Athabasca University ◢◣ Master of Arts - Integrated Studies

THE APPROPRIATION OF THE DUTCH NEO-CALVINIST
CONCEPT OF "WORLDVIEW," AND THE WAY IT WAS POPULARIZED
AMONG AMERICAN EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANS,
BY FRANCIS SCHAEFFER

MAIS 701 AND 702

By

JEREMY HEXHAM

Integrated Studies Project

submitted to Dr: Lisa Micheelsen

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts – Integrated Studies

Athabasca, Alberta

August, 2010

Abstract

Beginning in the mid-1970s, the term "worldview" gradually became popular among American evangelical Christians, as a result of the work of Francis A Schaeffer who popularized the term through his best selling books and films. The paper argues that in developing his thoughts about "worldviews," Schaeffer appropriated earlier, and far more sophisticated, theories of the Dutch political thinkers Abraham Kuyper and Herman Dooyeweerd. The ideas of these men, who are little known outside a narrow range of people within the evangelical sub-culture, is then explored to enable readers to understand the way evangelical thinking on this issue has developed. Part One of this paper examines the Dutch Neo-Calvinist background to Schaeffer's ideas. Part Two looks at the way Schaeffer popularized these ideas, which were then taken over and reduced to jargon by best selling evangelical authors who prepared the way for their use without an understanding of the complexity of the term and its intellectual background.

Contents

1

Part One
The Dutch neo-Calvinist Background to the use of "worldview"
by American Evangelical Christians

Introduction to Part One

During the 2008 American Presidential Election, Vice-Presidential candidate

Sarah Palin regularly invoked the idea of "worldview" to avoid articulating her policies.

Faced with hard questions, Palin, and several other candidates, said things like "this is

my worldview," or "he only says that because of his worldview" (*New York Times*, 2

October 2008; Gibson 2008). What was surprising about these exchanges is that

although the press castigated Palin for not answering questions, no one challenged her

to explain what she meant by "worldview" ,[1] or how it was relevant to the issue under

discussion. Instead, it was simply assumed that the idea of "worldview" was somehow

connected to her evangelical Christian education and church background (Beliefnet

2008; Brower, 2008; Huffington Post 2008; *New York Times*, 12/9/2008).

An examination of various books by evangelical Christians shows that it is indeed

the case that the term "worldview" is widely used in evangelical circles (Kraft 1978;

Schlossberg and Olasky 1987; Moreland and Craig 2003; Wolters 2005). Documenting

the way worldview has grown in popularity over time proved more difficult.

Nevertheless, there seems good reason to claim that although it was used before 1975,

it only gradually came into common use after 1975, and only really took off as a popular

idea in the past ten years (Appendix One).

The Dean of American historians of evangelicalism, George Marsden, says that it

---

[1] When a special term, like "worldview," is first introduced it will be placed in inverted commas. After that it will be written in a normal way.

was the evangelist, and popular philosopher, Francis A. Schaeffer (1912-1984),[2] who

popularized the idea of worldviews among evangelicals in 1976. He explains that

Schaeffer simplified the "sophisticated" ideas of the Dutch politician Abraham Kuyper

(1827-1920), which he brought to a wide audience through his "immensely popular film

series, *How Shall We Then Live?*" (Marsden 1991:108)[3] This film series appeared with

an accompanying book, and was followed by Schaeffer's best selling *Christian

Manifesto* (Schaeffer 1976;1981; 1982). Laurel Gasque, in her biography of the art

historian Hans Rookmaaker (1922-1977) also documents the influence of Kuyper and

his intellectual successor Herman Dooyeweerd (1894-1977) on Schaeffer (Gasque

2005:96-101).

David Naugle, who has written extensively on worldviews in relation to

philosophy, agrees. Naugle argues that the idea of "worldview," as a tool for cultural

analysis, originated with Kuyper before being developed by Dooyeweerd who added

philosophical weight to Kuyper's ideas (Naugle 2002:22; 25-26).[4] Then, from a small

group of Kuyper's North American disciples, "it spread into mainstream American

evangelicalism, where it has had a substantial impact" through the work of Schaeffer

(Naugle 2002:20; 24; 29-31).[5]

Because the works of Kuyper and Dooyeweerd remain relatively unknown, what

follows is an exposition of their ideas on worldviews in relation to their educational and

political thought. A short overview of the lives of both Kuyper and Dooyeweerd is

---

[2] The English writer Colin Duriez provides by far the best introduction to Francis Schaeffer in his biography *Francis Schaeffer: An Authentic Life* (2008).

[3] Later, Schaeffer's ideas were simplified by best selling authors like Tim LaHaye (b. 1926) in his best selling books on worldviews and education (La Haye 1980:5).

[4] The term "worldview," as Naugle notes a theological, as distinct from cultural/political, concept, was introduced to English speaking readers by the Scottish theologian James Orr (Naugle 2002:20). This Orr did in his *The Christian View of God and the World. The Kerr Lectures for 1890-91.* New York: Charles Scribner, 1897.

[5] Although Naugle has a lot to say about worldviews philosophically, his discussion of Kuyper and Dooyeweerd consists of a very general summary of their work. This essay provides a more detailed treatment.

provided in Appendix Two of this paper.

Kuyper's theory of "worldviews"

In ancient Greece the phrase "Know thyself" was carved above the entrance to the shrine of the Delphic Oracle. What this meant is somewhat unclear because even the philosopher Socrates (470-400 BC), told his friend Phaedrus "I can't as yet 'know myself', as the inscription in Delphi enjoins" because of ignorance (Plato, 1981:478-*Phaedrus* 230a). Therefore, while Socrates agreed with the idea of knowing oneself he was uncertain about how this could be achieved because the inscription was essentially a riddle, and therefore paradoxical (Plato,1981:478-Charmides164d and 164e).

During the Protestant Reformation in the 16th century John Calvin (1509-1564) began the influential 1559 edition of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, with the words: "*Without knowledge of self there is no knowledge of God*. Nearly all the wisdom we possess, that is to say, true and sound wisdom, consists of two parts: the knowledge of God and ourselves. But, while joined by many bonds, which one precedes and brings forth the other is not easy to discern" (Calvin 1961:35).

It was from this emphasis on self-knowledge, which runs through the philosophic and theological traditions of the West, that Abraham Kuyper began to develop his ideas about worldviews.[6] At the heart of his discussion of "worldviews" are three inter-related questions all of which concern the selfhood of the individual. These questions are: "1. our relation *to God*, 2. our relation *to man*, and 3. our relation to *the world*" (Kuyper 1898:16). The first of these questions focused on the fact that "worldviews" find their

---

[6] In his 1898 Stone Lectures on Calvinism, Kuyper referred to worldviews as "life systems." This, he explains in footnote 1 on page 3, was on the advice of his "American friends" who felt that the term "worldview" would not be understood in America.

"starting-point in a special interpretation of our relation to God." This Kuyper argued was "not accidental, but imperative," because our "consciousness" begins at a time when "our life is still undivided and lies comprehended in its unity" (Ibid).

Later, as we begin to think and reflect, this undivided whole takes shape in our thoughts. As a result an "antithesis," or division, is created between "all that is finite in our human life and the infinite that lies beyond it" (Kuyper 1898:17). It is, according to Kuyper, in this "infinite," which he goes on to identify with God, that "we find the common source from which the different streams of our human life spring and separate themselves" (Ibid).

Paganism, Romanism, Modernism and Calvinism as worldviews

Kuyper's key ideas on this topic are expressed in tantalizingly short sentences with regard to what he calls "*Paganism*," "*Romanism*," and "*Modernism*" (Kuyper 1898: 12-19). At the core of human consciousness lies what Kuyper calls "the depths of our hearts," from where "we disclose ourselves to the Eternal," and where, by implication God reveals himself to us. It is here that "all the rays of our life converge as in one focus" (Kuyper 1898:17). It is this "focus" that centers either in a relationship with the true God or an idol (Ibid).

Thus, "*Paganism*" creates its focus when it "assumes and worships God *in the creature*" (Ibid).[7] Against this clearly un-Christian view "*Romanism*," by which Kuyper means the Roman Catholic Church, argues that "God enters into fellowship with the

---

[7] Between Paganism and Romanism, Kuyper places what he calls "Islamism" which he says ""is characterized by its purely anti-pagan ideal" and "is the only absolute antithesis to Paganism" (Kuyper 1989:17-18). Unfortunately, Kuyper does not develop this thought and says nothing more of substance about Islam in the rest of his Stone Lectures. Therefore, his thoughts on the issue are unhelpful in terms of understanding his ideas about "worldviews."

creature *by means of a mystic middle link*, which is the Church" (Kuyper 1898:18).

Hence "the Church stands *between* God and the world" (Ibid).

More recently, Kuyper argues, "*Modernism*," arose from "the French Revolution," and nineteenth century "German philosophy" (Kuyper 1898:15). It created a worldveiw "diametrically opposed to" Christianity "in every sphere of human life" (Kuyper 1898:15). Indeed, Modernism actually "tries to overthrow" Christian traditions in favor of a mix of "Pantheism," Darwinian evolution, and "modern Buddhism" (Kuyper 1898:15-16). In answer to the question "how can Modernism, be described as a worldview when worldviews rest on a relationship to God?", Kuyper answers Modernism "implied a fundamental and special interpretation of our relation to God. It was the declaration that henceforth god was to be considered as a *hostile power*, yea even as dead, if not to the heart, at least to the state, to society and to science" (Kuyper 1898:21-22).

Calvinism on the other hand, Kuyper claims, "does not seek God *in* the creature, as Paganism … it posits no *mediate communion* between God and the creature, as does Romanism; but proclaims the exulted thought that, although standing in high majesty above the creature, God enters *into immediate fellowship with the creature*, as God the Holy Spirit (Kuyper 1989:18).

The Implication of Worldviews for Human Society

After establishing this religious framework, in terms of answers to his first question, Kuyper outlines his understanding of how these answers affect the lives of people. This he does by arguing that the way humans understand their relationship to God affects the way they related to each other. He writes "I maintain that it is the interpretation of our relation to God which dominates" the whole of life (Kuyper

1898:22). He then explains that because whenever anyone excels their success is attributed to "a divine superiority" (Kuyper 1898:25)[8]. Consequently, it leads to the adoration of "demi-gods," and "hero worship," which creates rulers who are regarded as sacred. On the other hand if people lack great talents, and are low on the social scale, they are seen as lacking in divine attributes. This gives rise to "systems of caste" and the justification of slavery. In this way Paganism ultimately places "one man under a base subjection to his fellow man" (Kuyper 1898:25-26).

"Romanism," Kuyper argues is tempered by biblical Christianity. Therefore, it "overcomes the absolute character of distinction" between individuals found in Paganism (Kuyper 1898:26). Instead it "renders" such distinctions "relative" "in order to interpret every relation of man to man *hierarchically*." This he claims leads "to an entirely aristocratic interpretation of life" (Ibid). "Finally Modernism," Kuyper tells his readers, "denies and abolishes every difference" because it is rooted in a monistic evolutionary outlook. Therefore, it "cannot rest until it has made woman man and man woman, and putting every distinction on a common level, kills life by placing it under the ban of uniformity" (Ibid).

Calvinism on the other hand "places our entire human life immediately before God" (Ibid). As a result "all men or women, rich or poor, weak or strong, dull or talented" are sinners who "have no claim whatsoever to lord over one another" (Ibid). Therefore, "we stand as equals before God, and consequently equal as man to man" (Ibid). From this theoretical position Kuyper draws the immensely practical conclusion "Calvinism condemns not merely all open slavery and systems of caste. But also all covert slavery

---

[8] In this and subsequent passages Kuyper is cryptic in his stone lectures which he wrote in English. Apparently he dealt with these issues in more details in his extensive Dutch writings which remain untranslated.

of women and of the poor; it is opposed to all hierarchy among men" (Kuyper 1898:27). Thus, Calvinism "was bound to find its utterance in the democratic interpretation of life; to proclaim liberty to nations; and not to rest until both politically and socially every man, simply because he is a man, should be recognized, respected and dealt with as a creature created in the Divine likeness" (Ibid).

Worldviews and the way we see the world

From this vision of human relationships Kuyper moves on to consider the relationship of humans to the world. Paganism, he claims, "places *too high* an estimate upon the world" (Kuyper 1898:29).

In "Romanism," he says, "the Church and the World were placed over against each other" (Ibid). Thus the Church was seen as sacred while the world was profane, creating a dualism that ran through every aspect of life. The "the entire social life" was under the authority of the Church, at least in theory if not in practice" (Ibid). As a result "art and science had to be placed under ecclesiastical encouragement and censure; trade and commerce had to be bound to the Church by the tie of guilds; and from the cradle to the grave, family life was to be placed under ecclesiastical guardianship" (Kuyper 1898 29-30).

Calvinism, on the other hand, proclaimed that every person and thing stands directly before God. It honors "the Divine image" in humans, as well as "*the world* as a Divine creation" (Kuyper 1898:30). Calvinism also recognizes a mediating principle that Kuyper calls "*common grace* by which God, maintaining the life of the world, relaxes the curse" of sin which rests upon it (Ibid). The main social consequence of this profound

change in thinking, Kuyper argues, is that "the Church receded in order to be neither more nor less than the congregation of believers, and every department of the life of the world was not emancipated from God," as the French Revolutionaries sought to do, "but from the dominance of the Church" (Kuyper 1898:32).[9]

Kuyper on "antithesis"

For Kuyper embracing a Calvinist worldview entailed developing a unique political theory (Kuyper 1898:98-142). This is his theory of "sphere-sovereignty." Behind this theory, however, are two other related ideas. These are "antithesis" and "common grace."

Antithesis is a key term in Kuyper's thinking (Kuyper 1898:17; 29; 116; 174; 186; 246; 1968:27, 63; 98). At its core is the idea of what Christians have traditionally called "the Fall." That is, the original human rebellion against God by which sin entered the world (Kuyper 1968:115-117). As a result Kuyper argues there are "*Two Kinds of People*," sinners and the redeemed (Kuyper 1968:150-154). This implies that there are "*Two Kinds of Science*," reflecting different worldview orientations (Kuyper 1968:155-176).

It is easy to argue that Christians and non-Christians have nothing in common on the basis of Kuyper's understanding of both theology and worldviews. But, Kuyper strongly rejected this view. He says that even though there are two kinds of science,

---

[9] One of the most interesting conclusions Kuyper draws from his analysis of worldviews is that Calvinism as a religious system sees all humans as equal before God and encourages what he calls "*the commingling of blood*" (Kuyper 1898:37-38). Thus Calvinism is against all forms of racism. Given the fact that this was said at a time when "scientific racism" was on the rise it is a remarkable statement. Cf. Dubow, Saul. *Scientific Racism in Modern South Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995; and Barkan, Elazar. *Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States Between the World Wars*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

one produced by believers, the other by non-believers, in practice "there is a very broad realm of investigation in which the difference … exerts *no* influence" (Kuyper 1968:157). As a result the ideas of Christians and non-Christians are "interlaced" (Kuyper 1968:162). Therefore, Christians and non-Christians can work alongside each other in harmony. This working together, which the idea of antithesis seems to deny, is possible because of what Kuyper calls "common grace."

