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INTRODUCTION

Whether Jesus would kill Hitler is a symbolic question about the relationship between church and state. Jesus did not have occasion to answer, but Dietrich Bonhoeffer did. Bonhoeffer with deadly seriousness tried to “live the life of Jesus.” He was a German pastor, a theologian, a philosopher, a spy, and a member of a conspiracy that, among other things, sought to assassinate Hitler. Much can be learned from Bonhoeffer about the relationship between church and state.

Bonhoeffer did not think in a vacuum. His thought grew out of Natural Law and Two Kingdoms (“NL2K”) theory, which was developed over the course of many centuries by men like St. Augustine, William of Ockham, Martin Luther, and John Calvin.

Section I of this article summarizes NL2K thought, identifying primary themes such as the paradoxical antithesis/commonality between Christians and non-Christians, the institutions of church and state, whether to use coercive force in religious matters, and whether natural law is the standard for civil law. Section II describes a persistent problem in the history of NL2K

1 Assistant Professor, Regent University School of Law. B.A., University of Nevada-Reno; J.D., Duke University School of Law. I am indebted to the following people for their valuable help with this article: Samuel W. Calhoun, Erin Ching, Brittany Marshall, Dr. H. Jefferson Powell, C. Scott Pryor, Craig Stern, Dr. David VanDrunen, and Jack S. Wroldsen.

2 This article’s summary of NL2K thought is based primarily on Dr. David VanDrunen’s 2010 book, Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms, A Study in the Development of Reformed Social Thought. VanDrunen’s book has been praised as “an excellent work of historical theology.” See, e.g., C. Scott Pryor, Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms: a Study in the Development of Reformed Social Thought, 26 J.L. & REL. 695, 695, 700 (2011); but see James K.A. Smith, Reforming Public Theology: Two Kingdoms, or Two Cities, Calvin Theological Journal 47, 122-137 (2012) (criticizing Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms). Pryor has indicated to me several areas in which VanDrunen’s claims in Natural Law and the Two Kingdoms should be clarified, especially with regard to Abraham Kuyper, the neo-Kuyperians, and aspects of John Calvin’s theology. However, it is my judgment that clarifying these issues would not affect the central claims of this article, investigating and assessing VanDrunen’s theological history scholarship is beyond the scope of this article.
thought: the tendency of the church to influence the state either too much, as in the theocratic Geneva and Puritan Massachusetts, or too little, as in the Antebellum American South and Nazi Germany. Section III uses the primary NL2K themes as a framework to assess Bonhoeffer’s relationship to NL2K theory, concluding, contrary to some, that Bonhoeffer embraced NL2K thought. In light of Bonhoeffer’s development of the NL2K themes, Section IV analyzes his actions during the rise of the Nazis, including his participation in the plot against Hitler. Finally, Section V assesses Bonhoeffer’s mostly positive contributions to NL2K thought, including the solutions he suggested to the problem of the church having either too much or too little influence on the state.

This article is relevant to both religious and non-religious readers for several reasons. First, it describes a vision of the church/state relationship that is compatible with the norms of liberal democracies. Second, it raises, even from the secular perspective, the possibility that religion can have too little influence on social and political issues. Third, it identifies solutions to difficult problems presented by religion in modern societies. Fourth, it provides guidance on both the restraint and encouragement of religion in secular society. Fifth, at a minimum, it is fascinating to consider what a rigorous ethicist like Bonhoeffer thought while he acted to oppose the Nazis and Hitler. It is akin to thinking through whether Jesus would have killed Hitler.

I. Natural Law, Two Kingdoms Theory

---

3 Jean Bethke Elshtain, *Freedom and Responsibility*, in *Theology and the Practice of Responsibility* at 273 (Wayne Whitson Floyd, Jr. and Charles Marsh eds., 1994) (Bonhoeffer’s life cannot be separated from his work.)

Natural law theory, for purposes of this article, claims that humans possess God-given reason by which they can know right from wrong. Two kingdoms theory holds that there is a Kingdom of God and a Kingdom of the World, both ruled by God, represented in this life respectively by the church and the state. These theories go back to at least the second century and remain prominent today. And they are relevant to contemporary thinkers because it has been argued that natural law rights are embedded in the American Constitution and that “[t]he two-kingsdoms view . . . is at the heart of our First Amendment.”

Dr. David VanDrunen’s 2010 *Natural Law and The Two Kingdoms* identifies a long tradition in which natural law and two kingdoms theories are connected. To be clear, neither VanDrunen nor this article argues that there exists one “NL2K” tradition containing all the figures addressed in VanDrunen’s book. “NL2K” is simply a rubric used in this article to associate various natural law and two kingdoms thinkers and themes. This article will use as an analytical framework seven key themes from NL2K thought: (1) the God-ordained state; (2) two institutions: church and state; (3) antithesis between the two kingdoms; (4) commonality between the two kingdoms; (5) coercion in religious matters; (6) whether the state is redemptive; and (7) natural law as the standard for civil law. These themes overlap, but treating them separately reveals different dimensions of NL2K thought.

---


6 See infra Section I(A)(2). Though many Two Kingdoms thinkers specially associate the Kingdom of the World with the State, others believe it encompasses a multitude of social institutions and activities.


10 VANDRUNEN, supra note _, at ix.
These themes can be identified in the following historic figures. St. Augustine (354-430), the Bishop of Hippo, was a Roman who lived to see the Visigoths sack Rome. His epic *The City of God* describes the relationships between the church and state, and the City of God and the Worldly City.\(^{11}\) Pope Gelasius I (died 496), in a letter to Emperor Anastasius, described the relationship between church and civil powers using the evocative language of Two Swords.\(^{12}\) Gelasius lived in Christendom and did not consider pluralistic societies, but not so with William of Ockham (1280-1349), a monk and philosopher who wrote extensively on politics and rejected the pope’s claim to civil authority among many other things.\(^{13}\) Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), was a Catholic priest and the writer of the *Summa Theologiae*, which famously described the concept of natural law.\(^{14}\) Martin Luther (1483-1546), the German monk who started the Protestant Reformation,\(^{15}\) articulated the language of the “two kingdoms.”\(^{16}\) Luther wrote extensively on the concepts of and relationship between natural law and the two kingdoms.\(^{17}\) Luther’s younger contemporary, John Calvin (1509-1564), was a pastor in Geneva, Switzerland, and drafted church and government reforms based on his positions on NL2K themes.\(^{18}\) The Dutchman Abraham Kuyper (1837-1920) was a remarkable figure, a pastor, university founder, theologian, newspaper editor, member of Parliament, and Dutch Prime Minister.\(^{19}\) Kuyper

---


\(^{13}\) VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 36-42. Ockham is credited with inventing “Ockham’s Razor.” LAURIE BAUER, THE LINGUISTICS STUDENT’S HANDBOOK at 155 (2007).


\(^{16}\) VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 55-62.

\(^{17}\) VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 55-65.

\(^{18}\) VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 67-115.

\(^{19}\) See VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 276 (citing LOUIS PRAASMA, *LET CHRIST BE KING: REFLECTIONS ON THE LIFE AND TIMES OF ABRAHAM KUYPER* (1985); FRANK VADEN BERG, *ABRAHAM KUYPER* (1950); and P. KASTELL, *ABRAHAM KUYPER* (1938)).
developed NL2K thought with his theories of sphere sovereignty and organic Christianity. And Karl Barth (1886-1968), described by Pope Pius XII as the most important theologian since Aquinas, systematically broke with NL2K thought, but considered himself a “theologian of the Reformed Church” and was an older contemporary of Bonhoeffer. Later this article will consider early American NL2K thinkers like John Cotton, Stuart Robinson, and James Henley Thornwell.

This section describes seven NL2K themes. There are differences of opinion among NL2K thinkers, but a majority view emerges. What also emerges is a problem: sometimes the church influences the state too much, sometimes too little.

A. Key themes

1. The God-ordained state

The large majority of NL2K thinkers have held the state is a legitimate, divinely-ordained institution. Characteristically of NL2K thinkers, Ockham held that Romans 13:1 describes the state’s God-ordained authority. Luther described temporal authority as “truly God’s own government,” claiming the authority of the state and its right to use coercive force are ordained by God and sanctioned by Christ.

---

20 See VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 276 et seq.
21 E.g., http://www.gci.org/history/barth; see VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 316 et seq; see Metaxas at 60, 120, et seq.
22 “[O]ne problem consistently appears …: the inability of Reformed theologians to clearly identify the borders of the two kingdoms … This confusion of the two kingdoms plagued Reformed socio-political theorizing thereafter …” Pryor, supra note 4, at 696-97.
23 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 33-35, 39, 56-60, 91, 123-8, 297, 329. Augustine, however, viewed the state as a necessary evil under a “cloud of suspicion,” largely because of the participation of non-Christians, whose ethics and destinies were antithetical to Christians. Id. at 34.
24 Romans 13:1 (“Let every person be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God.”); VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 60.
25 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 56-57, 60.
2. Two Institutions: Church and State

NL2K thinkers have generally held that the two kingdoms are institutionally expressed by two institutions, church and state. But there is significant variety among NL2K thinkers on the nature and relationship of these two institutions. Augustine identified two peoples, the City of God and the City of Man, and he loosely identified the City of God with the church and the City of Man with civil government. Gelasius described the world as being ruled by two institutions, church and state (as opposed to two peoples). Identifying two peoples suggests a bright line separating Christians and non-Christians with no overlap between the two groups. But identifying two institutions implies that Christians and non-Christians can be members of both the church and the state.

Gelasius described the two institutions as “Two Swords,” saying “[b]oth are from God and have distinct purposes.” Since each institution is from God and has its own purpose, the two institutions must be mutually submissive to one another in their respective areas of competence. “Spiritual activities” are the domain of the clergy, and “secular affairs” are the domain of the civil magistrate.

Ockham emphasized the state’s independence from the church, observing that Christ himself had refused to become a secular ruler. Ockham claimed the church should not use its

---

26 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 22-28 (citing AUGUSTINE, CITY OF GOD, Books 14, 19 (Trans. Markus Dods, 1950)).
27 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 33.
28 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 33-34; Augustine also acknowledged the possibility of Christians and non-Christians intermingling in both church and state. Id. at 32.
29 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 33 (citing BRIAN TIERNEY, THE CRISIS OF CHURCH & STATE: 1050-1300, 13-15 (1964)).
30 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 33-4.
31 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 33-4.
power in temporal or secular matters. For Ockham, temporal rule was common to the human race and could be exercised by Christians and non-Christians and “obliges everyone, believer and unbeliever alike.” Ockham glimpsed the possibility of religious pluralism.

Within the NL2K thought, Luther’s vision seems the most modern. There are two governments or kingdoms, one spiritual and one temporal. Both are ordained by God, but they have different purposes. The spiritual government’s purpose is to produce Christians, and the temporal government is for the restraining of evil. The Kingdom of God is ruled by the Holy Spirit (not coercion or the “sword”), and civil magistrates should not use physical coercion in religious matters. Heresy should be fought with Scripture, not force (though Luther was not always consistent about this teaching, a subject discussed below). However, in the Kingdom of the World, the government must use the sword to restrain evil. Thus, Christian civil government is impossible: the spiritual/Christian government is non-coercive, but civil government must rule by coercion; moreover, many people are not Christians and should not be coerced into obeying Christian standards. The state is neither subject to the church, nor should it encroach on the church’s spiritual sphere.

33 VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 38.
34 VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 38-9.
35 See VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 40-41.
36 VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 56-7 (citing MARTIN LUTHER, Temporal Authority: To What Extent It Should Be Obeyed, in LUTHER’S WORKS, vol. 45, 85-88 (Ed. Walther I. Brandt, 1962)).
37 See VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 57.
38 VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 57-58.
39 VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 58.
40 VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 57.
41 See VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 57; see also SCHLINGENSIEPEN at 125-26.
42 VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 57-58; see also SCHLINGENSIEPEN at 125-26.
Calvin’s position was close to Luther’s. There are two kingdoms, institutionally expressed as the church and the state. The church governs the “life of the soul,” but the state governs “matters of the present life” and external life. God grants the sword to the state but denies it to the church; the state may coerce its citizens through force, but the church may not (Calvin’s inconsistencies on these points are discussed below). In the spiritual kingdom, the only authority is God’s Word. But Christian teachings cannot be transferred to the state, politics or cultural activities. The church and state have their own sovereign jurisdictions, so that the church should not exercise the duties of the state, nor should the state exercise the duties of the church. However Calvin also believed that the state should assist the church by preventing idolatry and blasphemy. How can this be reconciled with his position that the state should not exercise authority over spiritual matters? We will consider this apparent inconsistency in Calvin’s thought in Section II(A).

Kuyper believed that not only is the state independent from the church, but that each “sphere” of life – art, science, politics, education, commerce – is independent and sovereign. The state’s role is to maintain the independence of each sphere. Kuyper believed in religious liberty for all people. Society has inherent, God-given potential that should be developed (e.g.,

43 VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 79 (citing JOHN CALVIN, INSTITUTES OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, 4.20 (Trans. Henry Beveridge, 1953))
44 VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 73, 76-79. The distinction between internal spiritual and external physical life is important and will be discussed in Section II(A)
45 VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 81, 87.
46 See VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 74.
47 VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 73-74, 78.
48 VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 81-82.
49 VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 82, 86 (citing JOHN CALVIN, Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, in CALVIN’S COMMENTARIES, vol. 16 (Trans. William Pringle, 2003)).
50 VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 296-7 (citing Abraham Kuyper, Sphere Sovereignty, in CENTENNIAL READER, 467 (Ed. James D. Bratt, 1998); ABRAHAM KUYPER, LECTURES ON CALVINISM, 90, 94-96, 157 (1931)).
51 VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 297.
52 VAN DRUNEN, supra note __, at 306 (citing JOHN WITTE, JR., THE REFORMATION OF RIGHTS: LAW, RELIGION, AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN EARLY MODERN CALVINISM, chpt. 6 (2007)); J. BUDZISZEWSKI, EVANGELICALS IN THE PUBLIC
peace, justice, prosperity). Kuyper’s view of the church’s relationship to the other spheres is unique among NL2K thinkers. For Kuyper, the church is an institution, but it is also an organism. As an institution, the church deals with properly religious matters. But as an organism, the church should pervade and transform the other spheres of society with the knowledge of God’s special revelation.

3. Antithesis

NL2K thinkers often describe antithesis between the two kingdoms, which stands in tension with another important theme, commonality, discussed in the next section. Augustine described a fundamental hostility between Christians and non-Christians. The antithesis is theological: Christians worship God, but non-Christians reject God. It is ethical: Christians live “after the spirit,” but non-Christians live “after the flesh.” And it is eschatological: Christians are destined for eternal life, but non-Christians are doomed to eternal death.

Unlike Augustine, who lived in Rome at a time of social conflict between Christians and non-Christians, Gelasius lived in religiously homogeneous Christendom. Thus, he described

---


53 See VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 305-6.
54 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 298.
55 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 298.
56 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 296, 304 (citing Abraham Kuyper, Common Grace in Science, in CENTENNIAL READER, 188-89 (Ed. James D. Bratt, 1998)). Kuyper’s views on special grace and revelation are discussed in Section I(A)(7).
57 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 27 (citing generally AUGUSTINE, CITY OF GOD).
58 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 22, 27.
59 See VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 24.
60 See VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 32-36.
the two kingdoms living in harmony.\textsuperscript{61} Thus, the theme of antithesis is absent from his Two Swords visions.

Luther’s and Calvin’s thought corresponds to Augustine’s in identifying fundamental antithesis between the two kingdoms, especially in terms of ethics and eschatology.\textsuperscript{62} Further, the means of ruling the two kingdoms are antithetical, as the Kingdom of God is ruled non-coercively, but the Kingdom of the World is ruled coercively.\textsuperscript{63}

Kuyper identified an *epistemological* antithesis between the two kingdoms.\textsuperscript{64} Antithesis arises from people’s basic worldviews, with Christians acknowledging and non-Christians rejecting God as sovereign ruler.\textsuperscript{65} Kuyper believed correct knowledge depends on acknowledging God.\textsuperscript{66} He believed Christians should engage in their own cultural endeavors (science, for example) based on premises about God.\textsuperscript{67}

4. Commonality

The theme of commonality stands in tension with the theme of antithesis. For Augustine, although a person could be a citizen in only one “city,” God’s or Man’s, Christians and non-Christians both participate in the church and state.\textsuperscript{68} Augustine contemplated Christians

\textsuperscript{61} VANDRUNEN, *supra* note _, at 34, 36 ((citing BRIAN TIERNEY, *THE CRISIS OF CHURCH & STATE*: 1050-1300, 13-15 (1964)).

\textsuperscript{62} Cf. VANDRUNEN, *supra* note _, at 56-59 (citing generally MARTIN LUTHER, *TEMPORAL AUTHORITY*, 71, 91 (citing CALVIN, *INSTITUTES, supra*)).

\textsuperscript{63} VANDRUNEN, *supra* note _, at 59; see *supra* note 4.

\textsuperscript{64} VANDRUNEN, *supra* note _, at 303.


\textsuperscript{66} Cf. VANDRUNEN, *supra* note _, at 291.

\textsuperscript{67} VANDRUNEN, *supra* note _, at 292-93.

\textsuperscript{68} VANDRUNEN, *supra* note _, 22.
participating cooperatively with non-Christians in many cultural endeavors, including government, for the sake of “earthly peace.”

Ockham contemplated a religiously heterogeneous society with Christians and non-Christians sharing everything not specifically related to the spiritual teachings of the church, including temporal authority. Similarly, Luther taught that temporal authority was exercised by and obliging on both Christians and non-Christians. A large common space emerges in Ockham’s and Luther’s two kingdoms, which can be occupied by Christians and non-Christians harmoniously: Christians must be allowed to live as Christians, and non-Christians must be allowed to live as non-Christians.

Calvin also recognized that Christians and non-Christians have common interests in civil government. However, his thought is similar to Gelasius’s in that he primarily contemplated a uniformly Christian society, and so it is unclear how he would have organized a pluralistic one. That Calvin approved of the execution of a heretic is troubling.

Kuyper believed that commonality between Christians and non-Christian is defined by “common grace.” Common grace applies to all human life and is “a temporal restraining grace, which holds back and blocks the effect of sin.” Common grace also positively develops culture and inherent human potential. “Common grace, therefore, allows a measure of cooperation among believers and unbelievers in cultural life, despite the ever-present reality of antithesis …

---

69 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 22-24, 28-30 (citing AUGUSTINE, CITY OF GOD supra).
70 Cf. VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 38-41 (citing generally OCKHAM, SHORT DISCOURSE).
71 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 60.
72 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 91 (citing CALVIN, INSTITUTES, 2.2.13-17).
73 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 93.
74 Calvin’s approval of the execution of Michael Servetus is discussed in Sections I(A)(6) and II(A).
75 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 307.
76 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 295 (citing KUYPER, COMMON GRACE, 168).
77 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 295.
Kuyper may have described the largest degree of commonality in the NL2K thinkers we have considered. He contemplated Christians and non-Christians actually working together to advance God’s original plans for the world. Kuyper’s commonality is not merely negative (i.e., restraining evil) but positive, affirming the inherent value of the contributions of Christians and non-Christians to society and culture.

Barth also described great commonality between Christians and non-Christians. He endorsed religious pluralism. For Barth, Christ is reflected and manifested even in non-Christians.

Given the commonality between Christians and non-Christians, the consensus in NL2K thought is that Christians should participate in civil government, but there is significant variety on the nature of that participation. Augustine permitted Christians to participate in the state and society for the purpose of “earthly peace” and to advance Christian interests. Gelasius necessarily envisioned Christians in government, since he contemplated a society populated only by Christians. Ockham sounded a warning: Christians should not impose their religion on or through the civil government. Luther encouraged Christians to participate in civil government not to advance Christianity but to bless their neighbors by working for peace, safety, and against evil. Calvin said Christians can offer “pleasing service to God” by serving in the civil government, though there is significant tension in Calvin’s thought on whether Christianity

78 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 295.
79 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 339.
80 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 325-26 (citing KARL BARTH, CHURCH DOGMATICS, IV/3/1 (Eds. G.W. Bromiley and T.F. Torrance, trans. T.H.L. Parker, W.B. Johnston, Harold Knight, J.L.M Haire, 1957)).
81 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 22.
82 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 34, 36.
83 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 38-39 (citing generally OCKHAM, SHORT DISCOURSE).
84 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 58 (citing generally LUTHER, TEMPORAL AUTHORITY).
should be advanced by the civil government. And Kuyper, too, had tensions and inconsistencies in his thought, advocating a Christianized culture and politics, yet upholding religious liberty and the inherent value of non-Christian social and cultural life. Finally, Barth held that Christians should participate in civil government, but he opposed Christian political parties and thought that Christian influence on civil government should be indirect and “anonymous.”

5. Coercion in religious matters

NL2K thinkers, in general, oppose using coercion to promote Christianity. But this statement must be qualified. Augustine, Luther, and Calvin each taught that the church should not rule by the sword, but at times each of them approved of the government persecuting heretics. Augustine’s allowance for a common life shared by Christians and non-Christians and his belief that Christians could work in the civil government for the common peace suggest that Christianity should not be imposed by the sword. But he called for the civil government to persecute a North African Christian sect, the Donatists, who left the Catholic Church. Luther opposed religious coercion. But he allowed the civil persecution of certain Anabaptists. And

---

85 See VANDRUNEN, supra note _, at 84-85 (citing generally CALVIN, INSTITUTES); See Section II(A).
87 VANDRUNEN, supra note _, at 330.
88 VANDRUNEN, supra note _, at 30, 58, 85
89 Cf. VANDRUNEN, supra note _, at 22, 30-31
90 VANDRUNEN, supra note _, at 30-31.
91 He claimed the Kingdom of God “need(s) neither law or sword,” forbade civil magistrates from exercising coercion in religious matters, and taught that Scripture, not the sword, must be used to fight heresy. VANDRUNEN, supra note _, at 57-58; cf. see also SCHLINGENSIEPEN at 125-26.
92 VANDRUNEN, supra note _, at 58.
Calvin taught that the church does not have the right to act coercively, but he approved of the execution of a heretic, Michael Servetus, and promoted a closely allied and intermingled church and state. Nevertheless, NL2K thought has generally opposed the use of coercive force in religious matters.

6. Is the state redemptive?

A theme that informs much of the foregoing is whether the state is redemptive, that is, whether the state’s purpose is Christian salvation. The majority position in NL2K thought is that the state is not redemptive. God has a different relationship with the church than with the state. God is the state’s Creator, but He is the church’s Redeemer. Since the state is not redemptive, the state should not be Christianized. This perhaps suggests pluralism, religious liberty, and a robust commonality between Christians and non-Christians.

It can be inferred from Augustine’s negative view of the state that he did not consider the state redemptive. Calvin held that the state was non-redemptive. God rules the spiritual kingdom as Redeemer, Calvin said, but He rules the worldly kingdom as Creator and Sustainer.

Kuyper also believed cultural and political life are embedded in God’s work as Creator. But some of Kuyper’s followers re-interpreted him as describing the state interacting with God on a redemptive basis.

---

93 VANDRUNEN, supra note _, at 81, 87 (Citing CALVIN, INSTITUTES).
94 VANDRUNEN, supra note _, at 85. Calvin’s Geneva can be better understood better in context and once we have studied the role of natural law in Calvin’s thought, which we will do in I(A)(10).
95 Cf. VANDRUNEN, supra note _, at 38-41 (citing OKHAM, SHORT DISCOURSE), 306 ((citing JOHN WITTE, JR., THE REFORMATION OF RIGHTS: LAW, RELIGION, AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN EARLY MODERN CALVINISM, chpt. 6 (2007)), 330-31 (citing KARL BARTH, THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY, in THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD, 166 (1968)). Kuyper did, however, appear to support the enforcement of blasphemy laws. ABRAHAM KUYPER, LECTURES ON CALVINISM, 103 (1931, reprinted 2002)
96 VANDRUNEN, supra note _, at 32-34.
97 VANDRUNEN, supra note _, at 73 (citing CALVIN, INSTITUTES, 3.19).
98 VANDRUNEN, supra note _, at 74.
Barth opposed the Creator-Redeemer distinction, believing separating God into Creator and Redeemer was to create two false gods. Jesus is Lord of both the church and the world. For Barth, the Creator and Redeemer are the same Jesus Christ.

7. Natural law as the standard for civil law

NL2K thought has consistently held that natural law is the standard for civil law based upon St. Paul’s writing in Romans 2:14-15: “For when Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature do what the law requires . . . . They show that the work of the law is written on their hearts, while their conscience also bears witness . . . .” Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, Kuyper, and many others held this view.

NL2K thought generally has held that natural law is known by reason. How reason relates to knowing natural law has been described differently, but these differences are not important to this article.

What is the content of natural law? The answer to this question will not only inform us about the (problematic?) moral and legal norms of NL2K thought, but it will also help us understand some of the apparent inconsistencies in NL2K thinkers, especially Calvin. NL2K thought has generally held that the content of the natural law is identical to the Decalogue (‘the

---

99 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 278; see supra note 4.
100 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 322-23 (citing BARTH, CHURCH DOGMATICS, II/1-2).
101 Cf. VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 342.
102 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 341 (citing BARTH, THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD, 220-21).
103 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 323.
104 Romans 2:14-15.
105 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 45 (citing THOMAS AQUINAS, SUMMA THEOLOGIAE, 1a2ae 95.2 (Trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province, 1981)), 62, 100 (citing CALVIN, COMMENTARY ON ROMANS, 2:14-15), 108, 156, 166, 288. Barth denied that there was any free standing knowledge outside of Christ such as natural law known via reason. Id. at 33.
106 For example, Aquinas describes conscience as reason applying general precepts to particular moral acts, a deductive act of reasoning. Calvin, however, describes conscience as an immediate awareness of the requirements of natural law. VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 101. Barth did not hold this position. Id. at 320-23; see note 124 supra.
Ten Commandments”) and the Mosaic moral law. Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, and many others held this position. In other words, the NL2K thought has held that the Decalogue and the Mosaic moral law are known via reason to all human beings. For NL2K thinkers, the Decalogue and the Mosaic moral law are appropriate standards and content for civil law – not because these laws are articles of Christian faith, but because they are known by reason to all human beings. Obviously this is controversial: “whether natural law exists at all is itself a controversial question …” let alone what its content may be. That said, this position begins to explain why NL2K thinkers often supported both religious liberty and the use of the civil government’s coercive force in seemingly religious matters. NL2K thinkers has believed that the Decalogue and the Mosaic moral law were not just doctrines of private religion but dictates of universal reason, and therefore legitimately enforceable as civil law.

Many of the NL2K positions are severable. The NL2K position on religious liberty could be taken independently from its position on natural law. Or it could be accepted that natural law is the standard for the civil law yet rejected that the Decalogue and Mosaic moral law are knowable by universal reason. Some aspects of NL2K thought, like its teachings on religious liberty, might remain helpful, while others are no longer plausible.

B. Summary of NL2K thought

We now summarize NL2K thought. It must be recognized that this article omits much about natural law and two kingdoms thought that can be found in VanDrunen’s book and elsewhere.

107 Cf. VAN DRUNEN, supra note __ at 46, 63-64, 100, 134, 160.
The state is a God-ordained institution and is inherently legitimate. So is the church. Church and state are separate and independent. God relates to the state as Creator but to the church as Redeemer. The church should use spiritual means for spiritual ends, and the state should promote civil peace and justice using coercive force. The civil government should use the sword to promote temporal peace, but it should not use that power to impose Christianity. The sword has been given to the civil government, not the Church. The state is not redemptive; it is not through the state that people are to become Christians. The state need not be Christianized. The state is common to and for the benefit of both Christians and non-Christians. Despite their theological, ethical, and eschatological antitheses, Christians and non-Christians have much in common.\textsuperscript{109} The inherent goodness of these commonalities, the facilitation of the church, and the love of one’s neighbor, are grounds for Christian participation in civil government. That Christians and non-Christians can work for and enjoy temporal peace together suggests religious liberty for Christians and non-Christians alike.

The standard for civil law is natural law, which all human beings can know by reason. The content of the natural law includes the Decalogue and the Mosaic moral law. There is a tension between the position that non-Christians are entitled to religious liberty and the position that the Decalogue and Mosaic moral law are appropriate content for civil law.

II. THE CHURCH’S INFLUENCE ON THE STATE: TOO MUCH OR TOO LITTLE?

Reviewing NL2K history reveals a problem: the church can have too much influence on the state, but it also can have too little. In this section we will consider three cases. The first two focus on John Calvin and John Cotton as instances in which the church exercised too much

\textsuperscript{109} VANDRUNEN, supra note _, at 23-24, 29-30.
influence on the state. But then we will consider a third case in which the church exercised too little influence, when two kingdoms theory was used to argue that the church should not speak out against slavery in the Antebellum American South.

A. Calvin and Geneva\textsuperscript{110}

During Calvin’s life (1509-1564), church and state were parts of a unified Christian society.\textsuperscript{111} In Europe, it was widely agreed that there could be only one church in a civil jurisdiction.\textsuperscript{112} Religious pluralism was not a live option.\textsuperscript{113} In the 1530s and 1540s, Calvin was the pastor of the leading church in Geneva. There he drafted reforms regarding church and civil government, which were implemented by the city council.\textsuperscript{114} The Genevan government consisted of several bodies, including the “Small Council.”\textsuperscript{115} The Small Council met daily and was closely involved with Genevan affairs.\textsuperscript{116} The church government included a body called the Consistory comprised of church leaders.\textsuperscript{117}

These civil and church authorities were allied and interdependent.\textsuperscript{118} The members of the church Consistory were nominated and approved by the civil government. The Consistory regulated much that might be governed by the state: education, medical care, business practices,

\begin{multicols}{2}
\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{110} VANDRUNEN, \textit{supra} note \_, at 86-91. My discussion of Calvin and Geneva below is similar to and indebted to VanDrunen’s.

\textsuperscript{111} VANDRUNEN, \textit{supra} note \_, at 83.

\textsuperscript{112} VANDRUNEN, \textit{supra} note \_, at 83.

\textsuperscript{113} VANDRUNEN, \textit{supra} note \_, at 83.


\textsuperscript{115} VANDRUNEN, \textit{supra} note \_, at 84.

\textsuperscript{116} VANDRUNEN, \textit{supra} note \_, at 84.

\textsuperscript{117} VANDRUNEN, \textit{supra} note \_, at 84.

\textsuperscript{118} VANDRUNEN, \textit{supra} note \_, at 84 (giting \textit{JOHN WITTE, JR. and ROBERT M. KINGDON, SEX, MARRIAGE, AND FAMILY IN JOHN CALVIN’S GENEVA}, 1-2 (2005)).
\end{footnotesize}
\end{multicols}
and “disrespect for the leaders of government … .”119 And it had jurisdiction over not just church members, but all Genevans.120 The Consistory lacked coercive power, but it could refer matters to the Small Council for civil penalties, and it sometimes advised the Small Council on these matters.121 The Consistory “acted as a kind of preliminary hearings court, something like a Grand Jury … .”122

Calvin often favored mixed church/state action.123 He believed the state should “foster and maintain the external worship of God … defend sound doctrine,” and “prevent the true religion … from being with impunity openly violated and polluted by public blasphemy.”124

Most notably, Calvin approved of the execution of the heretic Michael Servetus.125

We should consider Calvin’s context. “Characterizations of Calvinist Geneva are only meaningful relative to the standards of the time, and relative to reasonable expectation. Pluralism was not a value of late medieval and early Renaissance Europe … .”126 Calvin was not conditioned to perceive the church/state relationship like a western liberal. Despite his non-liberalism, he might be credited for generally denying the church the sword even though he lived in a society in which people’s Christianity was assumed. Even his role in the execution of Michael Servetus deserves some qualification:

Judicial violence – torture and barbarous punishment – was commonplace everywhere; if this is not borne in mind, it is easy to mistake the normal workings of civil law for bizarre manifestations of local pathology. … (Calvin’s) special

119 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 84.
120 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 85.
121 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 84-85 (citing Ecclesiastical Ordinances, in THE REGISTER OF THE COMPANY OF PASTORS OF GENEVA IN THE TIME OF CALVIN, at 49 (Ed. and trans., Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, 1966)).
122 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 85 (citing WITTE and KINGDON, SEX, MARRIAGE, AND FAMILY, at 68).
123 Calvin suggested cases like drunkenness and prostitution should be dealt with in coordination by the church and state. Cf. VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 85 (citing CALVIN, INSTITUTES, 4.11.3).
124 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 86.
125 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 85.
reputation for severity was established by the burning of Michael Servetus for heresy. (Calvin) did not serve on the tribunal which condemned Servetus, but he did approve of the sentence … . He is associated with only one such death … . Of course, the assent to the killing of Servetus is absolutely deplorable, but precious few who have figured in religious and political history as significantly as (Calvin) did, in his time or in ours, have only one life to answer for. This is not exculpation – he of all people should have had advanced views about tolerance toward heresy … . (But) [i]t is fair to remember, however, that his association with the killing of Servetus was an anomaly in his career.127

And aspects of the Genevan church/state relationship that are arguably consistent with NL2K theory. For example, Calvin charged the state with the maintenance of the “external worship of God” and to prevent “public blasphemy.” 128 Recall that NL2K theory holds that the Decalogue, including the first commandment (“Thou shalt have no other gods before me”), is part of the natural law, knowable by all people.129 So, Calvin held the state should enforce norms that he believed were generally known. On his account, he was not telling the state to enforce dogma; he was telling it to enforce the objectively knowable. Moreover, notice that it is “external worship” and “public blasphemy” that Calvin calls the state to regulate. He does not teach that the state should regulate people’s internal, spiritual worship or their private beliefs. In this way, his position is consistent with NL2K thought, that only the church governs the spiritual and only by spiritual means. The result may lack je ne sais quoi, but on these points Calvin was not inconsistent with his theory of church and state.

All of this does highlight the debatable proposition that the objectively knowable natural law is synonymous with the Decalogue. If it is objectively knowable that no one should worship false gods, then it may be reasonable for the state to regulate the worship of false gods. But if we think that the identity and nature of God are not objectively knowable by universal reason, then even on NL2K theory, the same should not be regulated by the state. Also, the proposition that

128 VANDRUNEN, supra note _, at 86.
129 Exodus 20:3.
civil law should be based on natural law is severable from the proposition that natural law is synonymous with the Decalogue. Later, we will see Bonhoeffer suggest an interesting solution to this problem by emphasizing the second table of the Decalogue, which prescribes duties to one’s neighbor,\textsuperscript{130} rather than the first table, which prescribes duties to God.\textsuperscript{131}

However, the relationship between Calvin’s Consistory and Small Council transgresses lines drawn by NL2K theory. The Consistory was a church body that regulated conduct of not only church members, but all Genevans. But if the church is only concerned with Christian spiritual matters, what grounds could there be for it presiding over non-Christians? Further, the Consistory had no coercive powers, but it could refer people to the Small Council for civil sanction, and it could advise the Small Council on these cases. Such action by a church body seems to exceed the parameters prescribed for church power and authority by NL2K thought. The church, through the Consistory and Small Council, was wielding the sword, if indirectly, and over non-Christians. Little could be clearer in NL2K thought than that this was impermissible: God has withheld the sword from the church and given her jurisdiction only over Christians.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{130} Exodus 20: 12-17. (Honor your father and your mother, that your days may be long in the land that the Lord your God is giving you. You shall not murder. You shall not commit adultery. You shall not steal. You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor. You shall not covet your neighbor's house; you shall not covet your neighbor's wife, or his male servant, or his female servant, or his ox, or his donkey, or anything that is your neighbor's.)

\textsuperscript{131} Exodus 20:1-11. (And God spoke all these words, saying, “I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery. “You shall have no other gods before me. You shall not make for yourself a carved image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. You shall not bow down to them or serve them, for I the Lord your God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children to the third and the fourth generation of those who hate me, but showing steadfast love to thousands of those who love me and keep my commandments. You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless who takes his name in vain. Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days you shall labor, and do all your work, but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the Lord your God. On it you shall not do any work, you, or your son, or your daughter, your male servant, or your female servant, or your livestock, or the sojourner who is within your gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested on the seventh day. Therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy.)
\end{flushright}
Calvin revealingly said, “[s]eeing the church has not, and ought not to wish to have the power of compulsion (I speak of civil coercion), it is the part of pious kings and princes to maintain religion by laws, edicts, and sentences.” In VanDrunen’s words, Calvin was saying [T]he state has to do it because the church cannot. But why assume that religion needs to be maintained by outward compulsion of some sort, or even that religion (or society) is benefited if such takes place? In hindsight, from the perspective of twenty-first-century America, such an assumption seems dubious or at least eminently debatable, though in Calvin’s sixteenth-century context it was surely more plausible.

This analysis seems just right. We should acknowledge that in religiously homogeneous Christendom, Calvin’s inconsistencies were less apparent. But, there was a crucial breakdown in Calvin’s theory and faith. The NL2K theory must be that God can rule the church effectively through spiritual means. Thus, it is a lack of faith in those spiritual means that leads to the use of state power to accomplish spiritual goals.

Calvin seems to have made two mistakes. First, he should not have enforced the first table of the Decalogue by the sword. Second, Calvin should have been more consistent with NL2K theory by having faith that God can effectively regulate spiritual matters using spiritual means without resorting to the sword. Calvin had the theoretical resources to do so, even if he sometimes failed to put his faith into practice:

The novelty of Calvin lies in connecting the doctrine of providence and creation with the experience of faith. The conditions of estrangement to which the human being and the world as nature and history are subject are a testing for the Christian faith. Such faith has to stand up in the face of the appearance of chaos and fragmentation, believing that the God who created the world will reverse the chaos and fulfill God’s plan of salvation.

---

132 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 90.
133 VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 90.
134 See VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 227.
B. John Cotton and Theocratic New England

John Cotton came to Massachusetts in 1623 and was its leading intellectual.\(^\text{136}\) He generally accepted the traditional NL2K positions, including the different jurisdictions, competencies, purposes, and powers of church and state, and that the church and state should not be mixed.\(^\text{137}\) Yet, Cotton was involved in the mixed church/state actions against Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson.\(^\text{138}\)

Cotton believed theocracy was the best form of government.\(^\text{139}\) Still, he believed the traditional NL2K theory applied to a religiously heterogeneous society.\(^\text{140}\) However, it was a different situation if a new Christian society were founded like Massachusetts. In a Christian society, the state should be used to establish true religion and punish false religion that might tempt Christians to leave the church.\(^\text{141}\) A Christian state should not tolerate anything that could harm its citizens’ souls.\(^\text{142}\)

VanDrunen notes several criticisms of Cotton.\(^\text{143}\) Foremost, like Calvin, Cotton’s theocratic teaching reflects a lack of faith in God’s administration of the church.\(^\text{144}\) Cotton stated “[t]hough the Spiritual weapons be absolutely sufficient to the end for which God hath appointed them …: yet if an Heretic still continue obstinate … such Gangrenes would be cut off by another Sword, which in the hand of the Magistrate is not borne in vain.”\(^\text{145}\) But if God’s means were “absolutely

---

\(^{136}\) VanDrunen, supra note __, at 215.
\(^{138}\) VanDrunen, supra note __, at 216.
\(^{139}\) VanDrunen, supra note __, at 222 (citing Cotton, Discourses on Civil Government, at 16-23).
\(^{140}\) VanDrunen, supra note __, at 221.
\(^{141}\) VanDrunen, supra note __, at 222-23.
\(^{142}\) VanDrunen, supra note __, at 221 citing Cotton, Discourses on Civil Government, at 12-13), 224.
\(^{143}\) VanDrunen, supra note __, at 226.
\(^{144}\) VanDrunen, supra note __, at 226.
\(^{145}\) VanDrunen, supra note __, at 227.
sufficient” to their ends, then the Magistrate’s sword is unnecessary. Either God is omnipotent or He is not. As with Calvin, what we really want from Cotton is faith that God can rule his church without resorting to the sword.

C. The Spirituality of the Church in the Antebellum South

Having considered Calvin and Cotton, it may seem as if the church needs to be restrained from over-influencing the state. The doctrine of the spirituality of the church, which curtailed church influence on the state, may seem like a necessary corrective. But we will find that this too has its dangers. The doctrine was promoted in the 1800s by Stuart Robinson, a Presbyterian pastor and professor, who led churches in Virginia, Kentucky, and Maryland.\footnote{VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 249.} Robinson taught that the church should only concern itself with spiritual things and that the church was prohibited from expressing political views.\footnote{VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 247.} The result was to completely remove the church from state affairs.\footnote{VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 249.}

Robinson advocated for the spirituality of the church during the civil war.\footnote{VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 249.} In his role as a pastor, he refused to support the North or the South.\footnote{VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 249.} Some have claimed that the spirituality of the church was created by Southern and border states to keep the church from condemning slavery, but Robinson’s interest was in the purity of the church.\footnote{VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 249.} Robinson believed the church was purest when it carefully separated the powers of church and state.\footnote{VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 249.} For Robinson, the spirituality of the church was the correct outcome of the NL2K doctrines, especially the separate


\footnote{VANDRUNEN, supra note __, at 250.}
mediatorships (Creator/Redeemer) of Christ and the distinct powers and purposes of the church and state. The purpose of the church is evangelism, not “to rectify wrong public opinion, wrong moral views of social and civil affairs … (not to) reform civil evils and to arraign the State on national wrong-doing.” Robinson believed the church should ignore the state’s issues and stay out of politics entirely.

Robinson’s position was principled, but his contemporary James Henley Thornwell’s, another Southern Presbyterian, was less so. Thornwell preached the spirituality of the church, but he did so to prevent the church from opposing slavery. Thornwell’s lack of good faith in promoting the doctrine was demonstrated by his sermons encouraging the South to secede and resist the North. He apparently did not mind mixing religion and politics when it suited his views.

The very limited scope of this section must be acknowledged. In no way does this section or article attempt a comprehensive assessment of the role of the Church, Christianity or Christians in Antebellum American slavery. It is not suggested that Christians and churches failed to oppose slavery only because of NL2K thought. Many supported slavery. Some wrote Biblical defenses of slavery. Scholars continue to note that certain biblical passages might be

153 VanDrunen, supra note __, at 250-52.
154 VanDrunen, supra note __, at 251 (citing Stuart Robinson, The Church of God as an Essential Element of the Gospel, and the Idea, Structure, and Functions Thereof, at 84, 123-24 (2002)).
155 VanDrunen, supra note __, at 251, 254.
156 VanDrunen, supra note __, at 256, 260-61.
157 VanDrunen, supra note __, at 260, n. 159.
interpreted to support slavery. These issues are outside the scope of this article. This section only makes the limited claim that some Christians were discouraged from opposing slavery on two-kingdoms grounds.

