In addition, I expect that some readers of *Markets and Morality* will find Williams' final chapter unsatisfying. Williams urges us to ask: Who is my neighbor? Emphasizing solidarity, Williams answers, "we are really responsible for all." However, because he says little about subsidiarity, Williams leaves it quite unclear how "the human community" should satisfy, for example, the right of the hungry to be fed. Williams is at his best when he focuses on the sphere of morality; he offers almost no concrete guidance on the place of rights in markets or governments.

Despite these criticisms, *Who Is My Neighbor?* when it is good, is very good. This book is an important contribution to both the ongoing debate about the place of rights language in Catholic social thought and the broader debate about the meaning of human rights.

—Gregory R. Beabout
Saint Louis University

Evangelicals in the Public Square: Carl F. H. Henry, Abraham Kuyper, Francis Schaeffer, John Howard Yoder

Jay Budziszewski
With responses by David L. Weeks, John Bolt, William Edgar, Ashley Woodiwiss. Introduction by Michael Cromartie. Afterword by Jean Bethke Elshtain

Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2006 (218 pages)

This structured exchange between political theorist Jay Budziszewski and four respondents on the need for, and the promise of, mature evangelical political reflection is a must-read. The exchange resulted from a 2003 conference on the subject, sponsored by the Ethics and Public Policy Center's program in Evangelicals in Civic Life. The book also includes an Afterword by Jean Bethke Elshtain, a most insightful consideration of the entire exchange.

Budziszewski, well-known as an evangelical, but now a practicing Roman Catholic, grounds the conversation with his careful and rigorous explication of the political ideas of four twentieth-century evangelicals known to be formative in the development of an American evangelical politics: Henry, Kuyper, Schaeffer, and Yoder. Acknowledging that these four represent various poles of evangelical thinking and that none understood himself to be a political theorist, Budziszewski attempts to show not only the extent of their formative influences but also the extent of their limitations as *political* thinkers. Hence, he concludes, there is much work yet to be done to enhance the effectiveness and broaden the influence of evangelical political reflection.

In particular, he argues that such reflection would profit considerably from a fuller appreciation of the tradition of natural law. This historically developed body of Christian *philosophy*, he argues, would provide contemporary evangelical political reflection with what it now lacks, namely: an *orienting doctrine* (*re*: government); a *practical doctrine* (or guide to action); and a *cultural apologetic*. Growing as it does from the doctrine of

"general revelation," natural law provides the tools for moving beyond biblical studies to a Christian political theory that truly and distinctively engages the wider world.

Budziszewski attempts a balanced portrayal of each thinker of formative influence in the evangelical movement, though with the caveat that by relying as he does on representative works, there will no doubt be room for debate about his conclusions. Perhaps not surprisingly, because each of the respondents is an authority on one of the thinkers chosen, there do arise questions by each respondent as to the comprehensiveness—in one instance, the fairness—of Budziszewski's various portraits. Yet—again with one exception—there is a surprising degree of agreement with Budziszewski's four critiques. It would seem that Protestant evangelicals are increasingly open to the idea of natural law.

Regarding Henry, Budziszewski argues that his deep ambivalence toward the usefulness and reliability of general revelation (one shared by many who came in his wake) acted as a real stumbling block to Henry's political reflection. As a result, he remained only a "pricker" of the evangelical conscience and a cheerleader for increased political participation, rather than a leader in the development of Christian political thinking.

Regarding Kuyper, Budziszewski argues that his clear appreciation for general revelation is ultimately undermined by his unbiblical principle of sphere sovereignty. The Catholic principle of subsidiarity, Budziszewski argues, provides a stronger grounding in biblical revelation and so provides a more comprehensive view of the role of government in God's created order.