The idea of "common grace"

"Common grace," as distinct from "special grace" which brings salvation to mankind through the atoning death of Jesus Christ, is based on the Calvinist idea of the Fall. This teaches that through the original sin of Adam and Eve everyone is born a sinner and inclined to rebellion against God. But, Kuyper argues, some people, Christians, have accepted God's special grace and their sins are forgiven. Nevertheless, Kuyper denies that redemption leads to perfection on earth. Even a redeemed Christian remains a sinner and owes their salvation to the work of the Holy Spirit (Kuyper 1900:252-337; cf. Heslam 1998:40-42).

It is at this point that Kuyper's understanding of "common grace" comes into play. Everyone knows some professing Christian who acts in very un-Christian ways. In fact, history is littered with examples of such people. At the same time we all know some non-Christian who is exceptionally caring and good. Once again history provides many examples of good people who were not Christians. Kuyper explains this phenomenon by arguing that everyone is equally capable of terrible deeds and great goodness. This is not because of anything in the person, but rather because the Holy Spirit works in us

all of us restraining evil and promoting good. It is this reality of self-evident goodness that Kuyper calls "common grace." It is common to all and is grace in the sense that it originates with God (Kuyper 1998:165-201).

"Sphere Sovereignty"

Kuyper defines sovereignty as "the authority that has the right, the duty, and the power to break and avenge all resistance to its will" (Kuyper 1998:466). He then argues that such "absolute sovereignty cannot reside in any creature but *must* coincide with God's majesty" (Ibid). Therefore what becomes important is how such "sovereign authority" is delegated in terms of the way it is "exercised in *human* office" (Ibid).

The answer, he says, depends on whether one accepts Christian revelation or not. Those who reject revelation allow, "*insofar as practical*," the exercise of "undivided" authority over all areas of life. This gives the State the power of "unlimited rule, disposing over persons their lives, their rights, their conscience, even their faith" (Ibid). Christians on the other hand proclaim "Sovereignty must be delegated not 'insofar as practical' but *absolutely* undivided and unbroken" (Ibid). He continues the "perfect Sovereignty" of God "directly denies and challenges all absolute Sovereignty among *sinful* men on earth, and does so by dividing life into *separate spheres*, each with its own sovereignty" (Kuyper 1998:467).

The need for a state arises out of two main dangers. First, "one sphere of life may encroach on its neighbor" (Kuyper 1998:468). Second, ""since personal life can be suppressed by the group in which one lives, the state must protect the individual from tyranny" (Ibid). Kuyper claimed that those who reject sphere sovereignty, tend to vest

sovereignty either in the State, or in the will of the people (Kuyper 1998:469-471). This

results in granting sovereign power to either an individual, like a king, or a group, that

claims to act on behalf of the people. In either case, sooner or later, tyranny results

(Kuyper 1898:108-115).

Against these positions Kuyper says Christianity vests sovereignty not in one but

in many different areas, or spheres, of life. This makes the absolute sovereignty of a

person or group impossible. Thus in their own carefully delineated realms "the family,

the business, science, art, and so forth are all social spheres" each with a right to limited

sovereignty (Kuyper 1898:116). They stand alone rather like the "mediating structures"

envisioned by the American political theorist Michael Novak (1980). The result is the

creation of a pluralistic society with many sources of power and authority. Yet, even

when such arrangements are recognized there is always the danger of returning to

absolutism because "*Sin* threatens freedom from within each sphere just as strongly as

State-power does at the boundary" (Kuyper 1998:472-473).

Kuyper's theory of the State

Recognizing that society can easily degenerate into anarchy, Kuyper develops

his theory of the State. He writes "The various spheres of life cannot do without the

State sphere" (Kuyper 1998:472). This is because "the State fixes their boundaries by

law" (Ibid). Thus the State "is the *sphere* of *spheres*, which encircles the whole extend

of human life" (Ibid). Therefore, it has a "*mechanical* character" which makes

government possible (Kuyper 1898:116-117). On the other hand, the various social

spheres have are "*organically* developed" (Kuyper 1898:117-118).

Kuyper then asks: "Does this mean that government has no right *whatsoever* of interference in these autonomous spheres of life?" (Kuyper 1998:124-125). He answers this question with a bold: "Not at all" (Ibid). Then he outlines the powers, rights, and duties of government. These are: "1. Whenever different spheres clash, to compel mutual regard for the boundary-lines of each; 2. To defend individual and weak ones, in those spheres, against the abuse of power of the rest; and 3. To coerce all together to bear *personal* and *financial* burdens for the maintenance of the natural unity of the State" (Ibid).

Sphere sovereignty in practice

On the basis of this theory of sphere-sovereignty, Kuyper legitimated his views about education, the economy, family life, and a host of other social issues (McGoldrick 2000:62-72). The example of education shows how Kuyper, and his supporters, reasoned.

According to his theory the realm of education is a social sphere in its own right. Kuyper declared "We must resist tooth and nail any imposition upon learning by the church" (Kuyper 1998:477). Then he adds "nearly the same may be said of the State," and any other powerful institution. Therefore, the integrity of schools and universities has to be protected from powerful forces, be they institutions, like business, churches, or wealthy individuals and even the family. In particular, the State cannot be trusted in this area because "every-state power tends to look upon all liberty with a suspicious eye," and education promotes liberty (Kuyper 1998:476).

For this reason Kuyper devised various schemes to increase the independence of state schools and universities while encouraging the development of independent

educational institutions. Recognizing that the State has a legitimate interest in education, Kuyper sought to regulate its power over education. In answer to the argument that the State has a right to do what it wants in schools and universities because they are paid for out of tax revenues. Kuyper counters this by arguing that taxes are raised from people for their benefit. Therefore, they have a right to have their money spent in ways that they approve.

Then he argues that it is the responsibility of the State to share its tax revenues with, what today we call, "non-profit" institutions. This is because not to do so means that, in effect, some people will be forced to pay twice for the services, such as education, that they require. That is, they pay taxes for the support of State schools and universities, then they pay again for their children to attend Christian schools and universities. This he asserts is clearly an injustice. Therefore, the State should recognize its duty to support all schools, and similar institutions, regardless of who founded them, and their religious or ideological orientation (Heslam 1998:36-40; McGoldrick 2000:52-61).

Kuyper also applied his ideas to things like economics and labor relations. In doing so he castigated both *laissez-faire* capitalists and what he saw as equally irresponsible socialists (Kuyper 1950).

Interestingly, he developed a critique of popular journalism which his party later developed into a unique press and broadcasting policy. As a result when public broadcasting developed in the Netherlands, a clear distinction was made between reporting news, and commenting on the news. Thus the main news broadcasts were to simply report what happened as objectively as possible. Then various interested parties,

political, and religious groups, were to be given the opportunity to provide commentary. This was, and to some extent remains, a highly complex system intended to recognize and foster the growth of a harmonious pluralistic society (Hiemstra 1977). Given the way our television is swamped by commercials and our news is increasingly a blend of reporting and docu-drama, such a system has a lot going for it.

Finally, it needs to be noted that, in spite of his arguments about limiting the power of governments, Kuyper was no libertarian. Nor was he a small government Republican. He believed in Government regulation, but by a regulated government. To understand what this means, and the way Kuyper's ideas were developed, it is now necessary to turn to the work of Herman Dooyeweerd.

Dooyeweerd's transcendental critique

Dooyeweerd's highly theoretical reflections on philosophy grew out of very practical concerns about law reform. On what basis, he asked, was it possible to reform Dutch law? To answer this question he looked at the philosophical arguments used by legal theorists. This inquiry led him to recognize that the drive for legal reform in the 1920s was rooted in the then popular neo-Kantian system of philosophy. For a variety of reasons Dooyeweerd found this system unsatisfactory. Therefore, he embarked on a detailed study of the Western philosophical tradition (Kalsbeek 1975:14-15; 19-22). Beginning with the pre-Socratics, Dooyeweerd analysis of the western philosophical tradition led him to conclusions that are remarkably similar to those reached by Thomas Kuhn in his highly acclaimed *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962) thirty years later.

As he read western philosophy from the pre-Soctratics until his own time, Dooyeweerd recognized a basic problem underlying all philosophical inquiry. This was the question why equally intelligent men, and the people he studied were men, failed to reach agreement on the basis of reason despite repeated assertions that they were committed to the use of reason to resolve philosophical issues. If reason guided each and every philosopher why were there so many unresolved issues and sharp conflicts between competing schools of philosophy? (Dooyeweerd 1948:1-2; Conradie 1960:36-37)

Surely, he argued, something was wrong and they all could not be committed to the use of reason as they claimed. Somehow, what each school of philosophy called "reason" was different in practice. Yet if philosophers argued on the basis of something other than reason what was it? Or if they actually used reason what led them to reach what were often diametrically different conclusions? (Dooyeweerd 1965:1-6)

The problem of theoretical thought

Dooyeweerd's *New Critique of Theoretical Thought* (1953-19) is perhaps best described as an extended commentary on the old English nursery rhyme "Humpty Dumpty," which goes:

> Humpty Dumpty sat on a wall,
> Humpty Dumpty had a great fall;
> All the King's horses and all the King's men
> Couldn't put Humpty Dumpty together again.
> (Opie and Opie1975:25)

If our initial, everyday, immediate experiences of life are likened to Humpty Dumpty and scientific, or analytic, thought is the "great fall," then we understand Dooyeweerd's basic

problem. In his view people initially experience life with an immediacy that lacks reflective analysis. Then, as they mature, and when they are reflective, they develop analytic skills that dissect the various components of the initial experience into their component parts. Yet these parts are never quite the same as the original whole (Dooyeweerd 1953:3-7).

For example, we can attend a concert and enjoy the music of Bach. Then we can reflect on the acoustics of the concert hall, the cost of the concert ticket, or think about the way the musicians are dressed. In doing so we can ask the question whether their black evening suits, and satin dresses, are really appropriate dress for the twenty-first century? Thoughts like these separate the experience of the concert from its actuality.

That is our analysis rips parts of the experience from the whole. This ripping is in itself very valuable and an essential part of life. It gives rise to what Dooyeweerd calls the "modal aspects" of reality such as arithmetic, physics, biology, economics, history, etc (Dooyeweerd 1953:1-24). Yet whenever someone lives through an event and then reads, or hears, a description of it something is missing. The analysis that makes a shortened description of the concert possible is both valuable and disappointing. This is because however well the concert is described the description is not the same as the concert itself.

This ripping effect, or analytic function of thought, Dooyeweerd argues gives rise to the various sciences which dissect what we normally experience as an living reality that is infinitely complex. Therefore, Dooyeweerd argues the one of the main challenges to critical thinking is not analysis, which it already does very well, but to show how the separate pieces of experience can be brought together again in a synthesis that creates

a coherent whole (Dooyeweerd 1953:45-52).

It is this difference between the experienced whole and the analytic parts that Dooyeweerd describes in terms of "naïve experience" and "theoretical thought" both of which, he argues, are created through the ever present experience of time. In its origin we experience life as a coherent whole. Then as we grow we begin to differentiate. This differentiation occurs because of what Dooyeweerd calls "cosmic time." The whole of our experience is bounded by cosmic time which acts like a prism that divides white light into the colours of the spectrum. Shine a torch through a prism and the original white light takes on a variety of colors. So too cosmic time divides our otherwise undivided experience of existence into many parts (Dooyeweerd 1953:3; 34; 38-44; Kalsbeek 1975:160-171).

Once the original coherence of experience is splintered then as humans we continually seek to make sense of life. In doing so, we try to recapture life's original untroubled sense of coherence and give it meaning. Therefore, what makes us human is our desire to understand and make sense of our existence. Yet, Dooyeweerd argues, to make sense of experience requires a starting point that stands outside experience itself. This he calls the Archemedian point after the Greek philosopher Archimedes (287-212 BC) who is reported to have said "give me a lever long enough and I can move the entire world" (Dooyeweerd 1953: 8-9: 11-12; Kalsbeek 1975:56-61).

Finding such a perspective Dooyeweerd argues presents humans with two choices. Either they look towards the source of all creation, which is itself outside creation, or they utilize one or more aspects of creation to interpret the rest of creation. Therefore, humans either look to God, the creator, as the source or their being and the

diversity of our universe, or they elevate part of God's created reality to become the integration point for all things. This latter choice, Dooyeweerd argues, is what the Bible describes as idolatry. In the *New Critique*, Dooyeweerd describes it as "apostate reasoning" (Dooyeweerd 1953:20-21; 99-107; Conradie 1960:50-51; Brümmer 1961:86-89).

Stated another way, according to Dooyeweerd, religion is "the innate impulse of human selfhood to direct itself toward the *true* or towards a *pretended* absolute Origin of all temporal diversity of meaning, which finds focused concentrically in itself" (Dooyeweered 1953:57). Thus for Dooyeweerd religion is "the absolutely central sphere of human existence" which "transcends all modal aspects of temporal reality" and holds everything together (Dooyeweerd 1953:57-58).

As such our religious orientation shapes our self understanding. This is because "All self-knowledge is dependent on knowledge on God. In the same way the *apostate selfhood only arrives at self-knowledge through its idols,*" which, Dooyeweerd says, it "absolutizes" to create meaning (Dooyeweerd 1955:323).

Therefore, he insists, all of our reasoning is ultimately based on "faith." For Dooyeweerd, faith is "by its nature related to divine revelation" (Dooyeweerd 1953:33). Therefore, anyone who rejects Christian revelation has to exercise faith in some aspect of created reality if they are to make sense of the world (Dooyeweerd 1955;293-319; Kalsbeek 1975:132-136). What exactly "faith" is, Dooyeweerd refuses to say, except that it is our "highest" function which enables us to create a coherent vision of life (Dooyeweerd 1955:293; 298-299; 302-305).

Recreating coherence

Returning to the image of Humpty Dumpty, what Dooyeweerd seems to be saying is that the authors of the old nursery rhyme were right. Once Humpty is shattered into pieces he can never be put together again in a way that restores his original wholeness. We may be able to stitch, nail, glue or graft Humpty into a whole. We may have photographs or him, or video tapes, films and sound recording, all of which look like and sound like Humpty. We may even make a robot that, like the robots of Isaac Asimov's novel *I Robot* (1957), looks identical to a human being. Or, perhaps like the scientists in the film *The Boys from Brazil* (Schaffner 1978), we may create a clone of Humpty. But, none of these things, however close to the original, will be the *real* Humpty Dumpty. All we can do is bring together certain aspects of the original to create a partial representation.

So too, in recreating theoretically the original coherence of naïve experience, all we can really do is approximate reality by viewing aspects of reality as though they are the whole. This in itself, according to Dooyeweerd, is not a bad thing. Indeed it is the essence of science (Dooyeweerd 1953:47-48). Behind such thinking, Dooyeweerd argues, is the fact that "All *diversity* of meaning in temporal reality supposes a temporal *coherence* of meaning and the latter in its turn must again be the expression of a deeper *identity* (Dooyeweerd 1953:79).

Where the search for a basis for theoretical reflection goes wrong, and where all human science goes wrong, is when we mistake the reconstruction for the original. When this happens people try to reduce the whole of life to a new coherence created by viewing life through the lens of one aspect of reality. To avoid such reductionism,

Dooyeweerd argues, we need to recognize that reality is held together by God. This means that the different aspects, or modes, of reality are just that aspects and not the whole (Dooyeweerd 1953:99-104). This for Dooyeweerd is the truth behind Kuyper's three original worldview questions (Dooyeweerd 1953:104-105).

Dooyeweerd and the notion of worldview

Developing his analysis of naïve experience and theoretical thought, Dooyeweerd slowly began to recognize certain patterns in the history of philosophy. As he did it became clear to him that Greek and later Roman philosophers, despite the differences between them, shared certain assumptions. These assumptions were later abandoned in the West following the conversion of the elites of the Roman Empire to Christianity. Then for a long period, usually called the Middle Ages, philosophers once again shared certain common assumptions that shaped their thinking. This changed once more with the dawn of the modern era beginning with philosophers like Hobbes and Descartes (Dooyeweerd 1948:17-24; 1979:7-11).

As a result of this inquiry Dooyeweerd claims to have isolated four major themes underlying philosophic thought. These are related to, although not restricted to, three time periods in Western history. These themes display fundamentally different interests. Consequently, he argues conflicts between philosophers in each of these periods were essentially quite different in character from the conflicts that occurred in the other periods (Dooyeweerd 1948:17-24; 1979:7-11).

Attempting to clarify this idea further, Dooyeweerd appeals to the idea of worldview which German thinkers had developed under the term *weltanschauung*.

Nevertheless, he argues that worldview does not quite capture the full implications of what he observed (Dooyeweerd 1953:120-124).

According to Dooyeweerd everyone has a worldview even though most people are unaware of the fact. This is because worldviews are simply the way people see the world. Therefore, a worldview simply reflects our socialization. Once analyzed and made explicit worldviews are transformed into philosophies of life. "The genuine life- and world-view," Dooyeweerd writes, "has undoubtedly a close affinity with philosophy …" Nevertheless, the two should not be confused (Dooyeweerd 1953:128). Worldviews and philosophies ought to be seen as complementary (Dooyeweerd 1953:124-133; 156- 158).

Where Dooyeweerd differs from other thinkers who write about worldviews, and philosophies of life, is when he argues that both philosophy and worldviews must "understand each other mutually from their common religious root" (Ibid). Thus, he moves beyond the analysis of worldviews and philosophies to what he identifies as "religious ground motives" (Dooyeweerd 1953:115). These are the "spiritual force that acts as the absolutely central mainspring of human society" (Dooyeweerd 1979:9) As such ground-motives are always "*communal*." Further they are inspired "either by the spirit of God or that of an idol" (Ibid).

Therefore, even when worldviews are analyzed and shaped into coherent wholes the inability of people to reach agreements remains. This, Dooyeweerd argues, is why we also need to become aware of, and analyze critically, ground motives. These he claims are the basic frameworks into which individuals are socialized by the communities into which they are born. Such communal attitudes underpin worldviews

and even naive experience itself (Dooyeweerd 1953:82-83; 164; 1965:32-34).

"Religious ground-motives"

Explaining his understanding of ground motives Dooyeweerd argues that

"western political systems, social structures, sciences, and arts demonstrate time and

time again that all public expressions of society depend upon spiritually dominant

cultural powers" (Dooyeweerd 1979:11). He reduces these to four dominant forces, or

ground motives that he says "have clashed" throughout "western history" (Ibid).

Dooyeweerd explains these cultural forces as:

1) The "form-matter" ground motive of Greek antiquity in alliance with the Roman idea of *imperium*.

2) The scriptural ground motive of the Christian religion: creation, fall, and redemption …

3) The Roman Catholic ground motive of "nature-grace," which seeks to combine the two mentioned above.

4) The modern humanistic ground motive of "nature-freedom," in which an attempt is made to bring the three previous motives to a religious synthesis concentrated upon the value of human personality. Greek ground motive of (Dooyeweerd 1979:15-16).

Of these, Dooyeweerd argues, the Greek must be seen as the key one in western

thought because it "continued to operate in both Roman Catholicism and humanism"

(Dooyeweerd 1979:16).

Outlining his ideas Dooyeweerd says that Greek thought and society originated

in a nomadic situation in physically dangerous forests and plains. Therefore, life was

shaped by a nature religion that deified "a formless, cyclical stream of life" in which "the

individual form was doomed to disappear" (Dooyeweerd 1979:16). In this situation "the

worship of the tribe and its ancestors was thoroughly interwoven with their religious conceptions" where time was "cyclical" (Ibid). More importantly, "Mysterious forces were at work in this life stream" which "did not run their course according to a traceable, rational order, but according to *Anangke*," or "blind, incalculable fate" (Ibid).

After occupying, and settling down to a stable lifestyle, in what became Greece, these formally nomadic tribes developed new religious conceptions following the growth of the *polis*, or city state. This "newer cultural religion," Dooyeweerd writes "was a religion of form, measure, and harmony" centered on the Olympian gods (Dooyeweerd 1979:18). Yet, instead of totally abandoning the older nature religion, the poet Homer "tried to incorporate" its major tenants into the new religion (Ibid). As a result the idea of *Moira* developed as a new expression of *Anangke* within a new framework. Consequently even the Olympian gods were subject to *Moira,* or 'fate', which now became "something of design" or a "principle of order" (Dooyeweerd 1979:15-28).

Dooyeweerd claims that the tension between these two religious traditions led to the development of the ground motive he identifies as "matter-form." Here "matter" represents the chaos of nomadic life, while "form" represents the ordered life of the *polis* (Dooyeweerd 1979:15-22). As a result both the older and newer religions existed in tension within Greek society. Consequently, the Greeks observed "the ancient rites of nature religions in private but," worshiped the Olympian gods in pubic as the gods of the State (Dooyeweerd 1979:21).

The rise of the Macedonian empire, and conquests of Alexander the Great, led to the development of ideas later identified with that of *imperium*. This idea was taken over by the Romans when they conquered Greece. As a result the Greek ground motive of

matter-form spread throughout the Roman world to create new views of law and society (Dooyeweerd 1979:22-25).

Standing in sharp contrast to the Greco-Roman, matter-form, ground motive Dooyeweerd , identifies what he calls a "second ground motive which shaped the development of western culture" (Dooyeweerd 1979:28). This is the biblical ground motive of "creation, fall and redemption." Unlike the tension ridden matter-form ground motive, Dooyeweerd argues the biblical one creates a unified view of life because: "No equally original power stands over against" God (Dooyeweerd 1979:28-31).

Thus while people influenced by the matter-form ground motive continually seek to interpret life by creating absolutes out of aspects of created reality, those under the sway of the biblical ground motive recognize that everything has its origin in God. Therefore they recognize the reality of diversity and do not try to reduce all of created reality to one or more aspects of that reality (Dooyeweerd 1953:61; 1965:41-43).

The third ground motive, identified by Dooyeweerd, is "nature-grace." This, he argues, is the synthesis between Greek and Biblical ground motives made by medieval Roman Catholic philosophers particularly those who worked with Aristotle's ideas (Dooyeweerd 1979:111-137). As such it blends aspects of both the Greek and biblical ground motives. This synthesis keeps the realm of nature, or natural life, essentially distinct from the realm of grace, where Biblical ideas hold sway. Consequently "the Christian idea of creation" was accommodated to Greek ideas about nature freeing secular life from subjection to Biblical thinking (Dooyeweerd 1953:65-66).

This compromise caused the Christian view of life to lose much of its uniqueness. As a result it eventually disintegrated as a universal cultural force in Western Europe to

make possible the new humanistic ground motive of "nature-freedom," or, as Dooyeweerd sometimes calls it, "science-personality" (Dooyeweerd 1953:198-199; 1979:175-178). Thus from the Renaissance onward, and particularly during the Enlightenment, Dooyeweerd identifies the fourth ground motive nature-freedom which inspires modern Humanism. He claims that this ground motive has slowly gained ascendency in the West. At the same time it has created continual intellectual arguments between scholars causing them to either reduce everything to mechanistic mathematical formulas, or, like Rousseau to emphasize human freedom and the personality of individuals over all else (Dooyeweerd 1979:148-188). All of these ground-motives, Dooyeweerd claims, have shaped Western society.

Dooyeweerd and sphere-sovereignty

Dooyeweerd's elaborate interpretation of western thought, his reflections on worldviews, and theory of ground-motives, has one result. In his view this is to expose what he calls "the dogma of the autonomy of theoretical thought" (Dooyeweerd 1953:35-36). This, he says, is the dogma that asserts reason, and reason alone, is the basis on which philosophers construct their arguments. But, Dooyeweerd claims his transcendental critique shows that it is not reason, but ground motives that shape the thought of the reasoning individuals. Therefore, if reason is not king, we can take biblical revelation seriously (Dooyeweerd 1953:37-38; 1965:1-26).

Consequently, he argues that he has provided a solid philosophical basis for Kuyper's theory of sphere sovereignty (Dooyeweerd 1979:40-60; Kalsbeek 1975:91-94). This is because once we take biblical revelation seriously we embrace the idea of the

biblical ground motive of creation-fall-redemption, which only makes sense when ultimate sovereignty is vested in God (Dooyeweerd 1979:40; 48).

Thus, what Dooyeweerd believes he has done is show that the various aspects of life exist as in "mutual irreducibility" (Dooyeweerd 1953:101). This means that each "modal aspect of temporal reality has its proper sphere of laws, irreducible to those of other modal aspects, and in this sense it is sovereignty in its own orbit" (Dooyeweerd 1953:101-102). This is because it is based on "the sovereign holy will of God the Creator, who has revealed Himself in Christ" (Ibid).

Thus, members of Dooyeweerd's philosophical school believe that, building on the insights of Kuyper, he has provided a basis for social justice and the meaningful involvement of Christians with a wide range of political and other issues (Dengerink 1979; Marshall 1983). For example, Bob Goudzwaard, a professor of economics, and former Dutch Cabinet Minister, finds Dooyeweerd's work useful for critiquing contemporary economic theory (Goudzwaard 1979). Similarly, Hans Rookmaaker, used Dooyeweerd's framework to create a penetrating critique of modern art (Rookmaaker 1994). What is significant here is that Dooyeweerd and members of his school engaged secular thought in a constructive manner (Dooyeweerd 1953:viii-ix).

Yet today the term worldview is used by many evangelical Christians in North America as a way of avoiding debate and engagement with other people's ideas. To understand how this change in the understanding of worldview, from an analytic tool to propagandistic jargon, came about. This means we need to look at the way Francis Scheaffer appropriated and popularized the term among members of America's evangelical sub-culture. To this task we turn in Part Two of this essay.

Part Two
Francis Schaeffer and the popularization of the concept of "worldview"
Evangelical Christians in North America

Introduction to Part Two

In answer to the question "Who's the major figure behind the election and re-election of George W. Bush?" Marvin Olasky, the man who initiated Faith Based Initiatives and a Bush confidant, wrote "On one level, the visionary Karl Rove. At a deeper level, a theologian most Americans have never heard of: Francis Schaeffer." It was, Olasky claimed, Francis A. Schaeffer (1912-1984) who "pushed many evangelicals into political and cultural involvement" (Olasky 2005).

In doing so Schaeffer popularized the idea of "worldview" among American evangelicals. He did this through his popular film series *How Shall We Then Live?*" and the accompanying book, which was followed five years afterwards by his best selling *Christian Manifesto* (Schaeffer 1976;1981/1982). Then, when Schaeffer's five volume, *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*," appeared they bore the sub-title "A Christian Worldview" (Schaeffer 1982).

As a result, following his death in 1984, various writers, who later became prominent evangelical leaders, attested to the fact that it was Schaeffer who first taught them to think in terms of worldviews (Dennis 1986:31;68;86;166;181). As John W. Whitehead, wrote "Until I read Schaffer, Christianity had seemed to be merely a pietistic experience without any real relationship to social action or culture. Francis Schaeffer's book *The God Who is There* immediately challenged me with the fact that Christianity does apply to the 'real world'" (Dennis 1984 179). As a result, in 1974, Whitehead's life changed course, instead of practicing law for the sake of making money, he went on to

found of the Rutherford Institute, in 1982, as "a civil liberties organization that provides free legal services to people whose constitutional and human rights have been threatened or violated (Rutherford Institute 2010 – About Us). He eventually became one of the main leaders of the Christian Right in America. George Marsden, the Dean of American historians of evangelicalism, confirms these testimonies by claiming that it was Francis Schaeffer who popularized the idea of worldviews among evangelicals after 1976 (Marsden 1991:108).

Although there are three main biographies of Francis Schaeffer, and at least twenty other books dealing with his thought, as well as over nineteen theses dealing with his work, none of them pay much attention to the European origins of his ideas. This issue is addressed in the following essay.

Who was Francis Schaeffer?

The details of Francis Schaeffer's life have been told many times. Therefore, all that is needed here is a short overview. Schaeffer was born in 1912 to working class parents in Germantown, Pennsylvania. His education was marred because he suffered from severe dyslexia which plagued him throughout his life. Despite his working class origins, as a teenager, he developed an unexpected love for classical music which through a chance meeting with a Russian refugee led him to read a book on philosophy. This in turn caused him to begin reading the Bible with the result that he experienced an evangelical conversion when he was eighteen years old (Duriez 2008:15-21).

His conversion changed his life by transforming his ambitions from that of a good manual worker to becoming a preacher, which meant acquiring a college education.

Consequently, he eventually entered a local college from where he obtained his BA (Duriez 2008:21-32). He then studied at Westminster Theological Seminary, eventually graduating from Faith Seminary, both of which were in Philadelphia, with a degree in theology. During this time he also married Edith Seville, whose parents belonged to the China Inland Mission (Duriez 2008:29-42).

As things turned out, their small apartment in Philadelphia was close to the Art Museum where he acquired his love of paintings (Duriez 2008:33-7). At Westminster Theological College he studied with some of the leading Calvinist evangelicals of the day. These included John Gresham Machen (1881-1937), Robert Dick Wilson (1856-1930), Neb B. Stonehouse (1902-1962), Oswald T. Allis (1880-1973), and a Dutch theologian, Cornelious Van Til (1895-1987) all of whom decisively shaped his theological outlook in an intelligent, but deeply fundamentalist, direction (Ibid).

After graduating Schaeffer became a pastor with the Bible Presbyterian Church. This was a fundamentalist group led by Carl McIntyre (1906-2002). In 1947 the Schaeffers, were invited to work for the church's mission to children assisting European churches re-establish Sunday Schools after the Second World War. After an exploratory trip to Europe, the family eventually settled in Switzerland where they remained working for the mission until 1953 (Duriez 2008:81-125).

They returned to America in 1953 for a year's home leave. During this time Schaeffer taught at Faith Theological Seminary in Philadelphia and gave hundreds of talks in churches across America to raise funds for the mission. Their stay in America was disturbed by the fact that McIntire was becoming increasingly fundamentalist and insisting on a complete separation from other Christian groups. The narrowness of this

approach disturbed the Schaeffer's and they sided with a dissident group within the church. As a result the Schaeffer's discovered that the mission was going to withdraw their support and they would be on their own. One bright spot in this otherwise troubling year was that Schaeffer was awarded an honorary doctorate by Highland College (Duriez 2008:120-122)

Consequently, the family decided to raise their own support and return to their work in Europe. In doing this they adopted the "faith mission" principles of the China Inland Mission (CIM), which said that missionaries were not to ask for financial support from other Christians. Instead they were to rely on God and pray for support. They could, of course, tell people what they were doing, but must never say, or even hint, that they needed money (Pollock 1962; Bacon 1984). Making this decision came about because Edith Schaeffer had grown up within the CIM, and was used to this type of arrangement (Duriez 2008:29).

The decision to return to Switzerland led to the founding of L'Abri, which in French means "Shelter," in 1955. In making this decision they were strongly encouraged, and supported, by Schaeffer's friend, the art historian, Hans Rookmaaker (1922-1977) who joined the L'Abri Board and worked with the Scheaffer's until his death (Martin 1979:96; 107-108; 153; 162; Gasque 2007:94-103).

Originally intending to continue their work with children the new mission soon developed into a ministry to students. This came about when their eldest daughter entered the University of Lausanne and brought home non-Christian friends. These students were immersed in existentialism and soon engaged in long discussions with her father. Gradually, a number of them became Christians and L'Abri movement took

shape (Duriez 2008:127-151; Schaeffer). This established the pattern of the Schaeffers offering free accommodation to people who wished to stay with them to discuss intellectual issues and the role of Christianity in society. Gradually, others joined them and the L'Abri movement was born. Today it has centers in a number of countries including America, Brazil, England, Korea, New Zealand, Switzerland, and the Netherlands (L'Abri 2010).

In the early 1960s Francis Schaeffer began to deliver Saturday night lectures in the basement of their home. The popularity of these lectures grew and they were tape recorded with the recordings being made available to visitors. Then, around 1965, the Schaeffer's role in L'Abri began to change as they received invitations to speak in England, and America at Christian conferences, colleges, and universities. These early tapes, the later talks and lectures, became the basis for both Francis and Edith's books, the first of which appeared in 1968 (Duriez 2008:160).

Secular writers on Francis Schaeffer's work

Prior to the 1990s few secular writers paid much attention to the work of Francis Schaeffer. What brought him to the attention of Americans was the rise of the so-called "Christian Right." Yet, when books on the Christian Right first began to appear in the early 1980s Schaeffer was not mentioned (Jorstad 1981; Zwier 1982; Fackre 1982; Bromley 1984). In fact, by 1988 many writers had come to the conclusion that the Christian Right had peaked and was about to disappear from the American scene (Bruce 1988).

One who disagreed with this assessment was Erling Jorstad. He drew attention

to Schaeffer's role in the formation of the movement and correctly argued that it would

be around for a long time (Jorstad 1987). His work was followed by that of the political

scientist Michael Lienesch (1993). By this time it was clear that the Christian Right had

become an established part of American life.

These scholarly works were followed by a rash of books by various best selling

journalists, such as Sara Diamond (1995 and 1996), Chris Hedges (2006), and

Michelle Goldberg (2006), all of whom sought to warn American liberals against the

"dangers" of what they called the "Christian Right." In doing so they went beyond earlier

assessments of the Christian Right and linked it to fascism, and what they called

"dominion theology" (Hedges 2006:10-18).

For example, Sara Diamond writes one "source of dominion theology was an

evangelical philosopher named Francis Schaeffer … Schaeffer's book *A Christian

Manifesto* sold 290,000 copies in its first year and remained one of the Christian Right's

most important texts into the 1990's" (Diamond 1995:246). She then goes on to explain

that he argued "America began as a nation rooted in Biblical principles. But as society

became more pluralistic proponents of a new philosophy of secular humanism gradually

came to dominate debate on policy issues …" (Ibid).

Several writers have attempted to link Schaeffer to Rousas John Rushdoony

(1916-2001) who founded the Chalcedon Foundation in 1965 (Chalcedon Foundation

2010). He created a theocratic movement known as "Christian Reconstruction," which is

sometimes called "dominion theology" (Rushdoony 1971; 1973; North 990; North and

del Mar 1991). Rushdoony was also largely responsible for the growth of so-called

"Christian schools" and "Christian homeschooling" in America (Rushdoony 1961; 1963;

Newsweek 1981)

Michelle Goldberg, for example, claims that while "Schaeffer was not a theocrat … he drew on Reconstructionist ideas …" (Goldberg 2006:38). Chris Hedges goes even further by describing Schaeffer as a "disciple" of Rushdoony (2006:13). He provides no evidence for this claim, but merely asserts it.

Diamond is more cautious pointing out that at a conference in 1995 Rushdoony launched into a vicious attack on Schaeffer's works and influence on evangelicals (Diamond 1996:52-53). Instead of locating the source of Schaeffer's ideas in the writings of Rushdoony she says he was "a product of internecine conflicts that split the Presbyterin church during the 1930s and 1940s" and an ally of the Fundamentalist leader and "strident anticommunist" Carl McIntire (Diamond 1996:48). In what way this information explains Schaeffer's ideas is not made clear. In fact, none of these writers really attempt to understand Schaeffer's arguments or show how he arrived at them.

Francis Schaeffer's evangelical critics

In comparison to the reaction of self-identified "Christian scholars," most of whom worked in "Christian" colleges and universities, secular critics were kind to Schaeffer. Shortly after his death, a volume of essays appeared containing essays by Christian scholars who tore his work apart. Reading this work it is as though a group of vultures had gathered around the carcass of his works to devour them (Ruegsegger 1986).

There are several problems with these essays which seem to suggest that someone without an earned PhD, and an academic position, has no right to influence so many people. For example, the writers persist in treating Schaeffer as though he

claimed to be a philosopher, historian, or social scientist, (Ruegsegger 1986:107-172; 221-243), when all he actually claimed to be was a pastor, with wide ranging, generalist interests, committed to evangelism (Dennis1986:43-49). Thirdly, although the authors claim to have probed his thoughts, they write almost entirely from an American evangelical perspective without appreciating the European background, in the works of Kuyper and Dooyeweerd, that shaped Schaeffer's thinking. This can bee seen in Forrest Baird's essay ""Schaeffer's Intellectual Roots," and is true of many other writers who discuss Schaeffer's work (Ruegsegger 1986:45-65; White 1994:62-67; Shires 2007:48-49; Hankins 2008:11-15; 96-105).

From there criticisms three main issues stand out. First, a group of evangelical historians claimed that Schaeffer was totally wrong in his understanding of American history. Second, a number of evangelical philosophers and theologians questioned his understanding of the history of philosophy, his comments on Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831), and Søren Kierkegaard (1813-1855). Finally, it is suggested that he rehashed half understood ideas from his teacher Conrnelius Van Til and the works of Rushdoony. Before discussing Schaeffer's influence on the way evangelicals adopted the idea of worldview, these criticisms of his work will be examined.

Contesting American history

First, Schaeffer is accused of distorting American history by seeing Christian influences where they do not exist. In fact, shortly before he died he had a lengthy correspondence with several evangelical church historians including Mark Noll, George

Marsden and Ronald Wells (Hankins 2008:209-227). Essentially, they argued that Schaeffer misunderstood American history and that the founding fathers were not inspired by Christian principles as he claimed. Noll went as far as saying that no one "who took the Bible seriously" could have "supported the American Revolution" because it George III was a reasonable and good King (Hankins 2008:214). These historians also criticized various other claims they believed Schaeffer was making with the result that he became increasingly frustrated with them (Hankins 2008:223-225).

On this issue it is difficult to disagree with the historians. Schaeffer does seem to have held an overly romantic view of the American Revolution and its leaders. As John Warwick Montgomery(b. 1931), points out, most of the leaders of the American Revolution were Deists, inspired by republican values, that had nothing to do with Christianity. On the other hand the majority of Empire Loyalists were Christians who took Romans 13 seriously. Nevertheless, Montgomery admits, some Christians were fervent revolutionaries. This he argues was despite, not because of, their Christian beliefs (Montgomery 1996). Thus, on this issue Schaeffer seems to have been clearly in the wrong.

On the other hand he may be correct in recognizing a strong Christian element in the subsequent development of American life, something his critics seem to deny. The problem here is that he failed to identify the sources of this influence, which came from waves of nineteenth century immigrants from Germany, the Netherlands, and other parts of Europe. These people, who were evangelical Christians, fled to America because of persecution by State Churches in their homeland. Consequently, they brought with them a strong commitment to what they called "biblical Christianity" (Bratt

1984; Brancaforte 1989).

Further, remembering that Schaeffer was making a general argument, it needs to be noted that what he says about America and the American Revolution is not very different from the arguments Peter F. Drucker (1909-2005), made in numerous books (Drucker 1978: 148; 189; 1968:123-124; 144; 252). Yet, Drucker's work is highly praised despite his sweeping generalizations (Flaherty 2005). It is also the type of general theory that was recently put forward by Kenneth and William Hopper in their *The Puritan Gift* (2007). Significantly, unlike Schaeffer none of these three authors are American by birth, nor are they evangelical Christians. Therefore, in general terms it is arguable, as Dennis suggests, that Schaeffer was not as wrong as the historians claimed (Dennis 1986:101-126).

Philosophical misinterpretations

Ronald Ruegsegger, surveying Schaeffer's main works, objects to his interpretation of Aquinas, especially his idea that the synthesis made by Thomas Aquinas (1224-1274) led to the "nature-grace dichotomy" being "replaced by a nature-freedom dichotomy" (Ruegsegger 1986:30; Hankins 2008:96-98). Yet, this is exactly what Dooyeweerd argued when he claimed Thomism paved the "the way for modern philosophical thought" (Dooyeweerd 1953:183).

Another issue Ruegsegger, finds questionable are the way Schaeffer understands the role of reason in Aquinas's thought (Ruegsegger 1986:28-29). Once again, Schaeffer's cryptic argument is similar to the one Dooyeweerd proposes and defends in detail arguing that in Thomism "the fall was also deprived of its radical

37

meaning" (Dooyeweerd 1953:179-181; 2004).

Similarly, Schaeffer's interpretation of Hegel is found lacking. Particularly his understanding of the relationship of Hegel's thought to relativism and his interpretation of Hegel's dialectic (Ruegsegger 1986:115-118; Hankins 2008:99). Here again Schaeffer seems in line with Dooyeweerd who argues "Hegel's dialectical logicizing of the historical process" set the stage for relativism (Dooyeweerd 1953:208-210). Although Dooyeweerd is far more nuanced than Schaeffer, and concedes that Hegel himself "had a deep historical insight," that held his scheme together, he does agree that relativism developed as a result of the failure of Hegel's system (Ibid).

Further, while Schaeffer's view of the dialectic may be questioned, his explanation of how the dialectic worked is reflects the way it was described by an earlier generation of writers (Schaeffer 1982:13-14; 232-233). For example, Frederick Engels explanation of dialectical thinking is remarkably similar to Schaeffer's (Marx and Engels 1968:410-416). Similarly, the older philosophy texts that were read when Schaeffer was a student explain Hegel and his ideas in ways that support Schaeffer's interpretation (cf. Höffding 1916:182-189). Finally, the negative interpretation of Hegel that Schaeffer gives was popularized by Karl Popper in the 1960s and early 1970s (Popper 1966/1945) Therefore, since Schaeffer's books were based on lectures he gave in the 1950s and 1960s, and intended as popular, not academic, books, it is somewhat unfair to criticize him for not debating the latest academic interpretations of the late 1970s and 1980s texts (Duriez 2008:159-162).

Another, common criticism of Schaeffer focuses on his understanding of Kierkegaard which is said to be flawed because of the way Schaeffer interprets him as

38

promoting irrationalism (Ruegsegger 1986: 108-109; 118-120; Hankins 2008:99-100).

Here again the criticisms seem somewhat unfair because, as Ruegsegger's admits,

Schaeffer's "interpretation of Kierkegaard has been a common one" (Ruegsegger

1986:118). Actually, it would be more accurate to say that it was the dominant one until

the 1980s (cf. Hawton 1952; Barrett 1962). Therefore, citing a work published in 1983,

as Ruegsegger does, to question the depth of Schaeffer's understanding is unfair (cf.

Burson and Walls 1998).[10]

The supposed American sources of Schaeffer's basic framework

Although some authors claim that "Schaeffer's message was not new" (Shires

2007:48), most recognize that this only applies to his basic theology. As far as his

cultural critique went, he message was startling new (Duriez 2008:154-155). As a result

writers on the topic attempt to explain where his ideas came from. In doing so, the

majority of American writers trace his intellectual roots to four sources. These are: 1) the

influence of Carl McIntyre; 2) the Scottish Common Sense philosophical tradition

mediated by Machen; and 3) the ideas of the American-Dutch theologian Cornelius Van

Til at Westminster; 4) Christian Reconstruction and the works of Rousas John

Rushdoony.

The supposed influence of McIntyre is the easiest to deal with. There is no doubt

that he strongly influenced Schaeffer's thinking about church politics, and theological

issues, like the inerrancy of the Bible, in the 1930s and 1940s. Nevertheless, by the

early 1950s Schaeffer found McIntyre far too narrow in both his thinking and practice,

---

[10] The book in question, which Ruegsegger cites is: Evans, C. Stephen. *Kierkegaard's "Fragments" and "Postscript": The religious philosophy of Johannes Climacus.* Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1983.

and lacking in cultural interests. Therefore, he broke with him and withdrew from the various movements he led (Hankins 2008:9-27; 44-50; Duriez 2008:43; 49; 61-63; 90;121-122).

Second, while it is correct to say that Schaeffer was "a faithful follower" of Machen in terms of his basic theology (Shires 2007:48), this does not explain his ideas about the interaction of religion and culture. An examination of Machen's books, particularly his influential, *Christianity and Liberalism* (1923), shows he had no interest in the type of worldview analysis Schaeffer developed.

Third, the influence, Cornelius Van Til (Ruegsegger 1986:56-58), is even easier to discount. There seems little doubt that Schaeffer picked up the term "presupposition," from Van Til. Yet, as various writers, point out, he used "presupposition" in a completely different way to the way to Van Til did (Ruegsegger 1986:34; 100; White 1994:70-71).When the CD of Van Til's published works, and unpublished lectures notes, is searched using various key words from Schaeffer's analysis, such as "nature" and "grace," the results are negative.[11]

As for the argument that Schaeffer's cultural critique depended on the writings of Rushdoony, it is clear that Schaeffer had developed his views long before Rushdoony began publishing in the 1960s. Therefore, while there are clear similarities between Schaeffer and Rushdoony's interpretation of western thought, this is easily explained by the influence of Kuyper and Dooyeweered on both of their thinking (Rushdoony 1961: xii; 3-5; 10; 1971:6; 21).[12] Further, Schaeffer's son, Frank Schaeffer, strongly denied

---

[11] In the 1920s and 1930s, when Schaeffer studied with Van Til, he did not use this type of language. In fact, it was only in the 1963, in direct response to the work of Herman Dooyeweerd, and later Schaeffer, that Van Til begins to use this type of language. Further, when he does so he strongly criticizes both Dooyeweerd and Schaeffer (Van Til 1997).
[12] The influence of Kuyper and Dooyeweerd on Schaeffer is discussed later in this essay.

any such dependence claiming that his father "regarded Rushdoony as clinically insane" and strongly rejected his ideas about dominion theology (Schaeffer 2007:333).[13]

Rejecting American thinkers as the source for Schaeffer's cultural critique and ideas about worldviews it is now necessary to look at the influence of Kuyper and Dooyeweerd on his work.

The influence of Kuyper

The influence of Kuyper on Schaeffer can be seen in the discussions of worldview scattered throughout Scheaffer's collected works (Schaeffer 1982). Examining the evidence it seems clear that he was decisively influenced by Kuyper in two ways. First, Kuyper's *Lectures on Calvinism* (1898) gave him a perspective on Christianity that moved him away from his narrow fundamentalist background. They introduced him to the idea of worldviews and the importance of culture. This outlook enabled Schaeffer to develop his interest in art without feeling guilty about spending time on what most evangelicals, particularly people in the Calvinist tradition to which he belonged, considered "worldly" pursuits (Ryle 1956/1879; 1959/1883; Gasque 2005:95).

Schaeffer's awareness of Kuyper's ideas and interest in art prepared him intellectually for his meeting with the art historian Hans Rookmaaker who he met at a conference in Amsterdam in 1948 (Gasque 2005:95-96; Duriez 2008:79). This meeting was a turning point in Schaeffer's life. The two men became close friends and colleagues who later cooperated to create the L'Abri movement (Edith Schaeffer 1969; Martin 1979:107-108; Gasque 2007:98-99). It was Rookmaaker who helped Schaeffer

---

[13] While Frank Scheffer's evidence may be questioned it has to be pointed out that he is very critical of his father, and that a link to Rushdoony would have strengthened his own argument. Therefore, his view seems likely to be true.

develop his understanding of Kuyper and from whom he learnt about Dooyeweerd whose works were still un-translated (Pinnock 1986:179; Martin 1979:108-109; Gasque 2005:97-99).

Apart from learning about worldviews and a Christian justification for art, it appears that three other Kuyperian themes influenced Schaeffer. These are Kuyper's insistence on the idea of "antithesis," his views about "common grace," and the idea of "sphere sovereignty."

Throughout Schaeffer's published works the idea of antithesis takes a prominent place (Schaeffer 1982 Vol 1:6-11; White 1994:67-75; Hankjins 2008:81-83; 94-95). This usage corresponds to that of Kuyper and is different from that of Schaeffer's teacher Van Til (Kuyper 1898:98-142; White 1994:70). Second, as with Kuyper, common grace, which Schaeffer sometimes calls "the maishness of man," is crucially important for his interpretation of worldviews and practical life (Kuyper 1900:252-337; Schaeffer 1982 Vol 1: 24; 180-181; 220-224). Finally, in outlining his views on ecology Schaeffer made a direct appeal to Kuyper's idea of "sphere sovereignty" (Schaeffer 1982 5:35).

The debt to Dooyeweerd

Anyone who has attempted to understand Dooyeweerd immediately recognizes an affinity between Schaeffer's overarching interpretive framework and Dooyeweerd's analysis of western thought. The problem is that Schaeffer rarely mentions Dooyeweerd and does not cite him as the source for many of his ideas. Further, despite the clear sense of affinity, Schaeffer uses different language and examples, to that of Dooyeweerd. Therefore, it is easy to overlook, or dismiss, Dooyeweerd's influence.

Nevertheless, it is clearly there.

This is best seen in a key section of *He is there and He is not Silent* (1972) where Schaeffer, clearly relies on a Dooyeweerdian framework which he simplifies. In this section Schaeffer begins his analysis of western thought, with the Greeks. He discusses the *polis* and says the way the Greeks thought the gods, who, like men, were subject to "the Fates." On this issue he clearly misses the complexity of Greek ideas about fate and the fates and sets an unfortunate president for later simplifiers of his own work. This tension between two types of religion based on order and chaos, he claims re-appeared in a new form in the work of Aquinas, attempted to create a synthesis between Greek and Christian ideas, This synthesis, he claims, slowly disintegrated to be replaced by the modern one of "nature and freedom" Thus, Schaeffer follows Dooyeweerd's more complex framework (Schaeffer 1982 Vol. 1:305-344; cf. Dooyeweerd 1953:15-28; 189-199).

Like Dooyweeerd, Schaeffer also argues that everyone has a worldview, even if people are not aware of the fact, and that worldviews are more or less identical with philosophies of life, and then, he says that underlying worldviews, and philosophies of life, one discovers a third more fundamental factor. This Schaeffer calls "presuppositions," while Dooyeweerd uses his own technical term of "ground motive." Nevertheless, presuppositions and ground motives are roughly equivalent even if Schaeffer is less precise than Dooyeweerd (Schaeffer 1982 Vol. 1:279-280; 324-329; cf. Dooyeweerd 1953:82-83; 124-133; 156-158; 164; 1965:32-34).

Finally, throughout his works, like Dooyeweerd, Schaeffer sees the epistemological question of human understanding as a central issue, related to our

need to integrate our experiences and knowledge. Then, again like Dooyeweerd, he finds the integration point in the triune God of Christian theology who is the creator of the universe (Schaeffer 1982 Vol. 1:287-289; 334-344; Dooyeweerd 1953: 45-52;101).

Thus Schaeffer's basic framework mirrors that of Dooyweerd and Kuyper while he words things slightly differently. The question we now need to ask is 'why does Schaeffer not acknowledge his sources?'

The problem of unacknowledged sources

As noted earlier, Schaeffer struggled throughout his life with dyslexia (Duriez 2008:17). This means that he was primarily an oral learner. The implications of this are far reaching. Colin Duriez observes "Schaeffer has been charged with employing Dooyeweerd's analysis without acknowledgement. However, Schaeffer considered that he owed no debt to Dooyeweerd" (Duriez 2008:173). Duriez then adds that as a student he sent Schaeffer a paper he had written on Dooyeweerd. To this Schaeffer replied: "I am really not sure that I have much relationship to Dooyeweerd. Most of my thought was developed prior to my detailed contacts with Hans Rookmaaker and in our detailed contacts I do not think that what we exchanged had much to do with Dooyeweerd at all, but simply our own thoughts …" (Ibid).

This statement is far less clear than the interpretation Duriez gives it. In the first place Schaeffer does not say that he did not learn from Dooyeweerd. All he says is that he was "not sure." Then he correctly links Dooyeweerd to Hans Rookmaaker, but dismisses a possible link to his ideas for two reasons. First, he believed that his ideas were already worked out before he met Rookmaaker, and second, their conversations,

44

although intense, did not refer to Dooyeweerd.

The problem here is that it is not at all clear that Schaeffer's memory was accurate. Certainly, as far as his theology went it was well formulated long before he met Rookmaaker. But, his cultural critique is an entirely different matter. In fact, as Duriez admits, Rookmaaker believed that there were affinities between Schaeffer's ideas and those of Dooyeweerd (Duriez 2008:174-175). He also suggests that Rookmaaker helped Schaeffer understand of other Dutch Calvinist thinkers, including Kuyper (Duriez 2008:79).

Duriez says "this apparent contradiction between the views of Schaeffer and Rookmaaker on the influence of Dooyeweerd is fascinating," but fails to discuss it. Actually, the explanation is relatively simple. In Rookmaaker's own books and lectures, he too makes no mention of Dooyeweerd for a good reason (Rookmaaker 1970; 2002). As Rookmaaker explained, he deliberately adopted Dooyeweerd's ideas to his audience and avoided technical terms. Therefore, he applied Dooyeweerd's framework without stressing the fact (Martin 1979:81-82; 125; 144). From this admission it is easy to see how an oral learner would pick up Dooyeweerd's ideas from discussions, and lectures, without necessarily realizing the fact.

Here it is very important to stress that recognizing the influence of Dooyeweerd and Kuyper on Schaeffer, is not to suggest plagiarism or academic fraud. This is certainly not the case. Schaeffer used his own language and examples to argue his case. What he gained from these men was a general framework and a number of key ideas, such as antithesis, that by the time he was lecturing were in the public domain in the Netherlands, although not widely known elsewhere. By visiting the Netherlands, as

he did, and through his interaction with Rookmaaker, some key ideas, from the Dutch neo-Calvinist tradition, entered his vocabulary and thinking. As a result he popularized them in the English speaking world.

To acknowledge this is not to detract from the originality of Schaeffer's contribution. What it does is to place his ideas in context, and give them an intellectual heritage and depth that critics have found wanting.

From worldview evangelism to politics

Today, as seen, many writers associate Francis Schaeffer with the New Christian Right (Diamond 1995:246; Hodges 2006:13; Goldberg 2006:38). Some see him as an extreme "dominionist" in the company of Rushdoony and his Christian Reconstruction movement (Hedges 2006:13). Others are more cautious arguing that while he was a key figure in the creation of the Christian Right he was not an undemocratic theocrat (Goldberg 2006:38).

It comes as a surprise, therefore, to find that his first recorded foray into the area of politics was a strongly worded sermon in 1943 attacking anti-Semitism. This was printed as a leaflet by his church, and republished in a denominational publication (Schaeffer 1943; Duriez 2008:56). Later, he took an equally strong public stand against all forms of racism and economic exploitation (Hankins 2008:130-135; Schaeffer 1970/1982:30; Schaeffer 1974a/b). Further, there is considerable evidence that throughout their married life the Schaeffers had many Jewish, Black and Asian friends who frequently stayed at their home (Edith Schaeffer 1981).

The second area where Schaeffer directly commented on politics was that of

ecology and the protection of the environment. This came about as a result of the publication of his book *Pollution and the Death of Man* (1970) which appeared nine years before the founding of the first Green Party in Germany. In this book Schaeffer argued that Christians have a special responsibility for the environment and that unbridled exploitation was both wrong and, from a theological viewpoint, a sin (Hankins 2008:117-122; Schaeffer 1970/1982:31-36).

Economic exploitation, and the abuses of capitalism, were another set of problems that troubled Schaeffer. Recognizing the importance of these issues led him to make sharp, and highly political comments, about the Christian's responsibility to promote justice. Once again his reflections on economic issues and their political consequences originated as sermons. These were later published in his book *No Little People* (1974). In this work he argued that "Christians have the important job of meeting men's material needs as well as their personal and spiritual needs" (Schaeffer 1974/1982:186). Consequently, he argued, "private property" ought to be "used with compassion" to aid others in need (Ibid). "Christians," he reminded his readers, "should keep in mind that their works will be judged," therefore they have a responsibility to serve others (Schaeffer 1974/1982:190).

Given these strongly worded positions on race, ecology, and economic justice, the impression created is that before 1974, Schaeffer was on the left of the political spectrum. It also seems that he practiced what he preached (Fowler 1982:61-76). This impression is confirmed by his son Frank Schaeffer who, in a regretful autobiographical book, says "If it hadn't been for me Dad's reputation as an evangelical scholar … would have remained intact …" (Schaeffer 2007:265). He then explains that he "goaded" his

47

"father into taking political positions far more extreme than came to him naturally" (Ibid).

The catalyst for this change was *Roe v Wade* which the younger Schaeffer saw as sanctioning murder. Therefore, after a furious row, his father agreed to include two episodes promoting a pro-life position in the film series *How Should We Then Live?* Although originally conceived as a cultural history, like the *Civilization* series of Kenneth Clark (1903-1983), from a Christian perspective, the films and accompanying book now ended with a political twist (Clark 1969; Schaeffer 2007:265-267). This addition had far reaching and unexpected consequences.

After the initial release of the films, the immediate effect of this decision was to alienate the Schaeffer's from established evangelical leaders, like Billy Graham, who strongly opposed mixing religion and politics (Schaeffer 2007:290). Then, to the surprise of everyone, including the Schaeffer's, the films developed a momentum of their own and became immensely popular in churches. As a result, Schaeffer, who at this time had been diagnosed with cancer, received numerous invitations to speak in American churches and at large conferences (Schaeffer 2007:269-270). They also brought Schaeffer into close contact with Roman Catholic Archbishop Fulton J. Sheen (1895-1979), and C. Everret Koop (b. 1916) who later became the Surgeon General of the United States (Schaeffer 2007:271-274; 283-288). As a result Schaeffer made a second film series with Koop under the title *Whatever Happened to the Human Race?* This series, and the accompanying book, were a direct criticism of *Roe and Wade* and attack upon the pro-choice position (Schaeffer 2007:271-273).

These films and the contacts they created led to further contacts with prominent politicians, radio, and television hosts, as well as prominent evangelical leaders.

Consequently, in a relatively short time Schaeffer was transformed from a somewhat obscure writer and speaker, with a niche market for his ideas, into one of the leading figures in the evangelical world. As Frank Schaeffer puts it "Abortion became *the* evangelical issue" and Schaeffer rode the crest of a wave (Schaeffer 2007:289).

Soon Schaeffer's books "were doing the advance work for people like Ronald Reagan and helping to craft Republican victories" (Schaeffer 2007:295). By the late seventies a whole host of people were courting Schaeffer, including "Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, James Dobson, James Kenedy" and a host of "other self appointed 'Christian leaders,'" backed by powerful media empires (Schaeffer 2007:297). This was because Schaeffer's "unique reputation for an intellectual approach to faith," and "reputation for" both "frugal living" and integrity, provided substance to a host of otherwise intellectually bankrupt radio and television programs and their hosts (Ibid).

Opening the floodgates to the evangelical worldview revolution

Long before Schaffer became a media personality he had slowly acquired a reputation as a thinker and honest broker within the evangelical subculture. Beginning in the late 1950s a trickle of young Americans visited the Swiss L'Abri. This trickle became a stream and then a flood in the 1960's (Shires 2007:Hankins 2007:53-63; Duriez 2008:128-155). Then came the speaking tours in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Shires 2007:Hankins 2007:74-79; Duriez 2008:160-168). Finally, the films, television interviews, large conferences, and widespread recognition (Shires 2007:Hankins 2007:161-165; 175-183; 191; 200-204; Duriez 2008:181-204).

At first it was young evangelical students, many of whom, like Gene Veith, John

W. Whitehead, and Os Guinness (b. 1941), went on to obtain their PhDs and become

intellectual and social leaders in the evangelical sub-culture, who adopted Schaeffer's

ideas (Dennis 1986:27; 177; Guinness 1973). Slowly, others, like Marvin Olasky (b.

1950) and Chuck Colson (b. 1931), known to most people because of his role in the

Watergate scandal, adopted these ideas as a basis for their political reflections and

action (Olasky 2010; Colson 2004:99). For all of these people, and many others, the

notion of "worldview" became a central idea (Dennis 1986:31; 181; Colson 2004:xi-xiv).

Then popular "Christian" writers like Tim LaHaye adapted Schaeffer's framework

and the term "worldview," which the openly acknowledged learning from him, to their

own needs. For example, LaHaye dedicated his runaway bestseller, *Battle for the Mind*

(1980), to "Dr. Francis Schaeffer, the renowned philosopher-prophet of the twentieth

century." LaHaye's simplified and gutted version of Schaeffer's ideas continues to

permeate in his bestselling books (Shires 2007:159).[14]

It was from these popular writers, rather than the scholars and activists, like

Olasky, Whitehead, or Guiness, that the use of worldview seems to have passed into

popular American evangelical culture. As a result the term is now very today popular, as

a slogan that the people who use it believe legitimates their evangelical beliefs. The

problem is: how many people who use "worldview," in their conversations really

understand it?

The tragedy of the American evangelical "worldview"

As suggested above, what most American evangelical Christians took from

---

[14] The idea of worldview even enters the best selling *Left Behind* series of novels such books as *The Rapture* (LaHaye and Jenkins 2007: 28).

Schaeffer, was "less the content of what he wrote than his model of Christian worldview development" (Hankins 2007: xv; cf. Shires 2007:158). In doing so they consistently overlooked the fact that his ideas on this subject were firmly rooted in the work of Kuyper and Dooyeweerd. This ignorance of the source of Schaeffer's led to a failure to really understand them and the development of "worldview" as a form of legitimation, rather than the useful analytic concept proposed by Kuyper and Dooyeweerd (See Part One). Nor, is it the way Schaeffer himself intended the term to be use.

Abraham Kuyper used the idea of worldview to establish a framework for analysis of three basic questions that he argued shape the life of everyone whether they know it or not. (Kuyper 1898:22). At the heart of these questions was the issue of self-knowledge. Therefore, at the core of his discussion of "worldviews" are questions about: "1. our relation *to God*, 2. our relation *to man*, and 3. our relation to *the world*" (Kuyper 1898:16). The answers we give to these questions, consciously or unconsciously, he claimed, shape our thoughts and lives (Kuyper 1898:17).

Therefore, Kuyper argued that by recognizing these questions, and the answers people give to them, we can begin to probe the roots of their ideas. In turn, the implications of these ideas enable us to understand the way people see social and political life (Hexham 2010:6-8).

Kuyper's disciple, Herman Dooyeweerd built on his ideas. Dooyeweerd argued that four major themes underlying worldviews have shaped Western society (Dooyeweerd 1948:17-24; 1979:7-11). Later he modified his argument in terms of what he called "ground motives" (Dooyeweerd 1953:61). After identifying four major influences of this kind on Western society, Dooyeweerd then reduced them to two major

influences: the biblical and the non-biblical, or humanistic (Dooyeweerd 1953:).

In developing their analytic system, both Kuyper and Dooyweerd worked with the twin ideas of "antithesis" and "common grace." The one, antithesis, posited a division between Christians and non-Christians. The other, common grace, brought the whole of humanity together as creatures of God separated from Him, and each other, by the Fall and human sin. Although Dooyeweerd worded his argument differently to Kuyper, and concentrated on how we know, both men sought to understand and engage others who disagreed with their understanding of the Christian worldview (Hexham 2010:9-11; 18-19; 22; 28

Francis Schaeffer appropriated the idea of antithesis and common grace within the framework of worldview thinking from Kuyper and Dooyeweerd. He then rephrased these ideas in terms of "Christian apologetics,"[15] Explaining his position he wrote: "There are two purposes of Christian apologetics. The first is defense. The second is to communicate Christianity in a way that any given generation can understand" (Schaeffer 1982 Vol 1:151).

Schaeffer goes on to explain his understanding of apologetics in the following way: "If a man goes overseas for any length of time, we would expect him to learn the language of the country to which he is going. More than this is needed, however, if he is really to communicate with the people among whom he is living. He must learn another language – that of the thought-forms" used by people and a culture (Schaeffer 1982 Vol. 1:129-154).

From these quotations it can be seen that Schaeffer's intention, like that of

---

[15] In the work of Schaeffer and other Christian writers "apologetics," means providing a reason for, or defence, of Christianity as a intellectually acceptable faith.

Kuyper and Dooyeweerd, was to facilitate communication at a deep level. Unfortunately, this intent has not carried over into the way his use of worldview entered the evangelical community.

Instead of concentrating on the hard work of understanding and communicating, popular writers latched onto statements like "We must not forget that historic Christianity stands on a basis of antithesis" (Schaeffer 1982 Vol. 1:8). Thus, by stressing antitheses, without common grace, the idea of worldview become a way of signaling difference.

Consequently, when Schaeffer argued "two world views," Christianity and Humanism, "stand as totals in complete antithesis to each other" (Schaeffer 1982 Vol 5:424), this was taken as a call to circle the wagons. Instead of using these insights to engage humanists, many evangelicals simply condemned humanism, and retreated behind a verbal wall that invoked with absolute certainty the difference between the Christian and other world views. With this retreat, communication between many evangelicals and people they saw as their opponents came to an end.

At this point we begin to understand how Sarah Palin was able to invoke the idea of worldview regularly, to avoid articulating her policies during the 2008 American Presidential Election campaign, without alienating her supporters (*New York Times*, 12 September 2008; 2 October 2008; Gibson 2008). There was nothing surprising in this because all she was saying was what they already knew: you cannot discuss fundamental issues like worldview with non-believers (La Haye 1980:57-83).

This transformation of the concept of worldview, from an analytic tool to an excuse for not engaging people, and ideas, that contradict one's prejudices, is the tragedy of the American evangelical worldview as it exists today. Frank Schaeffer

recognizes this when he argues, that leaders of the New Christian Right took his father's ideas and used them for "nakedly political purposes." He also claims, that by the end of his life, his father was "sick of these idiots" (Schaeffer 2007:298-300).

He then laments the way, he and his father, experienced the narrowness of American evangelicalism, as something totally alien to their outlook (Schaeffer 2007:298; 330-335). This narrowness, he convincingly argues, produced "a culture that makes sweeping and dismissive" judgments, that "oversimplify complex issues" (Schaeffer 2007:353). Subsequently, Frank Schaeffer walked away from the intellectual world his father and he helped build, and joined the Greek Orthodox Church (Schaeffer 2007:386-408).

Conclusion

All that remains to be said is that in developing their ideas about "worldviews," both Kuyper and Dooyeweerd, saw worldview analysis as a tool for engaging the arguments of non-Christians, and Christians alike. In doing so they always showed the utmost respect for other people and their ideas. For example, Kuyper praises liberal theologians like Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834), philosophers like Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677), and agnostics like John Tyndall (1820-1893), while disagreeing with their conclusions (Kuyper 1998: 383-388; 476-477). Similarly, Dooyeweerd has the greatest respect for other scholars regardless of their religious commitments (Dooyeweerd 1953:viii-ix; 137; 524). Indeed, he sees any retreat into a closed "Christian" world as dangerous, and emphasizes that his work leads to engagement, not a breaking off of contact with non-Christians and their ideas (Dooyeweerd 1953:114-

115). Similarly, throughout his writings Francis Schaeffer shows respect for artists and thinkers who are not Christians, and attempts to engage their work (Schaeffer 1982 Vol. 1:35-47; 129-136; 357-384).

It is this respect and engagement that is in danger of being lost by American Christians who embrace "worldview" thinking. Hopefully, moving from Schaeffer's more popular works to a re-discovery of Kuyper and Dooyeweerd offers a way of reversing this trend by encouraging evangelical Christians to take scholarship seriously.

The idea of worldview as Kuyper and Dooyeweerd envisioned it is an attractive one. But, the way the American evangelicals developed the idea, largely from the writings of Francis Schaeffer, is not a pretty one. Perhaps the best way to end this essay is with the reflections of Sir Karl Popper, on worldviews, and similar intellectual frameworks. In his posthumous book *The Myth of the Framework* (1994) Popper tells the following story about meeting a young Nazi who was convinced of the rightness of his worldview. He writes:

> It must have been not long before the year of 1933 – the year Hitler came to power in Germany – that young man said to me: "What, you want to argue? I don't argue: I shoot!" (Popper 1994;xiii).

Appendix One
The use of "worldview" in North American culture

Documenting the use of the term "worldview" both in popular culture and among evangelical Christians is difficult. The following information is provided because it suggests 1) a steady growth in the use of the term since the 1960s, particularly after 1976; and 2) that the idea of worldview was promoted among American evangelical Christians by authors related to publishing houses that originated within Dutch-American communities. Although, the resources are not available to provide conclusive evidence on the use of the term the following facts are enlightening.

According to the database *Canadian Newstand* there are only 4 references to worldview in the Canadian press before 1985, the earliest being in 1978. After that, between 1986 and 1990, there are 85 references. This number jumps to 231 between 1990 and 1995, and to 372 between 1996 and 2000. From 2000 to 2005 there were 1094 references to worldview. Since then the term has been used 931 times in the Canadian press.

The use of the term worldview by the press in the United States American is far more dramatic. For example, the ProQuest *New York Times* database which covers the period 1851 to 2006 records 1145 examples of the use of the term worldview. The first use was in a short article on Christian apologetics published on 22 May 1905, the term was used again in an article about Judaism on 5 September 1915. Between 1926 and 1950 there were five articles, mainly on German issues, where worldview was used in an essentially negative sense. The next mention comes in 1960 in connection with a Roman Catholic journal entitled *Worldview* and its comments on the abortion debate (NYT 17 January 1960). Between 1960 and 1975 there were 56 articles displayed in by

the search engine, but only a few of them actually contained the term worldview. From

1976 to 1990 there are 110 articles listed, but almost none of these actually contain the

word. Only after 1990 does the term come into general use. Between 1990 and 2000 it

was used 575 times, then from 2000 to 2010 it was used another 437 time. Although, as

noted, not all the articles that are located by the database, from 2000 an increasing

number of them do use the term indicating, as the more reliable Canadian data

suggests, that its use is becoming more common among journalists.

The available evidence about the use of the term "worldview" by evangelical

Christians suggests that its use was rare before 1980, and that it slowly gained

acceptance during the 1980s and 1990s. After 2000, however, "worldview" appears to

have come into general use although it is rarely defined.

In an attempt to gain some insight into its use by evangelical Christians the term

was entered in to the advanced version of Google Book Search for each five year

period since 1900. The search was then limited to well known evangelical publishers.

These results, although unscientific, were revealing. The term does not appear in the

Christian books in the Google database until 1933 when the Dutch American publisher

William B. Eerdmans produced a book on the Dutch East Indies that used the term.

After that Eerdmans slowly began publishing other books with worldview as one of their

key terms. Other evangelical publishers did not pick up the idea until 1957, when Baker

brought out a book that discussed worldviews. It was not until the mid-1960 more

evangelical publishers picked up the term, and not until the late 1970s and early 1980s,

that the term came into general use by all the main evangelical publishers. Even then its

use did not really take off until after 2000. Significantly, it was Eerdmans that really

popularized the term and Harvest House that took it to a mass market after 1990.

This initial, and admittedly limited, survey shows that the idea of worldview was first presented to the evangelical Christians in America by publishing houses, like Baker, Eerdmans, and Zondervan, all of which were based in Grand Rapids and were originally developed by people from Dutch Calvinist backgrounds. The following rather unscientific statistics from an advanced Google Book Search of leading evangelical publishers yielded the following information:

Year	Eerdmans	Baker	Zondervan	InterVarsity	Harvest House
1930-1935	0001				
1935-1940	0001				
1949-1945	0001				
1945-1950	0002				
1950-1955	0004				
1955-1960	0036	0003			
1960-1965	0061	0003			
1965-1970	0219	0008	0004	0006	
1970-1975	0266	0010	0010	0007	
1975-1980	0186	0056	0008	0008	0003
1980-1985	0631	00865	0081	0081	0006
1985-1990	0649	0375	0005	0005	0044
1990-1995	0841	0344	0000	0000	0161
1995-2000	2780	0414	0004	0004	0176
2000-2005	2430	0688	0003	0003	0225
2005-2010	2020	0544	0008	0008	0683

Although these figures are very general, and somewhat unreliable, they do provide some indication of the growth in interest in books that use the term worldview. They also show that the Dutch Calvinist publisher Eerdmans, which published the works of Kuyper, has consistently promoted this idea.

Appendix Two
Abraham Kuyper and Herman Dooyeweerd?

Abraham Kuyper

Abraham Kuyper (1827-1920) was the third child and first son of a Dutch Reform Minster and a former governess and assistant school teacher. He was born in the town Maasluis, near Rotterdam, the Netherlands, on October 29, 1837. When he was almost four years old his family moved to Middleburg where his parents homeschooled him. In the summer of 1849, the family moved to Leiden which was a university city. He entered University of Leiden in September 1855. Three years later he graduated with a degree in theology and entered the university's Divinity School where he earned his Doctorate in Theology. It was awarded on September 20, 1862 (Vanden Berg 1975:10-13, 16, 18, 29).

As a student Kuyper was "captivated" by, what he later described as the "illusion of modernist theology" (Heslam 1998:29-30). Modernism, as Kuyper understood it, involved "a move away from the doctrinal rigidity" of the Reformed theology of his day. This it replaced with "a religion of the heart" (Heslam 1998:29). The Modernist religious trend had gained strength in the Netherland since the 1830's, when theologians at the University of Groningen, began promoting it. After its initial popularity, Modernism started to fade at Groningen and Leiden became the center of the movement. There the ideas became a powerful force that "swept aside much of the orthodoxy of the churches, which at the time were too weak and innerspring to resist" (Heslam 1998:29-30; Vanden Berg 1975:18-21).

After graduating in theology, Kuyper was not immediately assigned to a congregation. So he served as a guest preacher in various congregations while looking

for one that needed a minister. In 1863 he was invited to give a Good Friday sermon in the village of Beesd. He chose to preach on John 19:30, but this was a very difficult sermon for him to write as he found himself caught in the middle between the modernist and orthodox interpretations of the text.

At this time Kuyper did not believe that Jesus was the savior and mediator between God and humankind. Nor did he believe that the Christian scriptures revealed God to humans. Rather, he saw Jesus as "a noble martyr who had died at the hands of His enemies for the courage of His Conviction." Nevertheless, the sermon was so well received that the congregation invited him to become there minister and he accepted (Heslam 1998:29).

On Sunday August 9 1863 Kuyper was installed as the minister of the church in Beesd by his father. Within a short time of arrive he became disappointed with what he found. His parishioners, who for the most part were orthodox, were happy with his pastoral work, but were not interested in modern theology and did not really welcome him. They were also disappointed by what they saw as his lack of knowledge of basic Christian truths. He soon learned that there were some in his congregation who were so opposed to modernization that they refused to attend his services.

Every minister who is called to an established church has to deal with malcontents. This is as true today as it was in Kuyper's time and before. Instead of staying out of his critics' way, as he had been advised to do, Kuyper made it a point of visiting them on a regular basis despite some hostile and awkward receptions. As a result of these visits he started to re-read, and evaluate traditional Calvinist theology, which he had originally rejected as being untrue.

This time he studied to enable him to accept and understand the ordinary people to whom he ministered. The result was "he underwent a second conversion, this time emerging as the orthodox Calvinist that he would remain for the rest of his life" (Heslam 1998:32-34)

Education was the issue that led Kuyper to develop his ideas about worldviews and become active in politics. After the creation of the modern Netherlands in 1815 the State introduced a secular school system which removed church control of schools. This was welcomed by ministers influenced by liberal theology and modernism, but strongly opposed by more orthodox Calvinists, Lutherans, and Roman Catholics.

As Kuyper reflected on his own religious development he came to believe that it was his education that originally led him to forsake orthodox Christian beliefs. Therefore, he argued that instead of being educated, he was actually indoctrinated into accepting theological modernism and rejecting traditional Christian beliefs. To counter such indoctrination Kuyper felt it necessary to either totally reform the State school system, or set up independent Christian schools.

Since reforming the entire school system was not an option, Kuyper opted for the establishment of an independent Christian school system. Nevertheless, he did not go back to the older idea of "church schools." Rather he argued that the education of children was the responsibility of teachers who should respect the wishes of parents. In addition to school reforms he also promoted the idea of establishing a new Christian university to train teachers and ministers of religion in a setting that affirmed Christian orthodoxy (Nichols 1973:79-94).

Because the Dutch political elite were liberal in politics and modernist in theology

this was not something they welcomed or were willing to support. Therefore, Kuyper

realized that it was necessary to enter into politics to change the law and allow both the

establishment of independent Christian schools and provide some support for them

from taxes (McGoldrick 2000:40-45; 52-56).

To cut a long story short Kuyper left the ministry in 1874 to enter politics. In 1879

he helped form a new political party, the Anti-Revolutionary Party. It got its name from

its opposition to the ideals of the French Revolution and was originally organized by

Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer (1801-1876) a forerunner of Kuyper (McGoldrick

2000:41-42; Essen and Morton 1990).

What is interesting about this party is that it was the first modern political party in

the Europe and originally recruited members from groups that were disenfranchised. In

other words it allowed people to join even though at the time they did not have the vote.

What they had, Kuyper realized, was the ability to support the party and spread its

ideas. This worked and as the party gained influence it fought hard for the extension of

the franscise to all of its members (McGoldrick 2000:49-52; van der Kroef 1948:316-

333).

To propagate his ideas, and those of his colleagues in the Anti-Revolutionary

movement, Kuyper contributed to a weekly religious newspaper *De Heraut* (*The*

Herald). Then in 1872 he founded the daily newspaper *De Standaard* (*The Standard*)

and *Heraut* became its Saturday edition with feature articles and religious reflections

(McGoldrick 2000:46-47)

Finally, in 1880 Kuyper founded his own university the *Vrije Universiteit van*

Amsterdam (Free University of Amsterdam – FU). Today the FU is one of the

Netherland's leading academic institutions (FU 2010). In calling it the "Free University," Kuyper did not mean that it was free in the sense of offering courses at no cost. Rather "Free" indicated that it was free from direct State control (McGoldrick 2000:56-61).

In 1898, Kuyper was invited to Princeton University in America, a country he admired, to receive an honorary doctorate. While there he gave the annual Stone Lectures, in English, which were published as *Calvinism: Six Stone Lectures* (1898). Kuyper stayed in America several months speaking at churches and universities (Heslam 1998:57-66). He also visited various American-Dutch communities such as the town of Grand Rapids in Michigan. While in Grand Rapids, Kuyper gave an address in which he expressed his admiration and support for the Democratic Party, describing himself as "Christian Democrat" (Heslam 1998:66-74)

One local newspaper, the *Grand Rapids Democrat*, was delighted and give his speech extensive coverage. As a result Kuyper felt obliged to write a letter qualifying his remarks by saying that he also admired many things about the Republicans. Then he added the comment that "no political party should be supported without question" (Heslam 1998:68).

Throughout his life Kuyper remained something of an outcaste from the Dutch establishment which never fully recognized his achievements. Nevertheless, his party was in power, in coalition with the Roman Catholic Party, almost continually from 1888 to 1938. Further, after 1945 it, or its successor parties, have had a major role in the Dutch Government until the present (McGoldrick 2000:55). For a short period, from 1901 to 1904, Kuyper was Prime Minister of the Netherlands (McGoldrick 2000:189-192).

Apart from pushing through legislation that supported Christians schools and universities such and the Free University and the Roman Catholic University he took a strong line against colonialism and worked for the independence of Dutch colonies. This was a particularly difficult and often unpopular position because the King and many of his closest associates were deeply involved with the exploitation of the colonies (McGoldrick 2000:175-186).

After his electoral defeat in 1904, Kuyper withdrew from politics to become something of an "elder statesman:" Now he concentrated on writing and securing the future of both his ideas and the Calvinist reform movement, sometimes called neo-Calvinism, that he had spent most of his life developing and promoting (McGoldrick 2000:208-226).

Towards the end of Kuyper's life the Anti-Revolutionary movement gradually became part of the Dutch Establishment with the result that its politicians played key roles in almost every Dutch government until the dramatic elections of 2010 when the established parties lost ground. The Anti-Revolutionary Party (ARP), remained a unified force in Dutch politics throughout the twentieth century. During the Second World War members of the party formed a Government in Exile in London under the leadership of Queen Wilhelmina (1880-1962). Back in the Netherlands other ARP members played a key role in the Dutch Resistance where they published the underground newspaper *Trouw* (Warmbrunn 1963:130-133; 217; 232; 233; 268; Westra 1972:216-357).

After the end of the war the ARP resumed its activities as a normal political party playing a key role in most coalition governments until its crushing election defeat in 1971 at the hands of a left-wing Christian political party with Green inclinations, the

Political Party of Radicals (PPR). Following this defeat they formed a coalition with two

other Christian parties to found the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA) in 1974,

although it was not until 1980 that the party was formally disbanded. Even then ARP

politicians remained a powerful, often dominant coalition partner in Dutch politics until

the Dutch General election of June 2010 when it was decisively defeated leading to the

resignation of its leader the then Prime Minister Jan Pieter Balkenende (MacDonald,

and Rabinowitz 1999; *Economist Intelligence Unit*, 2010).

Herman Dooyeweerd

Following Kuyper's death the ARP established a research institute, or think tank,

the Dr. Abraham Kuyper Foundation (AKF) which hired a young lawyer, Herman

Dooyeweerd (1894-1977) as its Assistant Director in 1921. Dooyeweerd was born in

Amsterdam where he became a law student at Kuyper's Free University of Amsterdam

(FU) in 1912 graduating five years later after writing his doctorate on *The Cabinet in*

Dutch Constitutional Law. After graduation he worked in the Dutch Department of

Labour before taking up his post at the AKF where he remained until 1926 when he was

appointed Professor of Legal Philosophy at the FU (Dooyeweerd 1986:11-13).

While at the AKF, Dooyeweered established his reputation as a prolific writer. He

did this by contributing numerous articles to both popular and academic journals. The

most important of his works from this time were a series of articles on Christianity and

politics in the *Antirevolutionaire Staatkunde* the AKF's monthly journal. He also

published the academic monograph *Calvinism and natural Law* (1925) and began work

on what was to become him magnum opus *De Wijsbegeerte der Wetside*e, which is

literally translated as *The Philosophy of Law* (1935-1936). It appeared in three large volumes (Dooyeweerd 1986:13-15). Later, in the 1950's this work was translated into English as *The New Critique of Theoretical Thought*, which is generally known as *The New Critique*. After this he published a number of equally large works on various aspects of philosophy and law in Dutch. Recently, work was begun translating these into English, but the accuracy of the translations has been disputed and the project seems to have been suspended (Friesen 2008).

As a professor at the FU, Dooyeweerd worked closely with his brother-in-law, Hendrik Theodoor Vollenhoven (1892-1978). He was also a philosopher in the Law Faculty and with Dooyeweerd a founder of the Association for Reformed Philosophy (2010). Although apparently an important contributor to the development of Kuyper's ideas Vollenhoeven's works have not been published in English until quite recently when a few fragments appeared on websites as online publications (Friesen 2008). Consequently, they will not be considered in this essay (Kalsbeek 1975:20-24).

Around the same time that the English translation of *The New Critique* was published a fairly large scale wave of immigration to Canada occurred bringing to this country many families with the Dutch Calvinist backgrounds. At the same time an American scholar, Evan Runner (1916-2002), returned from studying with Dooyeweerd at the FU to teach philosophy at Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan. He held this post he held from 1951 to his retirement in 1981. There he organized a Groen van Prinsterer Society, to popularize the ideas of Dutch neo-Calvinism, which is sometimes called "Reformational" thought, among the students.

Runner's lectures and enthusiasm caught the imagination of a group of students

from the newly established Dutch communities in Canada which led to the founding of a series of lectures in Univille, Ontario, in the late 1950's and early 1960's. A number of these students in turn went on to study with Dooyeweerd at the FU before returning to Canada to establish a series of Christian educational initatives the first, and most important, being the Institute for Christian Studies (ICS - 2010) which was launched in 1967 in Toronto and is now affiliated with the University of Toronto.

In 1972 the ICS obtained a charter from the Ontario Government to offer a master's program in philosophy and later, in 1980, it launched a PhD in cooperation with the FU of Amsterdam. Two other major initiatives which have proved even more successful than the ICS were the King's College (2010) in Edmonton, Alberta, which was founded as an undergraduate institution in 1979 with a charter from the Government of Alberta (King College 2010a), and Redeemer College (2010), in Ancaster, Ontario, founded in 1980 with the support of the Ontario Government (Redeemer College 2010a). There is also a major Reformational publishing project led by the Paidea Press (2010).

While working on graduate degrees at McMaster University two British students, Elaine Storkey and Richard Russell, came into contact with the ICS and the ideas of Dooyeweerd. After returning to England they established the Christian Studies Unit (2010) which held conferences and distributed Reformed publications. Today, the Cambridge economist, Tony Cramp, is listed as a follower of Dooyweerd while a professor at Salford University, Andrew Basden runs a website devoted to Dooyweerd's work (Dooyeweerd 2010).

It seems that Dooyeweerd's ideas were also developed in Australia and New

Zealand largely as a result Duncan Roper, a graduate student from New Zealand who studied mathematics at the University of Manchester in the early 1960's. After encountering neo-Calvinism in England, Roper returned to New Zealand to teach mathematics at university. There he established contact with both the InterVarsity Fellowship and various Dutch immigrant groups. These contacts led to the founding of the Australian Association for Reformational Studies although now seems to have folded. There also seems to be considerable interest in Dooyeweerd's ideas in South Korea, Japan and among many Chinese Christians.[16]

Probably the least talked about aspect of Kuper and Dooyweerde's legacy is the following of neo-Calvinist philosophy among Afrikaners in South Africa. Here Dooyeweerd's thought was developed during the apartheid era by scholars at the universities of Bloemfontein and Potchefstroom. To their credit, however, many were critical of apartheid (de Gruchy 1986).

---

[16] Information from Rev. Dr. Chang-han Kim, Calgary Korean United Chruch.

Bibliography

Asimov, Isaac. *I, Robot*. New York: New American Library, 1957.

Bacon, Daniel W. *The influence of Hudson Taylor on the faith missions movement.* Singapore: Overseas Missionary Fellowship, 1984.

Baird, Forrest. "Schaeffer's Intellectual Roots." Found in Ronald W. Ruegsegger, editor, *Reflections on Francis Schaeffer*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986:45-67.

Barrett, William. *Irrational man: A study in existential philosophy*. Anchor books ed. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1962.

Beliefnet. "More Worldview Talk from Sarah Palin." 3 October 2008. Found on the Internet at:
"http://blog.beliefnet.com/godometer/2008/10/more-worldview-talk-from-sarah.html
Last accessed 5 August 2008.

Brancaforte, Charlotte Lang. *The German Forty-Eighters in the United States*. New York: P. Lang, 1989.

Bratt, James D. *Dutch Calvinism in modern America : a history of a conservative subculture*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1984.

Bromley, David G., and Anson D. Shupe. *New Christian Politics*. Macon, GA: Mercer, 1984.

Brower, Milinda. "Exploring Sahah Palin's Worldview." *Public Diplomacy*. Annanberg: University of Southern California, 1/9/2008. Found on the Internet at:
http://publicdiplomacy.foreignpolicyblogs.com/2008/09/01/exploring-sarah-palins-worldview/
Last accessed 30/7/2010.

Bruce, Steve. *The Rise and Fall of the New Christian Right: Conservative Protestant politics in America, 1978-1988*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Brümmer, Vincent. *Transcendental Criticism and Christian Philosophy*. Frankeker: T.Wever 1961.

Burson, Scott R., and Jerry L. Walls. *C.S. Lewis & Francis Schaeffer: Lessons for a new century from the most influential apologists of our time*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1998.

Calvin, John, edited by John T. McNeil, translated from the 1559 edition by Ford Lewis Battles. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Volume One. London: SCM Press, 1961.

Canadian Newstand – online database available through the University of Calgary Library.

Chalcedon Foundation, 2010, found on the Internet at:
http://chalcedon.edu/
Last accessed 10/8/2010

Christian Studies Unit, found on the Internet at:
http://christianstudiesunit.org.uk/contact/index.html
Last accessed 8/8/2010.

Clark, Kenneth. *Civilization: A Personal View*. London: BBC and John Murray 1969. The film series had the same title. It was produced by Michael Gill and Peter Montagnon for the BBC and released in 1969. Details can be found on the Internet at:
http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0264234/
Last accessed 17/8/2010. (It is available on DVD from BBC publications.)

Colson, Chuck. *How Now Shall We Live?* Carol Stream: Tyndale House, 2004.

Conradie, A. L. *The Neo-Calvinistic Concept of Philosophy*. Pietermaritzburg: Natal University Press, 1960.

D'Antonio, Michael. *Fall from Grace: The failed crusade of the Christian right*. New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1989.

de Gruchy, John. *Church Struggle in South Africa*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1987.

Dengerink, Jan. *The Idea of Justice in Christian Perspectivel*. Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1978.

Diamond, Sara. *Spiritual Warfare: The politics of the Christian right*. Boston, MA: South End Press, 1989.

Diamond, Sara. *Roads to Dominion: Right-wing Movements and Political Power in the United States*. New York: Guilford Press, 1995.

Dooyeweerd, Herman. *Transcendental Problems of Philosophic Thought*. Amsterdam: The Free University, 1948.

Dooyeweerd, Herman. *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought Volume One*. Nutley: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1953.

Dooyeweerd, Herman. *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought Volume Two*. Nutley: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1955.

Dooyeweerd, Herman.*A New Critique of Theoretical Thought Volume Three*. Nutley: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1957.

Dooyeweerd, Herman. *In the Twilight of Western Thought*. Nutley, NJ: The Craig Press, 1965.

Dooyeweerd, Herman. *Roots of Western Culture.* Toronto Wedge, 1979.

Dooyeweerd, Herman, translated by Magnus Verbrugge, edited by John Witte Jr. *A Christian Theory of Social Institutions*. La Jolla, California, The Herman Dooyeweerd Foundation, 1986.

Dooyeweerd, H. *Reformation and Scholasticism in Philosophy*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2004.

Dooyeweerd, 2010, found on the Internet at:
http://www.dooy.salford.ac.uk/
Last accessed 8/8/2010.

Duriez, Colin. *Francis Schaeffer: an authentic life*. Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway Books, 2008.

Economist Intelligence Unit."Netherlands politics: Right, what now?" 10 June 2010

Fackre, Gabriel J. *The Religious Right and Christian faith*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1982.

Flaherty, John E. *Peter Drucker: Shaping the Managerial Mind*. New York: Jossey-Bass, 2005.

Fowler, Robert Booth. *A New Engagement: Evangelical Political Thought, 1966-1976*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1982.

Friessen, Glen. "Notes on Vollenhoven." 2008. Found on the Internet at:
http://www.members.shaw.ca/jgfriesen/Notes/VollenhovenNotes.html
Last accessed 10/7/2010.

Free University of Amsterdam, 2010, found on the Internet at:
http://www.vu.nl/en/
Last accessed 9/8/2010.

Essen, J. L., van, and H. D. Morton. *Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer: Selected Studies*. Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1990.

Gasque, Laurel. *Art and the Christian Mind*. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2005.

Gibson, Charles, "EXCERPTS: Charlie Gibson Interviews Sarah Palin." ABC News, 11

September 2008. Found on the Internet at:
http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/Vote2008/Story?id=5782924&page=1.
Last accessed 18 March 2010.

Goldberg, Michelle. *Kingdom Coming: The Rise of Christian Nationalism*. New York:
W.W. Norton & Company, 2006.

Google Books: Advanced book search – online search engine. Available at:
http://books.google.ca/advanced_book_search
Last accessed 8/8/2010.

Goudzwaard, Bob. *Capitalism and Progress*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.

Guinness, Os. *The Dust of Death: A critique of the establishment and the counter
culture, and the proposal for a third way*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press,
1973.

Hankins, Barry. *Francis Schaeffer and the shaping of Evangelical America*. Grand
Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub., 2008.

Hedges, Chris. *American Fascists: The Christian Right and the War on America*.
Toronto: Free Press, 2006.

Heslam, Peter S. *Creating a Christian Worldview: Abraham Kuyper's Lectures on
Calvinism*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998.

Himstra, John. *Worldviews on the Air: The struggle to create a pluralistic broadcasting
system in the Netherland*. Langham: University Press of America, 1997.

Huffington Post. "Palin's Church may have shaped Controversical Worldview."
Huffington Post, 09/02/2008. Found on the Internet at:
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2008/09/02/palins-church-may-have-sh_n_123205.html
Last accessed 30/7/2010.

ICS, Institute for Christian Studies, found on the Internet at:
http://www.icscanada.edu/
Last accessed 8/8/2010

Jorstad, Erling. *The Politics of Moralism: The new Christian Right in American life*.
Minneapolis: Augsburg Pub. House, 1981.

Jorstad, Erling. *The New Christian Right, 1981-1988: Prospects for the post-Reagan
decade*. Lewiston, NY: E. Mellen Press, 1987.

Kalsbeek, L., translated by Judy A. Peterson, edited by Bernard and Josina Zylstra.
Contours of a Christian philosophy. Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1975.

Kraft, Marguerite G. *Worldview and the Communication of the Gospel*. South Pasadena, Calif.: William Carey Library, 1978.

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Kuyper, Abraham. *Calvinism: Six Stone Lectures*. Amsterdam: Höveker & Wormser, 1898.

Kuyper, Abraham, translated by Henri de Vries. *The Work of the Holy Spirit*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1900.

Kuyper, Abraham, translated by Dirk Jellema. *Christianity and the Class Struggle*. Grand Rapids: Piet Hein, 1950.

Kuyper, Abraham, translated by J. Hendrik de Vries. *Principles of Sacred Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.

Kuyper, Abraham, and James D. Bratt. *Abraham Kuyper: A Centennial Reader*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

LaHaye, Tim F. *The Battle for the Mind*. Old Tappan: Revell, 1980.

LaHaye, Tim, and Gerry B. Jenkins. *The Rapture*. Carol Stream: Tyndale House, 2007.

Lienesch, Michael. *Redeeming America: Piety and politics in the New Christian Right*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1993.

MacDonald, Stuart Elaine, and George Rabinowitz. "Issues and Party Competition in the Netherlands." *Comparative Political Studies*, February 1999, Vol. 32 No. 1 63-99.

Marsden, George M. *Fundamentalism and American Culture*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Marshall, Paul. *Human Rights Theories in Christian Perspectivel*. Toronto: Institute for Christian Studies, 1983.

Martin, Linette. *Hans Rookmaaker: A biography*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1979.

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels; Selected works in one volume*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1968.

McGoldrick, James. *Abraham Kuyper: God's Renaissance Man*. Darlington: Evangelical Press, 2000.

Montgomery, John Warwick. "The Revolution: Christian In Spite of Itself." In Cranfield, C.E.B., John W. Montgomery, David Kilgour, *Christians in the Public Square.* Toronto: Canadian Institute for Law, Theology & Public Policy, 1996. Found on the Internet in *Issues*, at:
http://www.mtio.com/articles/bissar67.htm
Last accessed 10/8/2010.

Moreland, James Porter, and William Lane Craig. *Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview.* Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2003.

Naugle, David K. *Worldview: The History of a Concept.* Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2002.

New York Times, Vice Presidential Debate-2008: Transcript, 2 October 2008. Found on the Internet at
 http://elections.nytimes.com/2008/president/debates/transcripts/vice-presidential-debate.html. Last accessed 18 March 2010.

New York Times. Editorial: "Gov. Palin's Worldview." 12 September 2008. Found on the Internet at: http://www.nytimes.com/2008/09/13/opinion/13sat1.html#. Last accessed 18 March 2010.

Newsweek, "The Right A House Divided?" Vol. 97, No. 5, 2 February, 1981.

Nichols, Anthony H. *Abraham Kuyper –A Summons to Christian Vision in Education.* In the *Journal of Christian Education*, Vo. 16, No. 2, 1973:78-94.

North, Gary, and Institute for Christian Economics. *Tools of Dominion: The case laws of Exodus.* Tyler, Tex.: Institute for Christian Economics, 1990.

North, Gary, and Gary DeMar. *Christian Reconstruction: What it is, what it isn't.* Tyler, Tex.: Institute for Christian Economics, 1991.

Novak, Michael. *Democracy and Mediating Structures: A Theological Inquiry*. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1980.

Olasky, Marvin. "Francis Schaeffer's political legacy." *Townhall.com* 3/3/2005. Found on the Internet at:
http://townhall.com/columnists/MarvinOlasky/2005/03/03/francis_schaeffers_political_legacy. Last accessed 2/8/2010.

Olasky, Marvin. "Who Are the Christian Thinkers Who Influenced You - Marvin Olasky." Trinity Law School Video on U-Tube. 26 April 2010. Found on the Internet at:
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JlT8SSubcIw
Last accessed 16/8/2010.

Opie, Iona, and Peter Opie. *The Oxford Nursery Rhyme Book*. Oxford: Oxford Universtiy Press, 1975.

Orr, James. *The Christian View of God and the World. The Kerr Lectures for 1890-91*. New York: Charles Scribner, 1897.

Paidea Press, found on the Internet at:
http://www.reformationalpublishingproject.com/rpp/index.asp
Last accessed 9/8/2010.

Patrick Henry College 2010. Found on the Internet at:
http://www.phc.edu/acalltopens.php
Last accessed 15/8/2010.

Plato, edited by Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns, various translators. *The Complete Dialogues of Plato*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.

Pollock, John Charles. *Hudson Taylor and Maria: Pioneers in China*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Popper, Karl Raimund. *The Open Society and its Enemies*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1966. First published 1945.

Popper, Karl Raimund, and Mark Amadeus Notturno. *The Myth of the Framework: In defence of science and rationality*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Pro-Quest – online database available through the University of Calgary Library.

ProQuest *New York Times* –online database available through the University of Calgary Library.

Redeemer College, 2010, found on the Internet at:
http://www.redeemer.ca/
Last accessed 9/9/2010.

Redeemer College, 2010a, found on the Internet at:
http://www.redeemer.ca/about/whoweare/history.aspx
Last accessed 9/9/2010.

Rookmaaker, H. R. *Modern Art and the Death of a Culture*. London: Inter-Varsity, 1970.

Rookmaaker, H. R. *The Complete Works of Hans R. Rookmaaker*. Carlisle: Piquant, 2002.

Ruegsegger, Ronald, W. editor. *Reflections on Francis Schaeffer*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.

Rushdoony, Rousas John. *Van Til*. In the International library of philosophy and theology. Modern Thinkers Series. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1960.

Rushdoony, Rousas John. *Intellectual Schizophrenia: Culture, crisis, and education / Rousas J. Rushdoony ; preface by Edmund A. Opitz*. Philadelphia,: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1961.

Rushdoony, Rousas John. *The Messianic character of American education: studies in the history of the philosophy of education*. Nutley, New Jersey: Craig Press, 1963.

Rushdoony, Rousas John, and Intercollegiate Society of Individualists. *This independent Republic: Studies in the nature and meaning of American history*. Nutley, New Jersey: Craig Press, 1964.

Rushdoony, Rousas John. *The One and the Many: studies in the philosophy of order and ultimacy*. Nutley, New Jersey: Craig Press, 1971.

Rushdoony, Rousas John. *The institutes of Biblical law. A Chalcedon study*. Nutley, New Jersey: Craig Press, 1973.

Rutherford Institute (2010). Found on the Internet at:
http://www.rutherford.org
Last accessed 9/8/2010.

Ryle, J. C. *Holiness: Its nature, hindrances, difficulties, and roots*. London: Clarke, 1952. First published 1879.

Ryle, J. C. *Practical Religion: Being plain papers on the daily duties, experience, dangers and privileges of professing Christians, etc.* London: James Clarke & Co., 1959. First published 1883.

Schaeffer, Edith. *L'Abri*. Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishing, 1969.

Schaeffer, Edith. *The Tapestry: The life and times of Francis and Edith Schaeffer*. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1981.

Schaeffer, Francis. "The Fundamentalist Christian and Anti-Semitism." *The Independent Board Bulletin*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Church of America, October 1943.

Schaeffer, Francis A. *Escape from Reason*. London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1968.

Schaeffer, Francis A. *The God Who Is There: Speaking historic Christianity into the twentieth century*. Chicago: InterVarsity Press, 1969b.

Schaeffer, Francis A. *He is there and He is not silent*. Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House

Publishers, 1972.

Schaeffer, Francis A. "Race and Economics." *Christianity Today*. 4 January 1974a:394-395.

Schaeffer, Francis A. "Form and Freedom in the Church." Address to the International Congress on Evangelism, Lausanne, Switzerland, 1974b. Found on the Internet at: http://www.lausanne.org/documents/lau1docs/0368.pdf
Last accessed 25/08/2010.

Schaeffer, Francis A. *No Little People: Sixteen sermons for the twentieth century*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1974c.

Schaeffer, Francis A., Francis A. Schaeffer, and Jeremy C. Jackson. *How Should We Then Live? The Rise and Decline of Western Thought and Culture*. Old Tappan, N.J.: F. H. Revell Co., 1976. The film of the same title was made by Gospel Films, of Muskegon, Michigan 1977 and issued at the same time. Subsequently it came out as a video and then DVD.

Schaeffer, Francis A. *A Christian Manifesto.* Westchester: Crossway Books, 1981.

Schaeffer, Francis A. *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer: A Christian Worldview*. 5 vols. Westchester: Crossway Books, 1982.

Schaeffer, Frank. *Crazy for God: How I grew up as one of the elect, helped found the religious right, and lived to take all (or almost all) of it back*. New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, 2007.

Schaffner, Franklin J., Dirctor. *The Boys from Brazil*. Hollywood: ITC Entertainment, 1978. From the novel by Ira Levin *The Boys from Brazil.* New York: Random House, 1976.

Schlossberg, Herbert, and Marvin N. Olasky. *Turning Point: A Christian Worldview Declaration*. Westchester: Crossway Books, 1987.

The King's College, 2010, found on the Internet at:
http://www.kingsu.ca/
Last accessed 9/8/2010.

The King's College, 2010a, found on the Internet at:

http://www.kingsu.ca/about-us/history.html
Last accessed 9/8/2010.

Van der Kroef, Justus M. "Abarham Kuyper and the Rise of Neo-Calvinism in the Netherlands." In *Church History*, Vol XVII, 1948:316-334.

Van Til, Cornelius, complied by Eric D. Bristley. *The Works of Cornelius Van Til, 1895-1987*. Oak Harbor, Washington: Logos Library System, 1997.

Vanden Berg, Frank. *Abraham Kuyper.*Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960.

Warmbrunn, Werner. *The Dutch Under German Occupation, 1940-1945*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1963.

Westra, Johan Gerard. *Confessional Political Parties in the Netherlands, 1813-1946*. Ann Arbor: Univeristy Microfilms. Ann Arbor: Department of Political Science, University of Michigan PhD thesis, 1972.

White, James Emery. *What is Truth?* Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994.

Zwier, Robert. *Born-again Politics: The new Christian right in America*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1982.