A LIFE IN FREEDOM

Prof. Dr. A. van de Beek

In this introductory article I shall not speak about the historical roots of the concept of freedom in the Reformed tradition, but I want to sketch some mainly biblical-theologically inspired broad outlines. For before saying we are Reformed we confess first of all that we are Christians: living in Christ to whom the Scriptures bear witness. As a matter of fact my article will be personally coloured: it mirrors the way the Scriptures appeal to myself. I have neither the pretence nor the desire to set up general foundations for common thought about freedom, based on scriptural evidence. Such a general view for theology is not the purpose of the cooperation that Reformed theologians intend in their discussions in conferences and publications. It is far more important to communicate, what after being nourished by scholarly research, is very dear to us, to discuss it with each other, to be inspired or challenged to further investigations, new considerations and new self-reflection. As far is I am concerned, we should not try to hide ourselves behind a front of so-called academic objectivity, but jointly search for truth and authenticity, even if this makes us vulnerable. We must use our study as an instrument to find our way in the life before the face of the Lord and to support each other in this search.

Our deepest freedom is founded in Christ. As the apostle says: 'It is for freedom that Christ has set us free' (Gal. 5:1). It is not without reason that this is a quotation from Paul, for more than any other author of the New Testament he has expressed himself about Christian freedom. What is implied by this freedom? Johannes Weiβ¹ has defined it as freedom from the law, freedom from sin and freedom from death. Christians are not bound by the law for they live through grace. They are liberated from sin for Christ bore the damnation. And they are free from death for Christ overcame death. By connecting law, sin and death, law is put into the sphere of evil. If we must be liberated from it, just like from sin and death, how is it possible then that Paul says the law is

¹ J. Weiβ, Die christliche Freiheit nach der Verkündigung des Apostel Paulus, Göttingen 1902.
holy and good? And can we say that we are free from death without considering that death is the last enemy to be destroyed? Besides this in 'free from' only the negative is expressed, and not a positive attitude to life. How can you give form to Christian life in freedom with negatives only?

My Leyden colleague Hollander² has developed a different concept of freedom with Paul, in contrast to Weiß. He considers Paul's concept of freedom to be influenced by the Stoa. The really free human being is the human who lives according to his innermost being, thus according to the law of nature. Human beings are free if they do not oppose the natural law. Paul transfers this idea to Christian thought. Human beings are good as created by God, but through sin they became slaves of evil. They do not live according to their own being but they are driven by the flesh. Christ liberates them from this situation, so that they can live again according to their nature, according to the law of the mind (ho nomos tou noos: Rom. 8:23).

The value of Hollander's concept is that it lays bare that freedom is not the overcoming of some isolated problems of human existence, but that it has to do with the totality of our being. Freedom is an attitude toward life, even more: it is our being. Because it is our essence to be free, powers like sin and death no longer reign over us. This depowerment of the powers, however, is more a symptom than the essence: our innermost being is a life in freedom. It is not determined by the negative but through its own reality.

Nevertheless Hollander does not reach the essential point of Paul by relating his thoughts to the stoic natural law. First of all the significance of the law of Israel and Paul's roots in the Jewish tradition do not come out³. Secondly the stoic concept of freedom

³ Typical of the way Christian theology treats the biblical concept of freedom is the lemma eleuteria in the Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, II written by H. Schlier. Because 'freedom' is supposed to be freedom from the law, the Old Testament as book of the law can not have a function to freedom. Under the lemma the Old Testament and Judaism are not even mentioned, as if freedom/liberation did not have any significance in them.
is very formal: it tends to a liberal\textsuperscript{4} idea of freedom that I find neither in Paul nor further on in the Scripture. In Paul’s view we have been set free from the law of sin to the service of obedience\textsuperscript{5}. He is not interested in liberty in the meaning of individual freedom of choice, but in a freedom which is initiated by liberation to the service of another. Thirdly – and this is my main point – freedom in the New Testament is always understood as freedom \textit{in Christ}\textsuperscript{6}. Not for a single moment can the sight of the relationship with Him be lost. We are not set free from the law of sin and death by returning to the natural law, but through the law of the Spirit of life in Christ (Rom. 8:2). The core of Paul’s concept of freedom is expressed in 2 Cor. 3:17: ‘Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom.’ Our being is a being in Him. Through baptism we are baptized into Him. His life is our life, his Spirit testifies with our spirit. Paul likes the terms ‘in Christ’ or ‘with Christ.’ That is our essential being. That is our innermost nature, not by our own nature but because we are baptized into Him. Now his Spirit leads our lives. This relationship with Christ is our life. Because we know Him – knowing in the profound sense of \textit{jada}’ – everything which was significant before becomes insignificant. Even the most positive of the past is considered by the apostle to be a loss and rubbish (Phil. 3:7f.). Therefore Christian freedom is wholly different from the autonomy of the subject of the Enlightenment. It can also not be identified with a life under the categorical imperative of our consciences, as Kant poses in the late Enlightenment. It is the new being in Christ, led by his Spirit, which matters.

The relation to Christ is a personal relation. Precisely this aspect is essential to the Reformed perception of faith. Through his Spirit Christ dwells in us and we are related to Him. Nothing can separate us from his love. This is expressed profoundly in the Dutch Confession: we do not need the mediation of saints, for

\textsuperscript{4} ‘Liberal’ is used here in an European sense of individual autonomy with a right-wing political impact and not in the more left-wing American sense.

\textsuperscript{5} Rom. 6:16-18; cf. also Gal. 5:13-14.

\textsuperscript{6} Rom. 6:11; 7:4 and 25f.; 8:1f.; 1 Cor. 6:12-20; 11:1; Gal. 5:1-6; John 8:32 and 36.
nobody loves us more than Christ. God has elected us in Him and nothing can annul this choice. Through his Word and Spirit we become convinced of this love.

A characteristic expression of this relation is the Reformed idea of the autopsia of the Holy Scripture. The Scripture is reliable in itself. It convinces us through the Spirit and the Spirit convinces us by the Scripture. Thus the authority and truth of Scripture is not founded in the church. Neither one can find reasonable arguments for its truth, such as the age of these scriptures, or their broad acceptance. In themselves those statements are true, but they count for little compared to that single experience: Christ appeals to us by his Word and Spirit. We can compare this relationship with that to a beloved person. I can invent a lot of arguments why I love my wife – her beauty, her care, her opposition. But those arguments can never explain that single truth: we love each other. She could never be exchangeable, even if another woman met all these conditions. ‘It is you and no other one!’ The person herself exceeds all arguments. So we can come out with a lot of arguments why it should be desirable to be a Christian, but finally it is only He himself who matters. Christ – and no other name.

This emphasis on the personal relationship prevents us from esteeming the church above the Lord. The church is only one of the external aids to faith, says Calvin. It is a necessary aid, but not the aim. The personal character and the autopsia also prohibit orthodoxy for its own sake. When the words of the right doctrine are no longer expressions of our living faith, it is no longer a correct doctrine, but dead language which can never express what the relationship in the love of Christ is. Those who trust in the doctrine, lose the Lord. So they lose their freedom.

The nature of freedom in Christ and the relation to Him is described most characteristically by the metaphor of life and

---

7 Dutch Confession (Confessio Belgica), art. 26, 1st paragraph.
8 Most characteristically again the Dutch Confession, art. 5 and 7.
9 In the Dutch Confession even the doctrine of the Trinity is not only founded in the Scriptures but also in the experience of the work of the divine Persons in our hearts.
10 J. Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, IV,1.
death. We have died and we are resurrected with Christ. This is symbolized in baptism. In baptism we are buried with Christ into death. We died to our former existence. Our life no longer is a life in the old aeon, but our way of life is in heaven, where Christ is. Therefore we are sons of God (huioi tou theou) like He is the Son of God (Rom. 8:15-17). And being children we are also heirs: eternal life is our inheritance, since we are raised with Christ into his new reality.