Regarding Schaeffer, Budziszewski notes his contribution in identifying the increasingly ambitious agenda and creeping influence of secular humanism. Yet, while Schaeffer accurately describes the field of battle, his culture war confrontationalism ignores—if not disparages—the need for the "steady, plodding incrementalism" that is ordinary politics. Schaeffer's *Christian Manifesto*, says Budziszewski, "is written as though the only two political possibilities were quietism and upheaval—as if one had a car that could run at zero or at eighty but not at any speed in between" (82). Moreover, his presuppositionalist apologetic effectively points *away* from politics, and toward a Christian isolationism that undermines its effectiveness as an agent of political change.

Regarding Yoder, Budziszewski again aims to be fair, but here he gets the sharpest response, from political theorist Ashley Woodiwiss. The response is not surprising; Budziszewski appears to have little patience with Yoder's reversal of gospel emphasis, seeing Jesus' *story* as paramount over—and so guidepost for—Jesus' teachings. Such a reversal leads Yoder apparently to see the crucifixion less as atonement and more as political example. According to Budziszewski, for Yoder, "the point of the cross is not that Jesus bore our sins (he calls this 'hocus-pocus') but that he offered an example of what Yoder is to call 'revolutionary submission'" (94). Budziszewski then goes on to find Yoder's theory of nonviolence—and so his rejection of the providential role of the state—to be both unbiblical and self-contradictory, rejecting the plain meaning of Romans 12–13. While Yoder correctly criticizes liberal Protestant ethicists when they "insulate themselves from the force of Christ's example," he mirrors their error when he "insulates himself from the force of Christ's creation" (116).

Respondents David Weeks, John Bolt, and William Edgar, respectively, each express general agreement with Budziszewski's analyses and critiques of Henry, Kuyper, and Schaeffer. While each—quite properly—wishes to nuance Budziszewski's interpretations in order to show that his assigned thinker held a somewhat more comprehensive view of the political realm than Budziszewski describes, each also agrees that evangelicals should take more seriously the implications of general revelation, and so be less suspicious of the natural law tradition. Edgar wonders, though, whether the distance between presuppositionalism and general revelation is as great as Budziszewski argues, and whether the distance between general revelation and natural law is as small.

Perhaps the most intriguing—certainly the most biting—response to Budziszewski's analysis and critique comes from Ashley Woodiwiss. Describing Budziszewski's scope and method as overly narrow, Woodiwiss concludes: "The partial picture of Yoder that Budziszewski gives us would be virtually unrecognizable to Yoderians" (190). Woodiwiss is particularly exercised over the idea that Budziszewski approaches *The Politics of Jesus* as though it were a work in political theory. Only in the sense that Yoder aims to resituate politics within the church would this be true. For Yoderians, then, "[T]he church … constitutes its own polis and in doing so reads and critiques the self-understandings, practices, and institutions of the modern polis." Because of its historical "complicity in making and justifying the modern polis," and "its present marginalization in public ordering," the church can neither rule nor merely survive. To become more political, it must "negotiate the concrete particulars of its narrative engagement with the modern polis site by site, issue by issue" (193).

The book ends with a lively and engaging afterword by Jean Bethke Elshtain, who notes her appreciation both for serious political reflection among evangelicals and for the limitations of aiming at comprehensiveness in such reflection. As she puts it, "[P]ointing out logical contradictions or incoherencies often does little to persuade or to dissuade. So what works? How do we break through hardened hearts? One powerful way is through an illustrative story that invites people in and takes them on a journey toward a point" (196). The parables of Jesus, the stories of prophets, saints, and martyrs, all work to bridge the gap. Neither a narrow presuppositionalism *nor* a comprehensive theory of natural law, argues Elshtain, can lead to political illumination, given the taint of human sin and so the inevitable "fog of politics" (199). Thus, if principle matters, so does particular story. Stories have their effect, after all, because human beings *can* understand each other across presuppositional lines. At the same time, the concretized account of a particular life or act can provoke and inspire in a way that theory cannot.

The exchange that happens in this book is one that *all* serious Christians should confront. They will look hard to find a more pointed and profound conversation by better qualified participants. Michael Cromartie of the Ethics and Public Policy Center is to be applauded for bringing this group together in this way.

—William R. Stevenson, Jr.
Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan