bow their heads, and where two hundred years later the first stand was made for the freedom of the Church against King William's encroachments upon the old Church organization, seemed an appropriate field of labor for the minister who had chosen the restoration of the old ecclesiastical organization for his life task. The newly arrived minister did not delay in carrying out his ecclesiastical program. Dr. Kuyper wished that the Church should speak out her doctrine clearly and unmistakably: he could therefore have no comfort in the fact that in the congregation at Amsterdam the orphanage and other institutions were in the hands of regents who were committed to modern views. In his opinion, it was becoming that there should be taught in the institutions of the congregation only what the congregation confessed. The strife between the two parties was long and very bitter: the adherents of the modern tendency, being in the minority, were overcome in the end, their regents and regentesses were replaced by others, and the conduct of worship was intrusted to ministers of the opposite tendency. Dr. Kuyper seems already to have clearly perceived that his contest against the actual ecclesiastical organization must lead ultimately to a clash with the ecclesiastical authorities. Although the solution of questions of ecclesiastical law does not, like the great social questions, demand iron and blood, yet Dr. Kuyper already knew perfectly well that the deep-going modifications which he necessarily sought, would not be obtained by means of simple deliberations. In order to promote harmony and combined action in the consistory, it was therefore decided that all propositions, before they were introduced into the consistory, should be announced and the opposing opinions be carefully defined. In a society called "Beraad," those who were like-minded came together for this purpose. On joining the society men placed their signatures under the declaration that they had united together, under the bond of secrecy, to consult as to measures to be taken for the maintenance of their position in case of an eventual clash with the ecclesiastical authorities, should these come to the consistory and seek, by instruction from a higher hand, to enroll as church members such as denied the fundamentals of Christianity; an instruction which they declared they could not conscientiously obey.* On account of various circumstances, although there was harmony as to the end, there reigned too great a diversity of opinion as to the means for attaining it, and, above

* [The meaning is that, as some of the ministers at Amsterdam belonged to the "Modern" party, while the majority of the consistory were orthodox, there was danger lest the higher authorities should seek to compel the consistory to receive into church membership young people trained by these "Modern" ministers into their own views—a thing the consistory could not conscientiously do.]

all, on account of Dr. Kuyper's absorption in other work—he having undertaken from April 1, 1872, the editorship of *De Standaard*, and been chosen at Gouda as a member of the Lower House of government—it is to be said that the conflict then already foreseen broke out only after many years.

With his election at Gouda begins an entirely new period in Dr. Kuyper's life. As early as 1871 Groen van Prinsterer, discontented and discouraged by the attitude which the Anti-revolutionary party had taken up since 1868 to the Heemskerk ministry, had recommended him, along with Messrs. Keuchenius and Van Otterloo, throughout the whole country, as the only candidates to whom the restoration and defense of the Anti-revolutionary tendency could be safely committed. And one year later, when *De Standaard* appeared on the 1st of April, this extraordinarily far-sighted statesman declared that he “could without fear remain outside of the contest.” Thus that Groen should greet with deep sympathy the candidature of his friend was to be foreseen. “Kuyper is and remains,” said he, “the destined man: if in the face of the long chain of evidences of this any one should desire more, I would point them to the papers on *Onze Verhouding tegenover Rome* and *De Ordonantiën Gods*, which have appeared in *De Standaard*. Whether, having been chosen, he may not after ripe consideration decline, is for him a question of conscience: but his grateful fellow-workers must be zealous to put ‘the gifted leader’ in a position to exercise his own ‘decision in the matter.’” And when, on the 21st of January, 1874, Dr. Kuyper, in the contest with Mr. Verniers v. d. Loeff, was elected by 1504 to 1252 votes, Groen wrote: “The result of the election is a notable evidence of a power which resides, not in numbers alone, but also in zeal and prudence and is therefore doubly remarkable. What Dr. Kuyper will do is to me at least unknown. He alone is competent to decide, and I at least shall trust the decision to the gifted leader, who nevertheless does not depend on his own wisdom.”

What Dr. Kuyper did is well known: his membership in the House did not, however, continue long. Already, on the 21st of February, 1875, he needed to go abroad for the recovery of his health; the labor of the last years had drawn too heavily on his strength. Since his “promotion” only thirteen years had passed, and already some thirty-eight publications from his hand on all sorts of subjects had seen the light, already he was the recognized leader of the ecclesiastical movement, and already Groen van Prinsterer had indicated him as his successor in the political struggle, although this required a training wholly foreign to theology. In

the summer of 1877 Dr. Kuyper returned. In order to resume his pastoral office, he resigned his membership in the House. A call to Oosthem in Friesland, and a twice repeated call to Amsterdam, he refused; but after deciding to go to Ridderkerk, there came a sudden change. An idea which had at an earlier period occupied his mind seemed now to require attention. Already in 1875 Dr. Kuyper had maintained in the Second Chamber the desirability of free universities; and the provision, made by the present law on higher education, for the inspection of the teaching of theology brought the idea again upon the tapis this year. For consultation concerning the establishment of a free university, there gathered in the latter part of that year at Amsterdam, Messrs. Hovy, Hoedemaker, Van Ronkel, Küller, Van Marle, Sanders, Heyblom, Teding van Berkhout, Esser, Kuyper and Rutgers. They determined to call together a preliminary committee, to meet at Utrecht on the 22d of October, 1878, in which in addition to these already named (except Messrs. Van Marle, Heyblom and Teding van Berkhout) were included also ds. J. W. Felix, Prof. De Geer van Jutphaas, ds. Gewin, Dr. Van Goor, Dr. De Hartog, and Messrs. Goosheide and A. F. De Savornin Lohman. A draft of the statutes for the proposed association, drawn up by Messrs. De Geer, Kuyper and Rutgers, was determined upon in November, 1878, and published in *De Heraut*, while Reformed ministers and elders, who were willing to lend their aid and support, were invited to make it known to the committee. There was a further meeting held at Utrecht on the 5th of December at which it was determined to form a society for Reformed higher education. On the 22d of February, 1879, the royal approval of the statutes followed. On the 4th of June of the same year Messrs. Seefat and Hovy of Amsterdam, Esser of the Hague, and Van Boetzelaer of De Bilt were named as directors, while on the same day Messrs. Felix and van Beek Calkoen of Utrecht, De Hartogh of Rotterdam and Keuchenius of the Hague were chosen as curators. The institution was opened on the 20th of October next. Along with Dr. Kuyper there appeared as professors, Dr. Rutgers, Dr. Hoedemaker, Dr. Dilloo, Dr. van Ronkel, and Mr. Fabius; as first rector Dr. Kuyper delivered the opening address.

As is well known, the new institution met with fierce opposition. In the issue of the periodical called *Stemmen voor Waarheid en Vrede* for December, 1879, Dr. Bronsveld denied to individuals the right to establish universities: the higher education according to him must proceed only from the State or the Church. In his *Beide om een dubbel Corrigendum*, Dr. Kuyper endeavored to show on historical grounds the untenableness of this assertion. Dr. Brons-

veld seemed unconvinced. In a brochure which appeared in July, 1880—*De Bede om een dubbel Corrigendum Afgewezen*—he controverted what had been urged against him, according to the opinion of many, in an irrefutable manner. But already in September his vigorous opponent was ready with a reply. Dr. Kuyper answered the question, “How may a University be established?” *jure constituto* and *jure constituendo*. That by virtue of our positive law, the association for Reformed higher education is a legal association, that it may establish a school and call this preferably a “university,” that it may appoint professors in the school, that, finally, this is according to the sense of our national law a free university, and, acting within Arts. 83 and 98 of the law of 28th of April, 1876, can hold examinations and confer degrees, was shown without difficulty. The Association for Higher Education on Reformed Principles* was recognized by the king on the 12th of February, 1879 (No. 23), and standing before the law was granted it. Debate upon the question whether the Association has legal standing is by this excluded. Art. 99 of the law of 28th of April, 1876 (*Stbl.*, No. 102) gives to every Netherlander, to every existing association, to every ecclesiastical communion, and thus also to the Association for Higher Education on Reformed Principles, freedom to open a special school for higher instruction. That the instructors connected with such an institution may name themselves “professors” Dr. Kuyper shows next. All higher education is entirely free; the government itself can undertake no inquiry into the talents or the conduct of the teachers. The king expressly relinquishes control in other than the State Universities of everything that regards their regulation and titles. Men thus are free to name their teachers what they choose, and accordingly the language of the law regarding higher education in Art. 105 speaks of “professors” in relation to private higher instruction: the government constantly entitles the teachers in the Seminaria, “professors;” the association at Delft names its teachers in the Indian School “professors;” and certainly this gives the Association for Higher Education on Reformed Principles a right to apply the name of “professors” to its teachers. So also with the name of “university.” Dr. Bronsveld esteemed the use of that term, for the school that had been established, pretentious and in conflict with the law concerning higher education. *Universities*, in his conception, only the State institutions for higher instruction may be called, not those which are established by individuals. Dr. Kuyper repudiated this. Mr. Jonckbloet spoke in the Second

* [The official title of the Association is “Vereeniging voor Hooger Onderwys op Gereformeerden Grondslag.”]

Chamber of "private universities" without any one being offended by the expression; so also Mr. de Vries; and the king found no fault with the fact that in its statutes the aim of the Association was given as to found a "university." Dr. Bronsveld had also denied that the school was "free." His opinion was that only a university which stood on precisely the same footing with the universities founded by the State or a city is free. Dr. Kuyper showed by an appeal to the history of the controversy on education from 1830 to 1880 that nothing other has been meant in Holland by "freedom of instruction" or "free school" but individual liberty to establish special schools, and thus freedom from being compelled to make use of the instruction provided by the State.

At the close, Dr. Kuyper fully refuted Dr. Bronsveld's notion that the Free University lacked the right to confer degrees. With reference to higher instruction there are four kinds of rights which need consideration: 1. The *jus docendi*, the right to give instruction. 2. The *jus incorporandi*, the right of an association to receive a status before the law. 3. The *jus promovendi*, the right to grant degrees. 4. The *jus expostulandi sive artis exercendæ*, *i. e.*, the connecting of candidateship for social relations with certain degrees. The *jus docendi* is a primordial right, clearly set down in Art. 194 of our fundamental laws—which the law does not confer, but only *recognizes*. It may be prejudiced either directly or indirectly. Directly by the prohibition of higher instruction to individuals: indirectly by the suspension of candidature for influential occupations on degrees conferred by a State university. The *jus incorporandi* is a right which the State alone has. Earlier the sovereign did this by octroi ["grant" or "patent"] as, for example, in 1573 the States of Holland did in the case of Leiden's academy. Then it took place through the recognition of legal standing. With an appeal to what Mr. Kappeyne van de Coppello in the session of 21st of March, 1876, said on the subject, Dr. Kuyper showed that the *jus promovendi* is in no sense a *jus summi imperantis*, which belongs only to the State, but is simply the conferring of a scientific title on scholars who have shown a fitness to wear the doctor's degree or the like. The value of the title is not fixed by law, but by the great republic of letters, that knows which academies deserve recognition and which do not, and that everywhere honors the doctor who has earned his title lawfully. Entirely different is the *jus artis exercendæ*. When any one is made doctor by a European or American university, he writes "Dr." before his name, and there exists no law to forbid him doing so. But it does not follow that any one who has been

admitted to the bar at Brussels may practice as an advocate in Amsterdam also. The scientific degree is cosmopolitan; the social advantages connected with its possession are determined by every State within its borders. And it is only when the granting of degrees and the advantages which accrue from the possession of the degrees are confused, that it is thought that the *jus promovendi* is an attribute of the sovereign power. The Free University thus sufficiently possesses the *jus promovendi* in the scientific and international sense; but in order to obtain for its students the *jus expostulandi*, these students must, just like the students of the State universities, subject themselves to the examinations required by the State. And the one difference which arises thence between the students of the Free and those of the State universities is that the former are *not* and the latter *are* examined by their own professors. The question whether the time may not come when this *jus expostulandi*, or right of promotion (as Dr. Kuyper expresses it), may not also in good policy be granted to the free institution, has been already answered by the minister Heemskerk on March 21, 1876. Treating of the question whether Amsterdam should not at once receive the right of promotion he said: "Whenever this amendment is adopted and Amsterdam obtains by it the so much-desired privilege, the *jus promovendi*, then, sooner or later, it will come about that others also will demand like rights, and, as a matter of course, such a right will not be granted without securities."

From the point of view of public law, Dr. Kuyper insists, there is therefore nothing to bring against the establishment of the Free University; the second part of his paper is devoted to the proof that there is as little to bring against it from the point of view of science. Dr. Bronsveld had asserted that the Church had steadily reserved to itself the right to establish universities, that the churches of the Huguenots, of Calvin, and of Knox by virtue of a right given them by God, had founded universities of five faculties. Dr. Kuyper proved the contrary. He begins by setting aside three out of the eight universities which, according to Dr. Bronsveld, the Huguenots had founded, viz., those of Orthez-Bearn, Orange and Sedan, which, according to an article in Lichtenberger's *Encyclopædie* adduced by Dr. Bronsveld himself, were not founded by the Synod of the Huguenots, but by Jeanne d'Albret, Louis of Nassau and Robert de la Marek. Next he shows that of the five remaining ones, the schools at Montpellier, Saumur and Die were never anything else than Seminaries, or Écoles de Théologie, something like the school at Kampen; some of them with at most six professors, during a very short time, but

generally with much fewer. At Montauban and at Nimes, also, the remaining two of those to which Dr. Bronsveld had appealed, theology exclusively was taught. It would indeed have been impossible for the Huguenots, who could scarcely ever get together their f. 3000 for these theological schools, to establish eight universities of five faculties and to supply them with their full quota of professors. Geneva under Calvin and Leiden under the States found it difficult to find suitable professors: how much more would this have been true of the Huguenots, living in constant persecution and poverty? To the same conclusion Dr. Kuyper came regarding the Church of Knox. "Wholly in the spirit of Calvin," had Dr. Bronsveld written, "John Knox had ordered that in every town of any importance a gymnasium should be established, where instruction should be given in the ancient tongues, logic, mathematics, physics and rhetoric, while the first Scotch Book of Discipline already devoted a section to the universities." Dr. Kuyper showed that such an order never proceeded from Knox. No doubt Knox on the 29th of April, 1560, was invited by the Scotch Parliament to draw up, along with certain friends, a draft of regulations for instruction to which he gave the name of *Buke of discipline*. This *Buke of discipline* was thus not composed by the Church, nor established by a Synod, but was nothing else than a piece of advice by Knox which the Parliament could follow or not according to its will. Lastly, Calvin. Dr. Kuyper shows from the *Leges academicæ Genevensis* and the archives of the Church consistory there, that the Genevan University was no institution of the Church, but of the State. The Church consistory named only the theological professors and was charged only with the matters that concerned the theological professors.

At the end of his treatise Dr. Kuyper still further set forth how of old universities were established neither by the Church nor by the State; how the Universities of Bologna, Paris, Oxford and Cambridge, after the model of which all later ones were formed, owed their origin to individual initiative. In a long series of widely gathered citations, Dr. Kuyper showed how nearly all scholars have accorded on this point with what von Savigny established as the result of his investigations. By virtue of its origin the university idea is connected in the closest way with the free corporation. In Italy, in France, in England and in Spain, in the three first centuries of their rise, the universities sprang out of individual initiative. Germany alone offers a partial exception to the rule; and even there the universities at first were never State institutions in the sense in which at present the Dutch universities are. Many a university owed its origin, no doubt, to

princely initiative; but it did not on that account cease to be a free corporation. After its establishment it received the liberties and privileges which were possessed by the guilds and other corporations, *i. e.*, it had nothing to do with the State, it formed its own closed circle, it enacted its own rules, and possessed as a rule its own finances. It named its own professors, it chose its own officers, and sometimes possessed its own courts, its own police, and its own prison. The establishment of these schools by the princes of the land amounted thus to about this—that they entrusted a piece of the public land or of conventual property to a free corporation, under more or less binding conditions, for its use for this purpose. In the charters and letters of institution it is indeed almost always mentioned that the model of Paris or Bologna is before the eye, and that these were institutions entirely free from State interference there can be no doubt. The French Revolution made an end of the Academy. Since then the University has become an organ of the State. Göttingen gave the signal, Berlin and Bonn followed, and since then even the already existing universities have been reshaped and altered according to the same model. In the place of the old universities have come institutions the life-movements of which are regulated by royal decrees; which can never be sure for more than a year of the amount of their subsidy from the State treasury; the rector of which, as well as the curators and the professors, are named by the king; and which therefore in every respect are born of the State, depend on the State, and serve the opinions and interests of the party dominant in the State. There is, however, in all lands a longing for what formerly existed. In America there already exist 354 institutions for academic instruction, seventy-two of which are universities; in England the medical faculty of the “University of London” established in 1826 counts already 494 students, and there have arisen under it not less than fifty-three institutions of higher learning. In Belgium, Sweden and Norway and Switzerland the government, by the appointment of commissions to examine both the students of their own universities and those of the free schools, has met as far as possible the difficulties which the new movement has brought. Only in Holland do the students of the Free Universities stand on other than equal terms with those of the State universities. The latter find at their examinations their own professors, the former do not.

Since the appearance of *Strikt Genomen*, the question whether individuals may establish universities may be held to have been answered. There has never since been an attempt to bring the legal standing of the Free University into doubt. On the contrary: not

without satisfaction and in full truth could Dr. Kuyper, on laying down his rectorate on the 20th of October, 1881, say, "that the fierce onslaught made at first on our right is now almost entirely silenced."

The establishment of the Free University, however, was not the only thing that kept Dr. Kuyper at Amsterdam. The consequences of the petition of the people in 1878, against the school law accepted by the States-General in that year from the minister Kappeyne, were of the greatest importance for the Anti-revolutionaries as a political party. It had led to the union of their elements scattered through the land, and Dr. Kuyper perceived clearly of how much importance it was to perpetuate this union. This had been hitherto lacking. To be sure, Groen van Prinsterer had been accustomed, at the periodical elections, to call together, now at Utrecht, now at the Hague, certain of the like-minded, in order to consider together what could be done to advance a desired end; but a central bureau was lacking. The Association for Christian National School-Instruction had sometimes assumed the leadership, but experience had not shown that to be desirable. Above all was this want of a guiding hand felt very sharply in 1873. In May of that year some influential Anti-revolutionaries had collected some funds for the approaching election and had invited certain kindred spirits to charge themselves with the direction by forming a central bureau. But the incompleteness of this organization was very soon perceived. In 1877 the members of this bureau were considering whether it might not be desirable for them now to withdraw, when a request made to one of them led them to execute this purpose. A program was requested, to serve at the ballot-box. Response was given to this request, and that not only to the benefit of the inquirer, but also of many other election associations. It seemed, therefore, proper to organize the desired association on the basis of this program. At first it was the wish to issue the matter through the Anti-revolutionary press. But when from various reasons that appeared to be impossible, the committee of arrangements itself took the matter in hand and sent, after consultation with Prof. De Geer, Prof. Gratama and Mr. Lohman, and after advice with Dr. Bronsveld, Ds. Donner, Jhr. Elout, Mr. Teding van Berkhout, and the editor of *De Bazuin*, a draft of a program to all Anti-revolutionary election associations, requesting them to appoint delegates to a meeting to be held at Utrecht, where it might be amended and definitely determined on. Then the committee of arrangements withdrew in order to make way for one chosen out of the delegates of the election associations themselves. Of the

new committee Dr. Kuyper was made the chairman, and thus, although no longer immediately entering into politics, he became the leader of the Anti-revolutionary party. It goes without saying that from that time he needed to remain in immediate touch with *De Standaard* which is published in Amsterdam.

II.

Churchly sympathies were very early formed by Dr. Kuyper. While still at the university, the wish for a "Church" was awakened in him by the reading of the *Heir of Redcluffe*. "A mother who from our youth up leads our steps, this was the home-sickness, this was the thirst of his life."

Dr. Kuyper esteemed the Church necessary, in the first place, on account of the undeniable need of a legitimate authority. No man can do without authority. There never was a man (he thinks) who came by his own insight to a confident world-conception—the "modern" and the positivist as little as the completest skeptic or the believing orthodox. The spiritual process which the last named reverences in Israel, the first replaces by the mental process in the history of mankind; but no one of them, not even a single one of their coryphæuses, has seen with his own eyes all the documents of all the peoples of antiquity, has independently investigated them, has apart from the preparation or guidance of others tried and valued them. And even that would have little advantaged them. On no one of the other religions has there thus far been expended a tithe of the labor that has been bestowed on the religion of Israel and of the Bible; accordingly still less is known of the other religions than the Church fathers already knew of the religion of Israel. There can therefore be no talk of independent insight into the great progress of the religious life of all the peoples. No one can have that without authority. There exists only for some the opportunity to choose the authority to which they will bow, while for the great majority of men there is already determined by their birth, their breeding, their life-circle, the single authority which shall govern them: "Do what men will, it is the fruit of authority which they eat while they curse the tree from which it is plucked." Opportunity for independent investigation, even were that possible, is moreover enjoyed by very few. Those who are accustomed to thought and study, are often hindered from it by business cares: while a very great class of church members do not know what studying is, and, occupied from early morning till late at night, in office or field, in factory or shop, can never turn an undivided mind to spiritual things. Add to these finally the multitudes of artisans and servants. Are

we to maintain that with reference to these we can talk of an independent cosmological investigation? So far as they still have convictions, they live by authority: but "as the authority which Jesus ordained falls away, they lay hold of the lapels of the first or best they can find, a beloved minister, or an influential patron, or a noted writer, or a prattling neighbor, or—what not seldom happens—sadly confused by the hopeless Babel, they turn back to some general notions and increase the group of the discouraged who strive in dull indifference to still the unrest of their heart." It would be entirely different if the Church gave effect to its authority. It certainly is the legitimate organ, which, "within the limits set by the Scriptures, watches over our lives, punishes our sins, and can correct our errors even in the domain of the truth." To reject all human authority in matters of faith—so all the Reformers teach—includes certainly the rejection of one's *own* authority, and the unconditional recognition of the authority of the Lord. The authority of the Lord is, however, no longer revealed directly; but mediately, through His congregation, the Church. Thus the Church comes to the definition of that which now every one defines for himself. It should, making use of its inherent power, restore its unity, and no longer, as heretofore, permit all kinds of confessions and all kinds of opinions to win adherents among its members. The worship of God demands above all harmony in confession and life. Now both are lacking, and Dr. Kuyper looks to the Church for their restoration. Every preacher now has his own doctrine and his own creed with his own principles and methods, a tendency and an opinion of his own, and the community is split into just as many parts as there are pulpits in its midst. This feeds faction, sows doubt, deprives the preacher of his official character and destroys the unity of the Church.

The family and national life, lastly, Dr. Kuyper sees, is seriously menaced unless the Church is restored to honor. Preaching is indispensable, but it is not enough. As over against the powerfully organized rising power of the State there is need of a counterpoise. The life of the people is never directed by the power of their own personal life, but by the laws, customs, institutions, forms, in actual existence. Let men now only come forward, over against the State, in this strong, impressive form, and the family and social life will govern itself by its institutions and reflect its image in its own usages and modes of existence. Only as the Church, in its turn equally imposing, appearing in equally stable forms and equally forcefully, can the power of the State be broken. Let the Christian spirit be perceived as equally rock-like as the humanitarian spirit

expressed in the laws of society, then, but not till then, shall perhaps, in the choice between the two influences in the family and folk-life, the preference be given to the Christian type and thus a sacred character be preserved. The power of the State bears down and overwhelms the spirit, and the single burgher, or the narrow life-circle, is not in a position to offer it spiritual opposition. That the Church alone can do. It ought to be a spiritual organism, a breastworks for those who are not mature enough for the battle in the open field; even in the child's heart it should "form the spiritual bond with the glorious city of God above, which makes the smallest of the small invincible as over against all the power of the State; and where the State, according to its legalistic nature, forces the spirit to submit itself to the spirit of slavery, it must, with the love of a mother, lay its children to sleep with the holy breath of personal freedom blowing over the couch—which it receives from above, and which will convey them thither." This is the aim of the Church.

That it may be attained, Dr. Kuyper considers a reformation of our Dutch Reformed Church to its foundations indispensable. A Church organized as ours is cannot fulfill its calling, as he conceives it. "For the wrecked ship in the midst of the waves, the best manning is powerless: even a Barends brings no safety to the rudder." The Church must become Reformed, democratic, free, independent, completely organized in doctrine, worship and charity. First of all Reformed—in order to recover unity. Now all sorts of groups are formed in it, of all sorts of persons. Men are of Cephas, of Paul, or of Apollos, according to the university at which they studied, or the minister by whom they were catechized. There is but one remedy for this. The old escutcheon must be again brought into honor. Men must anew give themselves the name which they bore of old: "Reformed." The memories of the past attach themselves to this name. "Think that past away, and with our little flock we make a poor enough figure over against the spirit of the times. But lift the age in which we stand and live out of its isolation and let the stream that flows though all ages appear, and with a startling clearness, with a singular spiritual power of faith and knowledge, as transfused with the doctrine of God's electing grace and faithfulness, this same Reformed Church stands out in the light of its history. Love for the past is no sickly sighing for reaction. The past *must* be valued. Only self-deception leads us to think that every generation begins anew. Generation is united to generation by a thread of life which binds all generations together, and what the Lord entrusts to any generation, to a limited era, has not come to

it for its separate use, to be consumed and wasted, but must be laid up in the treasure-chamber of the spiritual life to belong to *all* eras. Our people are even yet Reformed, even in their Modern, Groningen, Lutheran and Roman circles. What Luther could never do, that Zwingli and Calvin did: they so powerfully poured the Christian spirit into life that it has been penetrated to its furthest circumference by this spirit. Not Luther, but these men have caused to spring spontaneously up a special nationality, a special State-life, a special life-force, out of the mighty impulse which they gave the peoples. Thus, here in Holland, it is not merely the Church, but also the nation as nation which is Reformed.' Dr. Kuyper stands in this matter by the side of Wormser, who, already in 1849, demanded a return to the Reformed type in philanthropy and home and foreign missions. Reformed and Christian are for Dr. Kuyper simply words of like meaning. Not as if the non-Reformed were not Christians. "But just as the merchant speaks of net weight, the mint-master of refined gold, the silversmith of high standard, the Scriptures of pure nard, so we also could speak of a 'net' Christianity, of a 'refined' Christianity, of 'pure' Christianity, not unjustly of a Christianity of 'high standard;' but avoiding such strange terms, we speak rather, according to usage and history, of 'Reformed,' in order by that term to distinguish sharply the counterfeit and the adulterated and the less mature from the Christianity which is according to God's Word. To say simply 'Christian' says nothing. Even the 'Romanist' can be that. Even the Remonstrants were that. The 'Christian name' is alien to no single Modern. Has it not been even seen that men who pride themselves on the denial of God's existence have in the open States-General hung out the false flag of 'Christian' on the gable of an unchristian school?"

Still, not simply Reformed, but also democratic would Dr. Kuyper wish the Church to be. He finds his ideal of regulation and Church order in the Free Church of Scotland. The Episcopal Church form he esteems objectionable; the Presbyterian, on the other hand, has his fullest sympathy. Calvin cared little for the *form* of the Church, so only it was rooted in the members of the congregation: Dr. Kuyper would see the democratic principle recognized as far as possible even in the *form* of the Church. "A Church which confesses that the elect are the *cor ecclesiæ* cannot be clerical. It *must* find its strength in the 'electi,' that is, in the church members." It was in order to realize that ideal that Dr. Kuyper, already in the first year of his ministry at Beesd, took up the pen; that at Utrecht he came into conflict with the ecclesiastical authorities; that, finally, seeing that along the path of gen-

teness the reforms desired by him were unattainable, he gave the signal for the present conflict. Up to 1816, before King William I introduced the present Synodical organization, the Reformed Church of Holland existed in free, independent congregations. The believers who had associated themselves in a special place, the congregation or church, were sovereign. Nothing was above them: all was of them, by them. According to the Reformed conception, the minister is no spiritual person, no intermediary between God and the congregation, but merely one specially prepared by study and education to expound the Word. The congregation must, of course, be governed; the conduct and teaching of the minister must be watched over; the poor must be provided for, and the sick cared for and comforted; but all this is done by the elders and deacons chosen from the congregation, who derive their authority exclusively from their election. Along with the minister, they compose the consistory, which governs the congregation and preserves order, but only because it has been called to do so by the congregation itself; in no sense because any one coming from without has given it authority to do so. The Netherlandish Calvinists, who, on the 2d of November, 1568, noted the points which later, when it should come to the establishment of a Church order, might serve as guides, dreaded "ecclesiastical authorities." When they received their appointment to their service, the elders were to be reminded that they "had no lordship to exercise either over the ministers or over the congregation, for it was wholly foreign to their calling to make laws or to exercise lordship over the ministers, or over their colleagues, or over the congregation."

What was true of the separate congregations was equally true of the whole formed out of them, "the Church." It may be debatable how close the bond was which held the several congregations together: that it—at least at first—was nothing other than common consent is certain. How otherwise, indeed, in the days when those who confessed the "new doctrine" were punished with death, should the Reformed congregations have been joined together? What else could have united them except the knowledge that they confessed the same doctrine? All external powers were engaged, not in uniting, but in scattering the young churches. This was thoroughly felt by the first Reformed. They very clearly asserted that no one could forbid a congregation to withdraw from association with the others. Already the provisional Church order of Wesel left the ordering of many things to the pleasure of the local church. "Nothing that is established in the Word of God, in the Gospel of the apostles, or in the settled custom of the churches,

shall be wantonly changed. But with respect to all that has no basis in the teaching of the Gospel of the apostles, the freedom of the Church is not to be limited by any prescriptions or formulas, so that all compulsion of consciences may be avoided and all occasion of strife be cut off" (Hooyer, *Oude Kerkordeningen*, p. 29). When questions arose which concerned contiguous congregations, it was a matter for the classical assembly to handle; when they concerned the congregations in a province, or perhaps all congregations, then the provincial or general Synods would assemble. Rulers over the congregations, these assemblies were not. Men came together for a *specified* thing: when that was accomplished, the members returned to their ordinary occupations. With the stroke of the gavel by which Bogerman dissolved the Synod of Dort, he ceased to be the "Synodi præses," and stood again on the level of all other ministers. Perpetual governing colleges such as we know in the Netherlands since 1816, the Reformed Churches did not of old time possess. In the Church there was only one Lord known, Jesus Christ: only one authority, the Word of God. Had men demanded obedience, it would have been looked on as usurpation. For only Christ, the King of the Church, could exercise power in the Church. With the principles, held sacred in our Church unbrokenly from the Convention of Wesel to the beginning of this century, the present organization of the Dutch Church is in direct conflict. Possibly King William I himself did not perceive this: the answer given in his name to the Classis of Amsterdam by the Counsellor of State, Repelaer van Drill, would otherwise be difficult to explain. Nevertheless the difference is no small one. Before this date there existed no permanent ecclesiastical government except the consistory, and the classes and Synods had authority only *ad hoc*: at that time there came into existence a permanent upper government, the Synod, with provincial and classical governments following it in due rank, to which the congregations, formerly sovereign, were now wholly subjected.

With the day of the entrance of this Church-form, Dr. Kuyper thinks, begins the decay of our Church: he considers the revival of the Church possible only after its disappearance. The Church—so he thinks—can exist only through voluntary association of like-minded men. When not resolved into free congregations, it passes unavoidably into despotism. Whenever, of old, a congregation, for conscience's sake, felt bound to break away from communion with the others, it was free to do so. This was looked upon as an act, which, when frivolously performed, was a great sin in God's sight; still, it was not forbidden. Now, however, the

congregations are compelled to remain in communion. Out of the organization into which King William I once for all united them, they can no more withdraw. This makes them helpless. The most varied opinions find place in it and one preaches just the contrary of what another teaches, and so nothing is accomplished. What one builds up, another tears down. What one wishes, another does not wish, and the end is that nothing is done. The royal decree which instituted the present organization of the Reformed Church, Dr. Kuyper would therefore wish to see repealed. The Reformed congregations must be placed in a position to decide *for themselves* how and in what ecclesiastical communion they wish to live. Only then will revival of ecclesiastical influence be possible. Then all that wish to be together can come together, but, on the other hand, those who do not wish to abide will be free to go away. Then only will it become possible for the Church to become again a "confessing" Church. Now, while it is compelled to endure the most contradictory opinions in its midst, it must be satisfied with cherishing ordinary virtue and religion. So "freedom of teaching," in Dr. Kuyper's opinion, must not be permitted in the Church. The Church may not shove to one side its Confession: it must recognize as its members only those who honor it. "A Church without a Confession is a knight without blazonry, a fleet without pennant, an impotent association which does not know or does not dare to say what it wishes." State and Church in this respect do not stand alike. Of the State is true what is not true of any other association: it embraces all, and there must be room for all in its patrimony. Freedom of conscience in its absolute sense is the indispensable demand in the political sphere: in the Church not so. It is already excluded by the nature of the Church as an association. Association presupposes coöperation toward some common end and agreement in the means necessary to attain it. He who does not desire that end, or who does not agree with the means, has no proper place in the association. Freedom, in the sense of unlimited right to confess and advocate all conceivable opinions, is not compatible with an association, of any kind or composition whatever, if the end of the association is considered. Exclusivism is therefore indispensable to every association according to its own nature and essence, and is also the hall-mark of the Church. Within its walls belong all who accept its Confession; those who reject its Confession do not belong within them. Dr. Kuyper has no wish to forbid any one going outside of these walls. The Church must not hinder the exit of those who can find nothing further within it. Of those who desire to remain in

its membership, it is to demand faithfulness to its statutes : this is not merely its right, it is its duty. Further, however, it does not go. He that would go, must not be compelled to stay.

On these grounds Dr. Kuyper contended, in the Second Chamber, that the "Christian Reformed Churches" should receive State subsidy, as well as the Reformed. The members of the Christian Reformed Church are, to be sure, scarcely members of the Dutch Reformed Church—considering as they do its present organization in conflict with the Word of God : they have forsaken the Dutch Reformed Church. That they have done this has cost them what they would enjoy out of the State treasury up to this time. After they left the Dutch Reformed Church, they received nothing further. Thus their leaving the Dutch Reformed Church is made difficult to them : the material support from the State operates as a dissuasion of departure and curtails their freedom of action. And it is just this last that Dr. Kuyper considers insufferable in the Church. Therefore he desires, in the first place, that the Church should be independent over against the State. "A Church, no matter how boastingly declared to be free, remains in a state of dependence, so long as she has to thank a power outside of herself for the bread that she eats." Not from a desire to discharge the Church, but on the contrary out of the conviction that the well-being of the Church and the prosperity of Christianity demand it, the State must allow the Church to have her free and independent position. On these grounds also, Dr. Kuyper demands the repeal of the royal decree of 23d of January, 1816, which regulates the present government of the Dutch Reformed Church. On the same grounds he would make an end of the present financial relations between the Church and State. Nevertheless he would be content to have the present teachers pensioned *ad vitam* from the public treasury and the State subsequently withdraw, and would think it not unacceptable that what is now disbursed should be capitalized.

Independence only can give back the Church her bloom and strength. Men love what they obtain by their own effort and by severe effort : toward what is cast into our lap we are indifferent and lukewarm. Men have no love for aught but the fruit of their own labor, the result of their own creation : and a church which depends on a power outside of itself is not such. It is not rooted in the sacrifices and interests of its members, and these only are the springs from which it can draw strength. Dr. Kuyper has no fear that the Church will ever come to want. On the contrary, it would profit the Church, if it were compelled to support itself out of its own means and received no more subsidy from the State, as a whole, as an entire *massa* ; then only those who agree

together for the attainment of the common end would bring their gifts; and this would be no loss, but on the contrary, a gain. Just because now the Church seeks to be for all, every one feels a stranger within its walls. But in small congregations of 1300 to 1400 souls it will be entirely otherwise. Members who find themselves back together in the same place weekly, who have all been baptized by the same minister, brought up in the same place, taught in the same school, and received by the same consistory, feel themselves bound to one another. "Think of each member then every Sunday in his own seat to which he is accustomed, while week after week he sees the same well-known countenances about him! Giving his share of the offerings that his church may be neatly and attractively fitted out, that from without it may look well and within can compare with others; experiencing in all the occurrences of his family-life the love of the congregation; looking on the orphans of the small congregation as his own adopted children; the less poor of the flock as stewards, according to their possessions; and every one having 'our house,' where he is known, and can never knock without good hope. Self-help creates power, thrift produces the quiet breath of the home-like. Even paying quickens interest, and rivalry with others is even for the unspiritual a motive to shake off the curse of inertia."

Lastly, Dr. Kuyper desires in the Church a well-ordered service of teaching, worship and charity. No church without service of teaching. The mightiest instrument with which to work upon men is the *word*. The word, however, is expression of thought. This must not be the fruit of one's own discovery, but derived from a well-ordered conception of the world and of life, the reflection of the true life that is in Christ. What is understood by that, every church must determine for itself: but when this is once determined, it behooves the Church simply to choose for itself as leaders and to pay as such those who plead for the truth recognized by it. They are ministers of the congregation, and preach thus only what the congregation confesses as truth. Not that they must subscribe the whole of the Confession, down to the smallest particulars. "A Confession contains nothing beyond that whereof men can bear witness before God, that it is profitable to godliness." Nothing more. What is more than this is free. Just as little does Dr. Kuyper hold that the Confession should be conceived as a document which, once completed, must needs remain unaltered. "Law of faith and life is to him God's Word alone." But in the Confession he distinguishes between form and content. The last is unchangeable to him, the former not. And this former

changes "in proportion as God gives the congregation insight into and hold on the Word."

Just as little as he would permit in the Church that every preacher should teach what seems good to him, would he have every leader hold religious service according to his own notion and way. There, too, would he have unity. There, too, he would have men show themselves brothers of the same house. Our present mode of divine service he would not wish to hold unaltered. Now the sermon is too prominent and the preacher accordingly too much the point of union of the assembly. "It invites him to whom it is not given to present a well-considered discourse two, sometimes three, times each week, to seek to escape the unavoidable by endless repetition or false plays of reason or the stringing together of platitudes. It makes church-going for children and the comparatively uneducated a tedious punishment, a mechanical act, and an unpleasant duty of merely sitting still." Therefore, Dr. Kuyper would like another form for the service of worship. He would have the congregation take a larger part in the worship. He would have them have a more active share in it and not, as at present, only hear and see. "Let there be ministers of the Word—ministers who take a couple of hours on Sunday and for the edification of the congregation minister to the needs of this life and to the progress of the kingdom of God by means of thoroughly thought-out discourses on the deep things of the Word. But let not every assembly of the congregation be given to this. Let there be also short, simple, liturgical services, in which every member of the congregation can take part down to the child in the Sunday-school—services in which God's Word is read, in which thanksgivings and petitions are offered, songs and jublations are heard, and a short exhortation brings the whole to a close. Above all, let there be not every three months, but at every turn and continually, a sacramental service for believers, that the Lord may come through the bread and wine to His people, to give His body for their food and His blood for their drink, for the renewal of their life, for the sealing of their covenant, for the strengthening of their faith."

III.

In the Church, Dr. Kuyper embraces the ideas of Calvin; but in the State he does not do so. Calvin was a republican; Dr. Kuyper, on the contrary, defends the constitutional monarchy and is a fervent adherent of the house of Orange. Calvin was of an aristocratic nature, and it is with delight that we hear him speak of the eminent men with whom he had enjoyed intercourse. Dr. Kuyper is a democrat, and in his writings he willingly lets it

appear that he does not belong to the great of the earth. As a model of a free land he appeals by preference to America. In giving a description of the freedom which he wishes, he adduces what Winthrop said in 1650 before an American popular assembly: "Not that corrupt freedom which debases man, demands a free bridle for every soul, obeys no authority, suffers no order, and is in unappeasable strife with truth and righteousness; but ours is the real manly freedom, which does not destroy, but unites, seeks support in just authority, honors and preserves the law in order that without fear heart and head may turn to what is good and beautiful, to what is noble and righteous." The form in which that authority manifests itself is to him indifferent, so only it be recognized that it is to be obeyed in accordance with the will of God. "The magistracy does what it does, not because it seeks it nor because it wills it, but because it is called, appointed and bound to it of God." He rejects popular sovereignty: "of it there can be no question among men who honor Christ as their King, as church members and citizens alike." But equally he rejects absolute monarchy and State sovereignty. In the last, he sees a dangerous snare to our liberty.

He considers it to be undeniable "that the centralizing state is steadily waxing into a gigantic bulk over against which every citizen at the last stands helpless." "Do we not see giving way," he asks, "all independent institutions which are clothed with sovereignty in their own circle, the supports for defense against the magic formula of the one, indivisible State? Once there was autonomy of provinces and towns, autonomy of households and classes, autonomy of legal process, autonomy for our universities, autonomy for corporations and guilds. And now? The State has steadily annexed, one after the other, all these provinces of independent rights: the State regulates our provinces, gives laws to our towns, enters our hosedoor, expropriates our patrimony, is master of our justice, makes curators and professors its servants, suffers no corporation save as its dependents, and, in finding the administrative sentence, is both party and judge, no matter how often the citizen cries out against it. Men have, and rightly, cursed the tyrannies of the 'ancien régime,' but I beg you not to forget that the part of the life of the people over which the State then spread its net, stood to the domain of this administration now as one to ten. Look merely at the budgets of Europe, then counted by the hundred thousands, now by the milliards. To leave anything uninterfered with, seems to the State a shortcoming and failure in duty, and he is esteemed the best minister who with Cherub's eyes, omnipresent, leaves you no corner of your patri-

mony where the arm of his ministering functionaries, the arm of his laws and decrees, do not reach you. What shall we be when this nothing-sparing, newly begun lust for centralization shall have completed its course? Where will be your power of defense, when the apotheosis of the State has branded beforehand every defense as sacrilege? What will remain of your personal freedom, when at length the Cæsarism which has sprung up out of the modern State and the modern imperialism, distributing its 'panes et circenses' in its economical regulation of material advantages, permits everything to itself, because there is no man who withstands it for the very good reason that there is no man who can withstand it."

When Dr. Kuyper calls himself "Anti-revolutionary," it is not because he is set against every revolution, but because he ranges himself over against the political and social system which embodied itself in the French revolution and out of which our modern State has been built up. The Dutch revolt against Spain, England's revolution under William III, America's separation from Great Britain, and the Dutch revolution of 1813 he considers thoroughly justified. He agrees "that there are times when the natural heads of the people receive a call to make an end to a godless tyranny by which the people are oppressed." The origin and the security of our constitutional freedom, we owe, in his opinion, however, not at all to the French revolution. England, Holland, Switzerland and America possessed their freedom long before that revolution broke out, while where the revolution, and not the Reformation, has worked, there it is once for all lacking. His well-known treatise, *Het Calvinisme, oorsprong en waarborg onzer constitutioneele Vrijheden*, is devoted to the defense of this position. Reformation and revolution both, no doubt, aim at the fruit of freedom, but cultivate it on wholly dissimilar roots. A liberty springing from a philosophical idea was the teaching of the Encyclopædists; a liberty springing from faith, of the Reformation. In actually producing freedom the revolution did not succeed, the Reformation did. "In Spain, Austria and France, the Reformation was rooted out and the revolution cherished, and political freedom remains weak. In Switzerland and Holland, where the revolution has operated after the Reformation, the inner power of freedom has rather waned than waxed. England, on the other hand, where the leaven of the Reformation but not of the revolution of 1789 has worked, remains ever the leader of the European peoples in the conflict against religious persecution and political tyranny."

It is then shown how the founders of America, the spiritual

children of the English Independents, were again in their turn the followers of Calvin. Later, it is true, in the revolt against England, there at first sprang up a sympathy toward France, but this soon subsided and in the American Constitution of 1789 there is nothing to be found of the teachings of Rousseau, and America up to to-day, the land of freedom by way of eminence, bears as does no other nation the deeply imprinted Christian stamp. Passing over to England, he shows that the Independents, more than any other party, advanced the liberty of England, that they sought the separation of Church and State, and demanded unlimited freedom of faith and worship, autonomy for every congregation, free association in Synods, suffrage of the church members, and publicity of church meetings; that Milton pleaded first and best for the freedom of the press, Godwin for publicity of the Parliamentary sessions, and in the Acts of the Barebones Parliament for the first time the civil marriage is proposed, yes, that there the first advances were made toward State support of science, and the modern idea was realized by it of one treasury for all revenues of the State; the introduction of the burgher-estate dates from their rise, the course of justice was simplified, sparing legislation was earnestly advocated, and capital punishment was lessened. He is not ignorant that they suffered defeat in Great Britain—they lacked organization and power to reform the English economy. “Cast as exiles on the shores of America, they bore with them to the new world the spiritual fruit of their roots and branches.”

The distinguishing marks of the Independents, further, are found again in the Huguenots, the Calvinists of France. Like the Independents, the Huguenots also, when they could no longer find in their native land liberty to serve God according to their consciences, went forth to foreign lands and founded colonies. The army of the Huguenots showed a strong family likeness to the troopers of Cromwell, “where there was no profanity, but worship; no cursing, but prayer,” and the political principles of the two were so much the same that the ground-lines of the American Constitution are found again almost entire in the Huguenot Constitution of 1573. That in spite of these points of agreement, Independents and Huguenots do not occupy the same standpoint, Dr. Kuyper recognizes. He explains this by means of the differing phases of the development through which Calvinism passed, and by the fact that the Independents were more far-sighted than the followers of Coligny and La None.

What was realized in America, England and France, was meanwhile already taught by Beza and Calvin. Beza, who forms the transition between the Calvinism of Geneva and the Calvinism of

the Huguenots, would not yet allow freedom of worship, but he detested nevertheless legalized murder. He agreed that for the matter of worship no one should be persecuted with fire and sword. He is a constitutionalist: he would have parliaments and orders, popular offices sovereign in their own sphere. He applauded the Dutch revolt against Spain, obtained troops of horse for Condé and kept the French Huguenots in treaty with the Reformed princes of Germany. More sharply formulated but less-developed, the conceptions of Beza are found also in Calvin. He would tolerate no departure from the chief principles of the Christian religion, but would suffer them in lesser matters. The form of the State is with Calvin the product of history and as such is to be revered: but if he were free to choose its form, then he chooses the republic, because, as he thought, authority entrusted to many tempts less to ambition. He denied that private persons were competent to oppose the government: he made it, however, the duty of the secondary officials, chosen from the people themselves, to preserve the people's freedom. If they are negligent in this, they are untrustworthy, yes, guilty of perjury. Calvin was moreover opposed to the policy of non-intervention. Europe for him was no aggregation of independent States, but a family of peoples. The prince of a neighboring land he considered bound to intervene when his neighbor fell upon the people. For this reason, he himself advanced the raising of money for the German troopers who had entered France.

The root of all this Dr. Kuyper finds in the fundamental doctrine of the Calvinists, in their confession of the absolute sovereignty of God. "Out of this confession it follows that all authority and power on earth is not inherent but derived, so that there can be no talk of sovereignty by nature in either prince or people. Sovereign is only God Almighty Himself; all creatures, whether born in the princely palace or in the beggar's hut, he esteems in themselves as nothing. Authority of one creature over another arises only as God grants it, and is not to be abused, but to be used for His glory. He is thus free to give that authority to whom He will. Sometimes He gives it to kings and princes, sometimes to nobles and patricians, again to the whole people. The question is not whether the people or the king rules, but whether both of them, when they rule, do it by His grace." "With this, sentence is passed on two things. First on the sovereignty of the people in the sense of Grotius and Mirabeau. The notion that every man, simply because he is born of a woman, has claim to a share of political authority, and further, that the State comes into being through the combination of these parts, limits God's free-

dom, places in man as man instead of in the strong arm of God the fountain of sovereignty and must result in the abolition of all moral authority. But equally is the '*droit divin*' sentenced by it, in the sense of the Stuarts, the French legitimists, and of the Prussian nobility. What Charles I on the scaffold still proclaimed, that 'the people ought to have no part in the government; that does not belong to them: a king and his servants are altogether different persons'—that is the old bad theory which stamped princes as a sort of higher beings, and cannot coëxist with the confession of God's free sovereignty. Even for the prince there neither may nor can be question of a *regnum dei gratia*, of a *droit divin* in any other sense than that in which each of us exercises the authority wherewith he is clothed, and therefore must use it with regard to the rights of others and answerably to God. But equally inexorably as against prince-worship does this principle of God's sovereignty resist the supreme power of the State which is now arising. Whether what is God's only be given to a prince, or to a Parliament, or to a whole State, makes no difference. The State no less than the prince is a creature that owes its existence to Him, and can never break through the law in which He has said in majesty, 'I shall not give my glory to another.' " If God is sovereign, He appoints the lot of men according to His good pleasure. " He who believes in election, knows that he is chosen to something, and thus has an ethical calling; a calling to which, because it is divine, the most loving sacrifice must needs be brought; but also a calling which, because God is sovereign, shall prosper him wherein he is called; and so he hesitates not, nor balances nor weighs, but puts his hand to the task and carries it through."

From the sovereignty of God, finally, follows the sovereignty of His Word. The study of the Old Testament has more than anything else advanced the development of our constitutional freedom. " All writers on Calvinistic political law, whether natives of Geneva or Scotland, of the Dutch Union or France, of England or America, have defended popular freedom, from the first to the last, with a steady appeal to the political law of Israel. Not that they would revive the Mosaic law in their day. Of such a demand Calvin says: 'How perilous and monstrous this doctrine is, let others show, mihi falsam esse ac stolidam demonstrasse satis erit.' No: but there lies in the free apparition of the prophets, in the laws of assemblies (the Haba), in the special laws of heads of tribes and families, but above all in the manner in which the first king was chosen, a principle of political freedom which must banish with its fresh breath all political authority. There it

stands written of Saul that he was designated first by anointing and then by lot, but also that after the deliverance of Jabez all the people marched to Gilgal and there made Saul king. Likewise of David, that he was no doubt consecrated by Samuel, but nevertheless was anointed at Hebron by the elders of Juda, and did not acquire the crown from the unfaithful stock through tender from the heads of the stock. Does it then not follow of itself, that the Calvinistic statesman, who took no single step without consulting the Scriptures, saw in the light of the Divine approbation the conception of a folk-constitution which did not annihilate the hereditary right of the throne, but nevertheless moderated the power of the throne? The history of popular opinion as well as the political treatises prove thoroughly, that the facts of Saul's and David's crownings have hastened the development of our constitutional conceptions much more than the most beautiful theories."

All this is much more fully brought out by Dr. Kuyper in *Ons Program*, published in 1879. When he desires that the magistrate shall be looked upon as the servant of God, and denies that any authority should exist on earth which is not instituted by God, he by no means intends by this that the magistracy shall be bound to the support of any one distinct Church doctrine, or shall come forward in the capacity of a Church, as happens now in Russia and Germany. Dr. Kuyper only wishes that the magistrates shall not withhold themselves from the direct and indirect influence of the Word of God. Under its direct influence, he understands that the magistrates "who stand on the highest step, shall, with their own eyes, whether in the study or in the cabinet, gather out of God's Word, what they shall afterwards uphold in the chair or from the tribune as principles of government; under its indirect influence, that which is given forth through the Church or through the press, through the public officers of the nation or of Europe." The task of the Church here he limits to bestowing very special care on the magistrates who belong to its membership and to the fostering of ethical and especially of theological study. To a State Church he has an aversion; he does not wish the State to conduct itself as if no Church and no religion existed; what he desires concerning the magistracy is that they should be as they are in America, where, on the one side, the magistrates as such may appoint days of prayer, honor the seventh day, and yet, on the other side, the mutual relations of Church and State are more neutral than in any country in Europe. Interference of the State in matters of faith leads always to tyranny and must therefore be guarded against. Conscience is sovereign, and must erect an

unsurmountable barrier to the secular power. Dr. Kuyper is not blind to the possibility of men using scruples of conscience as pretexts for declining their lawful duties, but he would "rather needlessly go out of the way ten times for a distorted conscience than even once only bear down a good conscience."

He thinks the magistrate bound to administer oaths "as a servant of God." He judges this necessary as a reminder that, when engagements to trustworthiness are received from the magistracy or even when the king enters into the relation of constitutional prince to his people, there shall not merely a contract be concluded, "but recognition be given to a bond which in the course of circumstances has been laid on them by God, so that they bind themselves faithfully to perform the duties to which they are held by God." "From this principle, now, that, in the court of justice and in the establishment of obligation between the magistrate and the governed, there always lies behind the relation between the two persons a relation of both to the living God, it follows that it is good, that it is according to right, that it is matter of duty, that on both sides men should mutually recognize solemnly that they are obliging themselves not to one another merely, but over and above that to Him who knows the heart. We therefore not only permit the oath, but demand its use as the cement of the State." The preservation of the oath he insists upon, accordingly, with great emphasis. He is content to limit the oath to few and important occasions, that it may not lose its force and seriousness by frequent use, but would release from the oath only those who look upon swearing as not permitted to Christians. Atheists who declare that they believe in no God, he would permit to make only a declaration, but they must first show that they are not members of any church. "An atheist who nevertheless remains a member of a church of God certainly already exhibits himself by that very act as an untrustworthy man." Accordingly they must declare in writing that they refuse to swear "because they do not believe in the living God;" produce a suitable declaration by at least three known persons, that they are known as honorable and trustworthy men; promise that if they come to another mind, the promise made by them shall stand to them as an oath; and, finally, have declaration made by an honorable person that they speak the truth in the matter in hand. Dr. Kuyper considers that the very small number of atheists will justify this exceptional treatment. On our Dutch census registers, there appear, after deduction of the Darbyists and other Christian groups, at most two or three hundred persons who do not belong to some church fellowship. "And should it be pointed out that there are never-

theless many atheists who lurk in the fellowship of the churches, then our answer runs, It surely is dishonorable enough for an atheist to preserve the appearance of worshipping God in a church to justify distrust of his love of truth and of the trustworthiness of his word. We do not believe that there is any considerable number of these, and it remains most probable that atheists are so few in number that it is not necessary to make an exception of them. And in any event, doing rather too much than too little, we have indicated for these exceptions among the citizens, too, the way to bring, so far as possible, the indisputable right of the State into harmony with their peculiar situation."

On the same ground on which he makes it the duty of the magistrate to administer oaths, Dr. Kuyper demands that the magistrates be charged with care for the Sabbath rest. He does not wish that they should themselves serve the people with spiritual meat, but only that they should open to others the opportunity to do so. It is this end that the magistrate must have in mind in the first instance; the promotion of bodily rest and family life must come in only secondarily. He does not wish that on this account all work shall be forbidden, but that the magistrate himself should refrain from all work, and, further, should close what only with his permission will be open and is in conflict with the object of the Sabbath; that no work should be done in places of industry and trade which are opened under patents from the State and thus with its permission; and that in the concessions for carriage, transportation on Sunday should be limited. "Building up in the fear of God requires calmness, and calmness comes not, but is dissipated, if the people precisely on Sunday more than any other day are driven about to all four corners of the wind." "Then men are not rested on Monday mornings, but are more tired than ever. Then men return to their work on Monday, not sobered, but more frivolous than before. Then the people are not sanctified through their Sunday, but secularized, made light of mind and unwonted to discipline and order. That, to speak this out in our program also, the present Sunday law with its departure from this high standpoint should be repealed is self-evident. Just so it scarcely needs to be noted that it is only by a circumspect and methodical transition that the manners of the people can be thus reformed. And that with such a sanctification of the Sabbath, the workman will need a half-day of the work-week also for recreation, will appear later, in the discussion of the social question."

Great is the influence which Dr. Kuyper would give to the people in the government. Men must obey: but men must be

no willless tools in the hands of the rulers. One of the chief grievances which Dr. Kuyper has against the modern State is precisely that it holds all power in its hand, and takes away the securities which men formerly possessed to protect themselves against the arbitrariness of the central authority. In order to recover them, Dr. Kuyper demands decentralization. "A country is not a section of the earth with living beings on it which men are pleased to call men, but it is a system of life-circles which are there *jure suo*, and have in the course of history come under mutual engagements." The men of 1793 thought they could make of France what they would. For Robespierre and his co-peers it was merely an undivided, unpartitioned, and cohering piece of ground which could be parted equally well into ten or into twenty pieces, without considering anything further than questions of size and number of inhabitants. "So all sections must fall out about alike, and in order to reach that end men troubled themselves neither about tradition nor the custom of the people, but clipped with the revolutionary shears just across and athwart and through all joints. Doing this, men got no province, but a department—that is, a block, a division, a section of the one and indivisible patrimony which, without any appearance of independence, simply had a right of existence as a means to 'commodiousness of government.'" "In this system the partition of a country has no other reason than that the country is too big to be administered according to requirement as one, in its entirety, as it lies. If a race of officials could be found that had learned to hold with gigantic talent the whole in order, then this would have deserved the preference. But now that that kind of miraculous official does not exist, we must, according to the proverb, 'Divide and conquer,' cut up the land, in order to remain lord of it, and split it thus into such large parts and such small fragments as can be cared for conveniently by one set of officials." Dr. Kuyper's Anti-revolutionary principles stand directly opposed to this. If you except emigration, colonization and conquest, Dr. Kuyper asserts that there has never been a people, among the non-nomadic folks, that could in this way be cut into parts, but, on the contrary, out of the smaller parts the whole people has later arisen. The household is thus the basis; the house-father the interpreter, the natural representative, from the "smallest cabins, on account of which a nation is a nation." It is because of this that Dr. Kuyper would give to every head of a family the opportunity to cast his vote. "Not by dreamers in their hired chambers, but by the people in their families are the living thoughts always awakened which govern the spirit of the peo-

ple." To make the suffrage dependent on a census of lodging-houses, of capacity, etc., he rejects as arbitrary or superfluous. Just as, by ascribing to every house-father the right of suffrage, he would restore to the smallest bodies out of which the State is composed their natural representation, so would he do the same with communes and provinces. He demands for them, in the first place, greater independence in government and legislation, and more freedom from the central authority. The mode of appointing the provincial governors should also be modified. The burgomasters and the commissaries of the king, at present officials of the realm, he would have appointed out of a couple of candidates laid before the king by the commune and the provincial States. Both should also be chosen exclusively from men of the commune or province. "At present the families of the nobles and the well-to-do move to The Hague, to Rotterdam, to Amsterdam, if not to Brussels. They are constantly feeling themselves more out of place in their province. They no longer have anything to do there. There is nothing to bind them to it. There is no future for their sons. This furthers the overcrowding of the great centres of population, pushes the style of living ever higher, and gradually swallows up generation after generation in luxury. But reverse the situation: give back to your provinces a provincial importance; clothe the dignitaries of the province again with power and influence; give them assurance that these high posts shall actually be conferred on the province: you will at once see how families will recover a liking for their provinces; they will enter again into the matters of their administration with avidity, and will honorably once more fill the places which are by nature theirs."

He would further desire that what begins within the circle of a province or commune should be also ended in the commune or province. What does not concern the realm in its entirety, should be taken out of its hands. Dr. Kuyper is averse to a return to the federative condition. Foreign affairs, war, the marine, colonies, the ledgers of the national debt, the mail service, the national roads and the great arteries of trade—these affect the whole land and are thus matters of State; but tramways and neighborhood roads can very well be brought under the control of the commune or the province. Under the control of the commune there should further be placed small "polders,"* ordinary canals and drainage

* ["POLDER is a term applied to a morass or lake, the bed of which has been reclaimed by draining. A great part of Holland and Flanders has been thus reclaimed and rendered not only habitable, but extremely valuable for agricultural purposes."—*Bædeker.*]

canals: * under the control of the province, the great "polders," small dykes, small rivers, and canals: and under the control of the realm the management of the great dykes, sea-defenses, chief canals and national marshes. Under communal control the separate military companies and battalions; under provincial control the uniting of these battalions into corps: and under regal control only the command of the soldiery as a whole in time of war. Dr. Kuyper would have the same arrangement with reference to education. Under communal control the lower education; under provincial control the normal schools, the intermediate schools and the gymnasia; and under regal control only the higher instruction. He denies that the notaryship needs be a national concern, that the gathering of the direct taxes and excises may not be done in part by the commune or province, that the Church finances may not be committed to the province, that the country-police cannot be in great part provincial, that the prison system may not be overseen by the commune and province, that associations whose whole sphere of work is local cannot be satisfied with communal recognition. In his judgment there may just as well be left to lower governmental circles a part of the work which is done in the maintenance of the law, the guarding of public safety, and the accommodation of suits and disputes. It is well-known that in the case of the more specially Reformed countries, Scotland, England, America and Switzerland, all this exists in this manner. There is still much of it left in Germany and Austria; and only among the peoples of the Latin race there is, as a result partly of the influence of Rome, but especially of that of the French Revolution, not more left than the initiative which proceeds from the royal government. Finally he wishes that in all branches of government the communal and provincial boundaries should be honored in the partitioning of the country, and the administrative verdict be made independent and absolute.

Dr. Kuyper is not blind to the danger which centralization brings to the freedom of the individual. He desires therefore that the rights of individuals should not be left undefended, even when they are not expressly reserved. In the oversight of corporations into which men voluntarily enter, the task of the government here is very simple. If it is only strictly and inexorably forbidden that withdrawal from them be hindered, its duty is done. It is entirely

* ["CANALS ('Grachten') . . . intersect the country in every direction. They serve a threefold purpose: 1. As a means of communication, with which almost every town and village in the kingdom is furnished. 2. As drains by which superfluous water is carried off from the cultivated land. 3. They form substitutes for hedges and walls, which are not more common enclosures for houses, fields and gardens in other countries than canals are in Holland."]—*Bædeker.*]

otherwise, naturally, in the case of corporations into which men do not enter voluntarily, and which they cannot withdraw from. A child, for example, cannot desert his father's house; one cannot live in the Netherlands without holding abode in a province, or residing in a commune. In these matters freedom must be surrounded with defenses against arbitrary authority. In the organic union of the people of the past, he thinks, our popular representation was unsatisfactory. In our present system, on the contrary, he sees in part an embodiment of the conception of the French Revolution, in part homage to the old tradition of organic representation, through the separation of the nation into three classes, that of "the highest-taxed," that of the "census-paying" and that of the "under-aged." This is to disorganize the nation. In the system of representation also the organic union of the people must come again to its rights, and, after removal of the faults which cleaved to it before, advance in its natural and orderly development. The Anti-revolutionary statesmanship sees in a people something more than a heap of men: it proceeds on the assumption that there are such things as groups of persons, who have their own interests to defend in the social and political spheres. Society is made up out of classes and groups and communities of persons. Equality of individuals does not exist, because there are differences in position and birth, in education and manner of life. These groups are not arbitrarily "made," but, through the circumstances and changes of life itself, are "born" from the members and limbs of the people; and because now a body never exists in anything else than in its members, and cannot express itself through anything else but its members, every representation is false and to be rejected, which does not permit the nation to express itself regularly through these members, that is, organically. The States-general should, therefore, in his opinion, be chosen by the States-provincial, the States-provincial by the communal councils, and the communal councils by the communal corporations.

Even this, however, would not be enough. With exclusive attention to the organic union of the people, men would become one-sided and would overlook the fact that there exists among the people still another bond of union. The force which can drive a people forward on the path of true development does not work except through the systematic organism of corporations, communes and provinces. But the direction in which this force shall carry the ship of State is determined more directly by the life-principle and life-conception which is awakened in the home circle. Is there talk, for example, of the introduction, extension

or abolition of a patent-taxation, then men will see farmers of all kinds of tendencies and colors unite against all sorts of citizens to protect agriculture from the patent; while in the case of a political question, the school-question, for example, all class distinctions are lost and the orthodox farmer works together with the orthodox townsman for reaching the desired end. In the sphere of government, therefore, there are two sorts of decisions to take into account: decisions which concern the people in their corporate union, and decisions which have respect to the political directions in which the people shall be led by their magistracy. Both the old and new statesmanship have neglected this. In wishing to be merely corporate, men once based their legal existence solely on the spiritual unity of the nation; while now in holding exclusively to the political character of representation, they have altogether disavowed the corporate. "The result of this has naturally been that both in politics and among the nations the corporate interest has been neglected, and that, by a fault which lurks in the fundamental law itself, we have entered unawares into a road which has no outlet, where our politics seems to be a lame horse and the country's interests both here and in India seem to be lost through vacillation and bad management."

To correct this evil Dr. Kuyper thinks a double representation necessary. The one should be corporately, the other directly elected. No one, says Dr. Kuyper, "can deny that the nation, so far as it is divided into Liberal, Calvinist and Roman Catholic elements, is grouped in a manner very different from the partition into classes and corporations. And just as little can anybody deny that the lines that separate the three groups just named cut athwart the lines that separate the classes and corporations. And therefore no one can admit the possibility of finding a single sort of representation which will at the same time reflect the two groupings. But if this be so, then one of two things must follow: that you create one popular representation which will bring its rights to one of the two groupings only (either the political or the corporate), and look upon the other as non-existent; or else that you give expression to the double grouping which exists among the people in a double representation, and thus give your States-General a double character, by placing beside the corporate States, of which we spoke in the preceding article, a States-assembly of political character chosen directly by the people." If men will not do this, then Dr. Kuyper sees an injustice in every limit put on the suffrage of the masses. Well-known is his utterance, so frequently repeated during the last election: "To be a Liberal and opposed to universal suffrage, is needlessly to provoke the nation."

Those who reject the old historical representation and install in its place the idea of the atomistic State, must find their ideal realized in what Napoleon did : “ a popular election by all French individuals, undivided and unbroken, through the whole land, in one day.” “ Just as Prince von Bismarck has made it now in the German empire : an imperial diet, to which *all* German individuals elect—so, according to these doctrinaires’ demand, should it be everywhere.” That, now that the revolution has once for all destroyed class distinctions, a corporate representation is to be obtained only after a long time, Dr. Kuyper does not deny. Still he does not consider this difficulty important. On the contrary, in the Chambers of Commerce and in workmen’s associations he sees already developing bodies which fill the place of the old guilds, “ and should our Chambers of to-day in the Binnenhof only become ‘ kamers in ruste,’ and a code come into being which would advance instead of hindering the work of developing these popular associations, there would be hope of our cities recovering in every respect their past power. And this the more because the changed position of the lords of the manors and knightly properties have led the villages and boroughs also to enter into their development, and the commune can thus, through this extremely important change, rise to a far higher importance than it ever possessed in its best days.”

It is self-evident that our present manner of election would not fit into this system. The corporate States must naturally be chosen in a wholly different manner from the political States. Every guild, every corporation must regulate the manner of voting in its own circle, under the oversight of a higher college which must guard against violation of the national laws, and protect the rights of the minority. They should, further, in case they are distributed over different communes, have the power to bring their influence to bear directly in the States-provincial, and to remove or suspend their deputies from the exercise of their mandate, if this should sometimes prove desirable, or supplant them by others. It should stand entirely differently with the political representation. Since in their case the primary end must be to reflect as truly as possible the spiritual disposition of the nation, its life-conception and world of thought, Dr. Kuyper would with reference to them prevent overruling of the minority by the majority in the choice of their members. His main grievance against our present mode of election is that the majority twice in succession is pitted against the minority. “ First, in every election district the votes of the minority of electors are lost, and then again in the Chamber itself, in its turn, the majority of the elected set them-

selves again against the minority." Here therefore he would desire a regulation which would make it possible for every group of like-minded voters to delegate one or more of themselves. In case, for example, five hundred thousand votes were cast, every one who could unite five thousand votes on himself should be considered as elected. In proportion as the population grew, so would the number of votes cast be also increased, and so the representation become larger. For the number of the members of the Chamber should depend on the number of votes cast, since those who do not vote are naturally not represented. This, Dr. Kuyper thinks, should be not merely exceptional, but the approved rule. It is to the interest of no one to know beforehand of how many members the States shall consist, but only to bring in as many of his kindred spirits as possible. "And if there is a portion of the people who do not care for political matters, and do not think about them, and have no heart for them, how in the world can we be asked not to reckon as a cipher these non-voting voters?" The objection that out of the twelve hundred communes of the Netherlands it would be easy for forty or fifty dozen votes to be constantly cast for persons who had united each a few dozens of votes on themselves, but too few to earn a mandate, Dr. Kuyper rejects as merely specious. "If there are groups which wish to count, but are not able to bring a candidate of their own to success, then they ought to attach themselves under the name of their own man to the party to which they stand nearest, and then their number of votes will have their full effect." So long as the fundamental law permits the fulfillment of their wishes, Dr. Kuyper would have them avail themselves of census-abatement and modification of district lines.

The same thing which hinders Dr. Kuyper from finding satisfaction in the present regulations of the Dutch State, leads him to disapprove also of its tax system. Here, too, in his judgment, the nature of the Dutch people is overlooked. Not the several persons, but the nation in its national union is charged with raising the taxation. The nation remains a nation forever, and the financial administration of the government touches not only living persons, but also the coming generation. For this reason he opposes a general national importation tax; it looks upon each one personally, and not on the nation as a nation as tax-owing. Dr. Kuyper further distinguishes with sharpness between what the magistrate does "as magistrate" and as "man of business" for the citizens. Postal affairs, telegraphing, pilotage, and education are matters which do not directly belong to the nature of magistracy as such. The administration of justice, on the

other hand, the care of streets and roads, the administration of the navy and army, relations with foreign powers, cannot be lost hold of if the magistrate is to continue to be magistrate. The taxpayer should thus be chargeable only with the last-named things; the others should come at the expense of the owners. In order now to make the expenses as little oppressive as possible, Dr. Kuyper insists on limitation of matters undertaken by the State, raising of the tax from the organic property of the people, and decentralization in administration and taxation. To the commune he would give most to administer, to the province a notable part and to the realm itself as little as possible. "Concerning the commune taxation, a burgher can judge best; concerning the provincial one still a good deal; but concerning the realm taxation, certainly, the least of all." The kingdom has taken, however, nearly the whole administration in hand, and just on that account, writes Dr. Kuyper, it has come about that, since 1850, the expenses of the realm have increased by more than nine and forty millions of gulden. To meet debt and deficit, he would, in the first place, have an abolition of all royal subsidies for the communes, and the salaries of the members of the States-General cared for by their constituents; those of the cantonal judges and arrondissement benches by the communes and provinces, while the entire cost of its government should be borne by each province. The national militia and the lower education^o he would have every commune itself pay for, while he finally would expect a considerable decrease of the royal expenses from each province itself undertaking its intermediate education, normal schools and gymnasia, with the Church communities once for all counted out, the cost of the colonies and what concerns the marine set to their own account, and the raising of the tax as much as possible made communal.

In order to do no wrong to the claims of the organic union of the people, Dr. Kuyper thinks the magistrates must receive, of their means, out of "the increase of value which they themselves by their presence bring to the property of the nation" in commune, province and realm, by receipts obtained in a manner conformable to the nature of their being. He explains the first by an example. "Compare," he says, "the best land in Venezuela with our hungriest heath-land, and the latter will still be high in price, simply because the national union and a magistracy pledge order, afford transportation and put you in communication with the outer world, and thus at the least triple the value of your land. Similarly a house in Amsterdam of six rooms is worth more than a house in Purmerend of twelve. A shop in Rotterdam

makes twice as much from its capital as a similar firm in Assen. And, not to say more, a store in the Kalverstraat of our capital is five times as valuable as a store of similar size in Culemborg or Tiell." As to the second, he judges that to the realm belongs every tax on every portion of the kingdom, besides the import and export rights, the hypothecation, stamp, registration and succession taxes, the excises and whatever is received through branches of the public service from the royal domains, as tribute from other peoples or otherwise. To the commune, on the other hand, he would leave the disposal of the tax on dead capital, houses, consumption, and luxury, letters of incorporation, patents, licenses for professions, and similar businesses. He considers it a fault that there is a personal national tax. "Your house brings you into connection not with the kingdom, but with your neighbors and thus with the inhabitants of your town. What is laid upon it should be received then by the commune and not by the national government. Only then will the personal factor be able to work equitably in accommodating itself to the great differences of condition in cities and villages; will the silly taxing of chimneys and rooms cease; and also the progressive character be so arranged that it will really correspond to the reality in the local conditions."

From the communal income there should then a certain quatum be laid aside for the province and for meeting an eventual deficit in the national budget. The province is lacking, as he thinks, in media of taxation, since it does not come into relations with either persons or communes. Its expenses it must cover, therefore, by land improvement, drainage, etc., but what is lacking the communes must meet proportionately from their budget. Not otherwise is it finally with the nation. "The national government must possess an elastic means to close its accounts with each year. This, now, in our organic system cannot be otherwise found than by drawing *pro rata* upon the provinces, or, what comes to the same thing, on the communes. A deficit of 3,000,000 would thus cause a tax of about five additional cents per capita on the communes. An additional advantage would be occasioned by this, that the whole nation would at once feel that there was a deficit at The Hague, and those at The Hague would have precisely in this an additional spur to avoid a shortcoming which would be so undesirably public."

In conclusion, Dr. Kuyper speaks at large of defense, the colonies, the social question, and coöperation with other parties. In the matter of defense, he distinguishes two sorts, moral and military, both of the highest importance. The defense of the country

is, in a program of Anti-revolutionary principles, no appendix, but a fundamental principle. With the victory of revolutionary principles, patriotism is destroyed; and with it the idea that there is such a thing as a "righteousness of nations." The national days of fasting, thanksgiving, and prayer, formerly so highly in honor, have latterly been no longer appointed: the diplomacy which must "knit the tie which unites the international life of the nations," is adjudged a useless luxury, and reverence for treaties "as childish naïveté, the chosen butt of ridicule." "To speak still of a Christian family-bond for the nations is for our unchristian political philosophers and Jewish liberalistic authorities a thorn in the eye." Dr. Kuyper certainly does not deny that the law of nations celebrates a beautiful triumph for the sentiment of humanity, but he considers this dearly bought if it is erected on the ruins of the rights of the nations. More and more are the boundaries of the nations washed out, and the peculiarities of the peoples destroyed. Everywhere there is an effort observable to remodel the life of every people, of every village, of every station, according to one uniform pattern. Of old, the law of nations sought to secure to each nation its existence; now on the contrary the attempt is made to sacrifice the rights of the nations to one existence: men yield up every right to bring the European population into a universal conglomeration, and to remove everything which still hinders the smelting together of the diverse peoples. Without a revival of the national consciousness, he thinks therefore military defense useless. For this he deems knowledge of the history of the land in the first place needful. "Precisely in the history of the land lies the epic element which will inspire to new exploits by recalling the past." Thus will be reawakened the consciousness of citizenship now so weakened. "In the hour of danger the government has need of the people." "Wise governments have always, therefore, striven for their favor." "Our government, on the other hand, seems to look upon this wisdom as antiquated." "At least it has literally labored now for some years to undermine all trust in the governmental authorities of our rulers; it has contributed by nearly its every act to awaken discontent and murmuring; it has remained deaf to the most pressing and just complaints which have come to it; and it has sunk into the worst into which a government can fall, *i. e.*, into party tyranny, or, if you will, into the misuse of the executive power of the nation which is and must remain for all, for the destruction of what more than half the nation wishes." High importance, for what he calls moral defense, is attributed by Dr. Kuyper, finally, to diplomacy. He considers this far from a luxury; but rather on

the contrary wholly indispensable. That it may serve its end better than heretofore, he would connect a permanent college of advice with the department of foreign affairs, for the purpose of lessening the influence of cabinet changes on the course of affairs, and would salary the foreign ministers sufficiently to permit a man without private means to accept such a post.

Of an entirely different nature is the military defense. Although he supposes it must cost annually more than 40,000,000, he would not wish to advise laying the head in the bosom and letting defense languish. No people of character can yield up their national existence. If they must fall, let it at least be with honor. The present means of defense in the Netherlands, he considers, "meanwhile, to speak briefly, a disgrace to the government, and discreditable to the nation." Improvement, he expects, in the first place, through a higher valuation of the soldier. Further, through abolition of substitutes, discrimination between conscripts and volunteers, provincial armies, and harmony between people, army and militia. But here he would pass over to a high standard. For six months he would have all works undertaken in army and navy suspended, the departments themselves definitely organized, the general staff brought into order, and a well-considered and really consistent plan of general defense elaborated, in order that the vacillation may be stopped which the system of defense undergoes with every change of cabinet. "And when this has been accomplished, then there must be immediately prepared a complete plan of defense for the three most likely attacks that may be anticipated, down to the smallest detail, to the duty of every army division and the execution of each plan, and the whole be communicated to the commanders: and further all be put in such order that a sudden surprise either on the eastern boundary or on the seacoast shall be made impossible."

Equally radical is Dr. Kuyper in colonial matters. That these should be integral portions of the kingdom he denies. The colonies are the property of the kingdom; they form an organism of their own; and are separated from it by origin and history. He would not, then, smelt the two families together. In the colonies law may be given and justice executed in the name of the kingdom, but their internal affairs must as far as possible be decided at Batavia and Parimaribo. Exploitation and colonization he meanwhile would have none of. "One people may exploit another just as little as I may live off of the field of my neighbor." And for colonization he thinks the time not ripe. The sole lawful principle he thinks that of guardianship. The people conquered by the Netherlands he would have trained, their property made to

yield them the most possible, and they themselves put in the future in the most independent position possible. The conservative as well as the liberal colonial policy finds in him therefore an opponent. Over against both systems he erects the demand which has now for a long time been spoken of in India, that the farming system shall cease. Still this is scarcely a part of his program. Ethical training he considers unimaginable for India, if its starting-point is not to be "Christianizing India." From the government itself, however—this he puts in the foreground—there must proceed no efforts toward conversion. "The government knows, indeed, that India must be Christianized, but is itself incapable of doing the Christianizing, and meanwhile it finds over against itself, as its desired ally, the Church with its members which only waits until permission is given to bring the Gospel to these nations." Nevertheless, what he desires is not that the native idolatries of India should be let alone, out of esteem for them, or out of fear of fanatical outbreaks, but that the Christian principle shall triumph only by way of conviction. The Protestant Church must receive in India the same freedom as the Romish; missions must no longer be *suffered* as a necessary evil, but *welcomed* as a blessing; while in the schools the Christian-European form of society shall be free to labor for the blessing of the Mohammedan form of society. "Thus Christianity of itself may become a power which will gradually secure the education of the Javanese nobility, and, doing this, even if only by degrees, will open the way for what Java should have already possessed now for fifty years—a free university." Just as he demands a complete alteration in the conduct of the government, so he wishes a change also in the form of government. In the first place, he desires that the officials shall no longer be engaged in industrial undertakings or governmental agriculture, and shall not be, as is now tolerably frequent, at the same time both governor and judge. Further that the question of quality be considered. Nothing is more dubious than the feeling that India can "get along with an inferior article." He would station Europeans at the head only of the bureaus of administration. For Dr. Kuyper considers it an illusion to suppose that the Netherlands can provide a sufficient number of persons to man the whole Indian administration. Great difficulty is created in his system, however, by the financial question, inasmuch as the four best means of raising funds under our present management: farming, land rent, vassalage and opium-raising, do not seem allowable to him. He would wish that by a gradual change the whole domain should be distributed into holdings, to be worked by the Javanese on uncurtailed wages, and

then that the farmer should pay for the farm, ground burden, patent and exportation right. His West Indian program is naturally entirely different. There he would have the governor restored to an independent position over against the colonial States, aid given anticipatorily to the native society, and the necessity for foreign capital and foreign enterprise removed.

In regard to the social question, meanwhile—to close here—his earliest developed ideas appear, at least to some extent, to have been modified. The legislation on labor which Dr. Kuyper as early as 1876 desired seems to be coming. With the same argument as that by which he then in the Chamber pressed it upon the Minister of Justice, he demands it again in *Ons Program*. For Dr. Kuyper does not belong to the number of those who “imagine that there is power in a soup-cart, or in friendly visiting, or in Bible reading, to abolish the evil. The social question concerns not the poor, but the employer, the clerk and the small bureau employé.” Yet Dr. Kuyper does not expect it from legislation or labor. Along with a “change in the law” he considers it necessary to “return to godly conduct.” That inequality in property can be removed, he dismisses as a chimera and a deception of the people: his only effort would be the regulation and alleviation of the inequality which has arisen from sin and of the conflict which will persist as long as sin remains. Any degree of realization of this he considers possible only through a return to God’s Word. For that Word which condemns the usurer, and curses the hard-hearted master, says at the same time that vengeance is the Lord’s and that “it does not appertain to men to take vengeance out of God’s hands and to extort with the fist what was not given them from the Father’s hand.” But along with this he makes the demand that political equality be restored: not in order to *rule* by means of laws, but in order to *protect*. The protection of the weak is the especial task of the Government, and we are falling short of it in our legislation. In this he has his eye especially on our gratis legal processes, on the registration, military, poor and education laws, but not less on the “existing regulations and decrees which have by degrees embraced the whole body of our relations.”

In these matters he agrees that the Protestant Churches are powerless to do anything for the moral reformation of the lower classes, that trade and navigation have languished ever since King William I cast his eye exclusively on India, that our sugar-industry has been destroyed by regulations and import and export duties, and the stock markets have crowded out the markets of commodities. Only in case the elements which are now excluded

be embraced again in the representation of the nation, does Dr. Kuyper think a revival of these relations possible. "Only afford the opportunity to the elements which are now apparently or really held down to come forward for their rights, to lay their finger on the wound which is sapping their welfare, and to offer in the council-chamber defense against the amputation of their indispensable sphere of life; and gradually all that is sick will of itself grow well."

I have sought in what I have said above to set forth objectively what Dr. Kuyper has in view in Church and State. I shall not be expected to pass judgment upon it. To say nothing more, this is certainly not the time to do that. We read in the Frithiofsaga how the wise Bele admonished his sons:

"Praise not the day till set is the sun,
The mead is all drunk, the counciling done."

AMSTERDAM.

WITSIUS H. DE SAVORNIN LOHMAN.