Romans 7 provides another metaphor: that of husband and wife. As long as the husband is alive the married woman is legally bound to him, Paul says. But when her husband is dead, she is free. As long as we live we are bound to the Torah. But after we died we are free from it. Because we died, indeed, in Christ we are free. We must pay attention to the fact that Paul does not say the law died, and thus we are free. That is, in my opinion, the error Weiss makes. The law remains operative. But we died in the death of Christ and by his death the world is now dead for me. The old aeon has gone. We no longer belong to it. In itself the law is good, but for us it belongs to a mediated era, it was given to us by a mediator, as Paul says. In that era the law was ineffective because that time was dominated by the flesh (sarx), the period in which human beings had to work with their own nature and their own flesh. That law of works remained fruitless. But now we died in Christ. Now we are no longer married to the previous life of which the law was an expression, but we have been set free to marry Christ. We are the wife of Christ, or, in eschatological perspective: the bride of Christ. Because Romans 7 speaks from a juridical point of view the metaphor is even stronger: without the romantic feelings of the metaphor of the bride it reflects the legal status of the church: we live by right in Him and He in us, through the love of his Spirit. In death all worldly differences fall away. In death the slave is equal to his lord, says Job (3:19).

Being in Christ in his death, we are also in Him in his new life. There, too, the earthly differences are insignificant. In Christ is neither slave, nor free, Greek nor barbarian, male nor female (Gal. 3:26-29). All worldly relations are of no importance here, sunk into death. Only this single relationship counts: God all in all.

---

When we say we died to law, this seems to create a new distance to Israel. But when we say Christ is the fulfilment of the law, this is impossible. He represents basically what is intended by the law. He fulfilled the law by obedience to death, even death on a cross. So He is the Son of God and thus the fulfilment of Israel. In his way we see the way of Israel reflected: the suffering son, from Egypt, through the exile to Auschwitz. This is the highest freedom: to say in the midst of the inexpressible violence of this aeon: 'You are my God.' Israel does not belong to this world and the world makes this continuously clear, just like it made this clear to the Messiah. Therefore, when the church joins the world in its controversy against the Jews, she lives with the world. Then she belongs to the other side from Israel, from Israel's God and the Messiah. Then she loses her freedom and returns to the man to whom she died. Then, just as powerfully as Paul spoke against the Galatians she must be confronted: 'You foolish Galatians!' (Gal. 3:1). A church which joins in any form in persecution of Jews is foolish, and returns to the old aeon. For she has forgotten that the Son of God is the suffering one, in line with the people of God.

More and more I am convinced we can not speak about Christian freedom without Israel. It is the freedom of belonging to the Lord, whatever may happen to us. This implies a contempt of all worldly interests which is unendurable to the world and to which the world reacts by persecutions. Jews and Christians have experienced that, because they have no images of God and are atheoi. They have a God who is a Name only and who suffers. Freedom in faith is connected inextricably to the desert, to the suffering servant of the Lord, to the cross, finally to death. Therefore, when the church is not persecuted, she must adopt a critical attitude towards herself. Has she given up her freedom for the power of Egypt and the fleshpots of the world? For Christian freedom is the freedom of those who know they are on the way to a better country. 'There remains than a Sabbath-rest for the people of God' (Heb. 4:9). Our home is not in this world, but with Christ. We are free solely and simply because we died. We do not belong to this world. It does not matter whether we express this by terms

---

of death and life, in terms of a personal relationship of love which exceeds everything and which can be destroyed by nothing, or in terms of a removal as Paul does in 2 Cor. 4. It matters only that the bond to Christ is our true life and that everything else is relative. That gives us true freedom. Essentially nothing is of any importance. For we received everything.

Now from the beginning it was a problem whether this basic relation to Christ as the core of Christian freedom would not end in libertinism. Paul has already foreseen the objection: ‘Shall we go on sinning, so that grace may increase? (Rom. 6:1). Should we not confirm the world of death to show we have another life? In the time of the Reformation with its emphasis on an immediate relationship to Christ this question occurs again: ‘Does this doctrine not make wicked and careless people?’ 13 Will society not become worse by Christians? Both Paul and Olevianus radically reject this idea. And rightly so! Society only can get better by the idea we died to the world. It will curb our avarice. Of course this can not be the essential argument to become a Christian. For that there are no arguments at all. It happens to us through the love of the Lord that is granted to us by the Holy Spirit. But consequently this new life implies that we are in the world in such a way that it is good for the world as well.

This is made especially clear by the fact that in Reformed theology sanctification of life is first of all conceived as mortification. I find it a splendid conception by Calvin to place poenitentia not preceding justification but consequent to it. 14 Poenitentia is not the way to faith, but the way of faith. We learn to regret our old life and thus we die continuously to our self-satisfaction. We learn to lose. In the Reformed tradition people like to characterize Christian life by the saying of John the Baptist: ‘He must become greater; I must become less’ (John 3:30). This becoming less means dying to the world. We do not need to struggle for ourselves and for our own position in the world. We do not need to frantically struggle to preserve our rights. Even at this point it went wrong in South-Africa. Long before Christian

---

13 *Heidelberg Catechism*, qu. 64.
faith was perverted by denying others as equal, it went wrong with
the personal relation to Christ, when a Christian thinks he only can
be a Christian if he can save his own position of power. It was a
foolish return to the old world of sin and death. Actually, the
Afrikaners learned it from the Europeans, from the English with
their British Empire, and they had got it originally from Holland:
they were the farmers who had to feed Dutch glory as a colonial
power. One of the oldest Christian hymns says: ‘Your attitude
should be the same as that of Christ Jesus, who being in very
nature God did not consider equality with God something to be
grasped, but made himself nothing; he humbled himself’ (Phil.
2:5-7). He did not struggle to preserve his rights and power.
Therefore we have no need to frantically defend our possessions
and our wealth. We have no need to build a new apartheid
between native-born and foreigners, or to close our borders for
those who come from elsewhere. In Europe, too, the slogan ‘Our
own people first,’ to defend our own interests at the cost of other
people, is getting stronger. In Europe, too, a spirit of regulating
life bureaucratically reigns by lack of true inner freedom. Since the
days of Constantine Christians have been inclined to exchange
freedom for power and for the peace of the world. Emperors and
Popes struggled for it. Merchants and politicians stored profits
from it. But it was always on the cost of another. And essentially
it was at the cost of the freedom in Christ. ‘It is hard for a rich
man to enter the kingdom of heaven,’ Jesus said (Matt. 19:23).
But did not somebody who searches for wealth in the name of
Christian faith and considers his own culture and society to be
normative to everyone in the name of Christ, from the very
beginning disown Christ through whom we died to the world?

Now the human heart is crafty and it devised a trick to be able
to keep the whole world and at the same time to seem a devout
Christian. The ultra-orthodox farmer hoards wealth on earth,
though he knows the parable of the rich fool by heart. But he says
about his wealth: ‘It is only the dross of the earth.’ So it does not
matter if you have a lot of it. For the kingdom of God it does not
matter at all. Thus you can do everything you want in your earthly
life, while your home is in heaven. Those whose home is really in
heaven will not only by words but also inwardly and by attitude
to life turn their back to this world. ‘The world and its desires pass
away, but who does the will of God lives forever’ (1 John 2:17).

One can also hold out freedom in Christ as a placebo for those who have nothing to lose. It is good if people who can neither lose nor win anything, themselves are comforted by this belief both in life and death. But the wealthy can never use it as a slogan to secure their own position against the poor. That is swearing in the church. And the poor can never secure himself when he is called to risk his neck in the protest against injustice. The belief in eternal life in Christ is not an affirmation of present injustice but dynamite under it.

Those who have their freedom in eternal life in Christ can dedicate themselves fully to justice. Fully indeed: they do not need to hold back anything, not even their own life. We do not need to keep quiet out of concern for our lives, where injustice occurs or where people live in a way which only serves their own profit. This is even more valuable, if those people call themselves Christians. We can find fine examples of this freedom to sacrifice yourself for the sake of freedom for others in the beginning period of the Reformed tradition. It is pithily expressed in the fourth verse of the Wilhelmus: ‘Neither body nor goods I saved; my brothers highly named also gave evidence to you. Count Adolf died in Friesland in the battle. His soul in eternal life expects the last day.’ A man like Willem van Oranje, who knew very well the value of earthly life, was willing to sacrifice everything for the cause of freedom. Unfortunately even Calvinists in his time and later on did not always understand this freedom and made themselves the measure of everybody.

Finally the life in freedom has to do with making everything subservient to Christ. He is our highest good and deepest being. In 1 Corinthians the debate on freedom plays an important role. The Corinthians conceive freedom formally: you can do whatever you want. Though they do not return to former life, they negate the gospel by their position. It becomes vain and powerless. The discussion concentrates on the eating of meat (1 Cor. 8). Freedom implies you can eat meat without qualms but also that you can give it up without qualms. The criterion is whether you can win somebody for Christ (1 Cor. 9:20f.). Do you help the other to live the life of freedom as you do? If we understand the personal relationship to Christ as the core of freedom, this is the essential
question of Christian ethics. Everything is put into perspective, but not because of the finitude of life as the Stoa says, but because of the good that exceeds everything: the love of Christ. Therefore we can make everything subservient to this love for the world, so that it will come to this freedom. Thus is freedom in the Scripture not a static concept, but it is founded in liberation, as an act, an experience, a process and a task.

Finally Christian theology is concerned with liberation of the world. This means Christian theology is basically always theology of liberation. But here, too, we must keep in mind the proportions. For theology of liberation can never become a programme that we must enforce. Then it becomes a new law and we turn freedom into a prolongation of earthly life. Then political, social and economic freedom becomes an aim in itself and not a consequence of a more profound inner freedom. Then not only is repression of new groups on the horizon, but we also lose our freedom at the same moment that we get our political freedom: it becomes a possession to be grasped. Freedom is not the liberation of some aspects of life (then we would be back with Weiß, only with different objects), but of life itself.

The use of words in the Old Testament is illuminating here. In present theology political and social liberation is often linked to the story of the Exodus. In this story, however, the usual words for liberation do not occur. The most suitable would have been the hif’il of *plt*: escape. The Lord let Israel escape from Egypt. But it is not found in the story. Words that deal with redeeming or releasing slaves could also have been used. It was finally liberation from ‘the land of slavery.’ But those words, too, are avoided, probably because ‘redeem’ and ‘release’ suppose the owner has a legal claim on his slaves and they were released voluntary. Both are not the case with pharaoh. For Israel is the son of the Lord and not of the house of slavery.

More remarkable is the fact that the word *js’* does not occur in the story of the Exodus. Precisely this word is preferred in the book of Judges and by the prophets to indicate the salvation from the enemies by God. But in this salvation not only the enemies are relevant but even more the cause of their oppression: the disobedience of Israel to the commandments of the Lord. It is not
without reason that 1 Samuel suggests a play on words between *mosia* (saviour) and *masiah* (anointed)\(^{15}\). The saviour is first of all the one who saves Israel from his sins. Precisely because of this connotation the word was not applicable to the Exodus, and for two reasons: 1) here the oppression was not the consequence of previous disobedience but part of God’s miraculous way with his son, Israel, and 2) Israel could not yet be disobedient to the commandments, for the law was given to the people at Sinai after their departure from Egypt.

Therefore the word *nts* ‘, to bring out, is used as a technical term for this event. Israel is brought out of the land of slavery. This not only means they are liberated from Egypt as a domain where they were slaves of the Egyptians, but far stronger and stricter that Egypt itself is a land of slavery. The Egyptians, too, are not free. The whole Egyptian existence and constitution is the reverse of freedom. As in Genesis Babel stands for human megalomania (the men who make it to the top), so in Exodus Egypt stands for an oppressive constitution and society with divine features. Systems of this kind, well-oiled though they may be, are lands of slavery. They are so not only because they have always to do with the profit of the few at the cost of many, but also because the few are not free either. The most unfree human being is the dictator (never without the custody of his body-guard), but also the celebrated king is a slave: a slave of his being celebrated. He is the slave of this life that he at the cost of many slaves must try to prolong to infinity, as the Egyptian pharaohs show.

According to the book Exodus the presence in the land of slavery leads to death. It leads to death for those who want to maintain it. Pharaoh drowns in the sea, the chaos waters of the flood, with his whole power, after previously in all Egyptian families every first-born, who is pre-eminently life and future, died. Only Israel was saved from death by God, because they already died before. First this happened in the circumcision of Moses’ eldest son. The circumcision is in Exodus 4 a symbolic death. His representation of God turns Moses to a ‘bridegroom of blood.’ Only through death is a life with God possible\(^{16}\).

---

\(^{15}\) See esp. 1 Sam. 10f.

\(^{16}\) Cf. Ex. 33.
Subsequently they had to put the blood of a lamb on the doorframes. The lamb was the substitute for the son, who had to be redeemed by a lamb (Ex. 13:13). Only in this way does Israel leave the land of slavery and can they go with dry feet through the sea; the domain of chaos and death. Only those who died in the Lord go on towards freedom.

God brings them out of Egypt to freedom. It is, however, the freedom of the desert. The Torah ends with the story of Moses seeing the promised land, without entering it, as the Old Testament ends with the exile and the New Testament with ‘Maranatha.’ In the world we shall have trouble. For we died to the world. That applies to Israel, that applies also to the church which is incorporated into it and to its Lord, too. He has overcome the world, not by founding a super world power as his kingdom, but by dying to the world.

After being brought out of the land of slavery, Israel receives the commandments. Then everything that liberation theology says about social and political freedom is applicable. The people of the Lord can not live in the perspective of oppression and slavery. The authors of the Old and the New Testament take into account their cultural context, but the direction of their thoughts is clear. Because you have been brought out of the land of slavery, you should keep nobody in an position of dependency. You must release slaves, you must not ask interest, you must acquit debts – and a king is suspect. And when the poor are exploited, the prophet Hosea suggests a return to the beginning: back to the desert (Hos. 2:13), as the author of Hebrews says Christians have forgotten the elementary teaching of faith and so as newborn children (in baptism) still need milk and are not yet able to eat solid food (Heb. 5:17-6,3).

So justice and righteousness as a life in freedom are not a programme for Egypt (it will die in itself), not a programme for the world (we have died to it). They are not a programme, but a consequence: a consequence of the life of the children of God. Theology of liberation does not apply to the world which should become Christian, but to Christians who are called on to live according to their real being as people of God. That is a life of freedom. Their law is the true law which is the law of freedom (James 2:12), which Israel and the church enjoy, because in this
law of freedom labourers are no longer exploited, as James says (5:4). You can see persons, communities, governments who want to stay within a Christian tradition or claim to be nourished by values of a Christian culture, but who themselves do not live freedom because they set up possession, power, land, profit as final standards for their actions. They can not give them up and so they are unable to teach others the generosity of Christ. Therefore they must be admonished prophetically. That is a heavier judgement than saying they are not Christian. Here not the ban but the judgement is in order. We do not exclude them from the church (at the very most temporarily in case of excessive conduct, as parents send a child to bed), but we fight for their salvation and we call to their attention how foolish they are by selling the freedom of Christ for treasures on earth, where moth and rust destroy (James 4:3).

How do we live our lives, whether or not under governments who call themselves Christian? How do we live our lives in an unjust society? A ready-made answer can not be given. The sole answer is: borne by the love of Christ. And the means of serving of the other can be very different. For each method you can find examples in the Bible. In the time of the pax romana Paul calls for the acceptance of the quiet and peaceful life that the government bestows as a gift of God (Rom. 13). The Apocalypse some decades later considers the tyranny as a bestial, demonic reign against which you are powerless with weapons, but from which the Lord will save you (Rev. 13). Ehud murders the tyrant and thus he becomes a saviour: he repairs the right of God (Judges 3:12-31). Sifra and Pua are not brute but cunning; they lie away lustily, not for their own sake, but for the children who were entrusted to them (Ex. 1:19-21). And Paul exercises all his skill in Greek rhetoric to move Philemon to release Onesimus as a beloved brother.

Obviously methods and instruments can be very different. The end justifies the means. It matters only what the end is. If the end is my own power, or the power of my country or my culture, even the power of my church (as a contradiction in terms), then we have surrendered our freedom to the flesh. Then we look for the living among the dead. The sole end must be that others know the true freedom in Christ: what it means to give up all power, even
the power you are entitled to from before the creation of the world, even the right to heaven and your eternal election. 'I could wish that I myself were cursed and cut off from Christ for the sake of my brothers,' Paul says (Rom. 9:3). But that is also a contradiction in terms, for precisely this willingness is the love of the Spirit of the Lord which has been poured out into our hearts.

As Reformed theologians we discuss freedom. Our task will not be fulfilled if it is limited to only meeting each other and interesting discussions. Our deepest question must be how we learn to live the freedom of Christ and how to find words to propagate this. The main intention of our common work is, as far as I am concerned, from the very beginning, how we can make the fundamental freedom in Christ subservient to others — the fundamental freedom because of the unassailable relationship to Christ, founded in God's election from eternity. And how can we deploy this freedom against all forms of slavery and oppression? Only then do we merit the name Reformed, and I am very conscious that here the proverb ecclesia reformanda quia reformata must be applied. Reformed people, too, have to learn much. Reformed people, too, must be converted. They must even be converted daily. It is my hope we can assist each other at this in the future and serve in that way the world.