D. Church Influence on the State: Too Much or Too Little?

Distortions of the NL2K theory has led to the church having too much influence over the state, as in Geneva and Massachusetts, but it has also led to the church having too little influence, as when Christians were discouraged from opposing American slavery because of the doctrine of the spirituality of the church. Calvin and Cotton fell into theoretical inconsistencies, and they lacked faith that God could accomplish spiritual ends through spiritual means. But Robinson’s and Thornwell’s NL2K thinking led them to restrain the church from opposing American slavery. A problem emerges in NL2K thought: how may the church properly influence the state? Bonhoeffer also faced this problem when many Christians in Germany, steeped in two-kingdoms thought, believed it was not the church’s role to oppose the Nazi state. Bonhoeffer developed NL2K thought specifically in response to this problem.

III. BONHOEFFER IN THE TWO KINGDOMS

Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1906 to 1945) lived in Germany during the rise of Nazism. He died at the end of World War II, executed by the Nazis for his antiwar activities, including helping Jews escape from Germany to Switzerland and participating in the Officers’ Plot by seeking Allied support for a coup against Hitler. He was a Lutheran pastor, theologian, philosopher, and

---


ethicist. He was a spy, a member of the anti-Nazi resistance, and a conspirator against Hitler. And his anti-Nazi, anti-Hitler thoughts and actions resulted from his thinking through the NL2K themes.162

This section describes Bonhoeffer’s position on the seven NL2K themes. He is part of the line of NL2K thinkers, but he also differed from and developed NL2K thought in important ways, which were fundamental to his anti-Nazi activities. Section IV will demonstrate how Bonhoeffer’s anti-Nazi, anti-Hitler activities were informed by his NL2K thought.

This section focuses on Bonhoeffer’s book Ethics, which includes extensive treatment of the NL2K themes, and which Bonhoeffer and many commenters have said was his most important work.163 Many subjects and themes from Bonhoeffer’s other works are omitted or not emphasized in this article.164

A. Bonhoeffer on the NL2K Key Themes

162 Cf. JOEL LAWRENCE, BONHOEFFER A GUIDE FOR THE PERPLEXED, 7 (2010); Wayne Whitson Floyd, Jr., Style and the Critique of Metaphysics: The Letter as Form in Bonhoeffer and Adorno, in THEOLOGY AND THE PRACTICE OF RESPONSIBILITY at 239 (Wayne Whitson Floyd, Jr. and Charles Marsh eds., 1994) (“Indeed, the general assumption about Bonhoeffer’s letters has been that they were composed out of the exigencies of history ….”).


164 There is little to no discussion of “religionless Christianity,” “the four mandates,” “the world come of age,” “etsi deus non dareetur” or “arkandisziplin.” But the descriptive purpose of this article is to describe Bonhoeffer’s relationship to the NL2K themes. Discussion of the omitted topics’ relationship to the NL2K themes might be fruitful, but it is beyond the scope of this article. Briefly let’s consider Bonhoeffer’s arkandisziplin or “discipline of the secret.” It has been argued the Bonhoeffer believed Christians should conceal their Christianity when they act publicly. See JONATHAN MALESIC, SECRET FAITH IN THE PUBLIC SQUARE 123 (2009) (Malesic acknowledges that Stanley Hauerwas has argued the opposite). However, this argument does not imply that Christians should not participate in public action like government, only that they should conceal their Christian identity when doing so. Id. at 123-24 (2009). If anything, arkandisziplin implies Christians should participate in government.

This article does not emphasize Bonhoeffer’s Letters and Papers from Prison, which may be surprising given the extensive attention Letters has been given by others. But in addition to the primacy of Ethics, my interpretation of Letters is like Karl Barth’s, who believed Letters was of lesser significance and was overemphasized by many, and like Eberhard Bethge’s (Bonhoeffer’s closest friend) who believed Letters offers only “scanty clues” to Bonhoeffer’s thought. See EBERHARD BETHGE, EXILE AND MARTYR 16, 21 (1975) (Barth advised sticking with Bonhoeffer’s “early and middle writings rather than to the letters” and that there was “slender basis” for new theological developments therein. Barth believed many misinterpreted Letters); cf. DAVID H. HOPPER, A DISSENT ON BONHOEFFER at 58 (1975); but see EBERHARD BETHGE, EXILE AND MARTYR 138 (1975) (Bethge wrote that Letters do “say something” about Bonhoeffer’s thought).
It has been argued that Bonhoeffer rejects “two kingdoms” thought. But we will see that Bonhoeffer is very much an NL2K thinker. Bonhoeffer did not reject Luther’s two kingdoms doctrine or the related ethics, but only their misinterpretations that justified a worldly status quo. He rejected “pseudo-Protestant” and “pseudo-Lutheran” thought that divides the two kingdoms by a static line. But he associated himself with the Reformation and Luther’s two kingdoms, being intent on “remaining true to the tradition of the Reformers.” He was a Lutheran, and has often been described as a Calvinist. Others have observed that Bonhoeffer is part of a tradition of thought that runs through Augustine, Luther, Calvin, and Kuyper. We will now consider the NL2K themes in Bonhoeffer thought.

1. The God-ordained State

Bonhoeffer’s position on the nature of the state accords with NL2K thought, but with significant developments. Bonhoeffer emphasized that the state is to preserve creation for Jesus Christ. For Bonhoeffer, civil government is ordained by God. Echoing Luther, he wrote that

---

166 Cf. Barry A. Harvey, Religionless Christianity, in Theology and the Practice of Responsibility at 47-48 (Wayne Whitson Floyd, Jr and Charles Marsh eds., 1994); Clifford Green, Bonhoeffer, Modernity and Liberation Theology, in Theology and the Practice of Responsibility at 121 (Wayne Whitson Floyd, Jr. and Charles Marsh eds., 1994). See Bonhoeffer, supra note __, at 76; John W. De Grucy, Christian Witness in South Africa, in Theology and the Practice of Responsibility at 287 (Wayne Whitson Floyd, Jr. and Charles Marsh eds., 1994) (Bonhoeffer opposed the abuse the “two kingdoms” doctrine when used by the church to claim neutrality in the politics.)
167 Bonhoeffer, supra note __, at 168-71; cf. Schlingensiepen at 331.
168 Cf. Eberhard Bethge, Exile and Martyr 17, 48 (1975); Bonhoeffer, supra note __, at 171-72, 258; see also Schlingensiepen at 135.
171 See Bonhoeffer, supra note __, at 87, 179-82, 297.
God uses civil government to restrain evil.\textsuperscript{172} Like Luther and Kuyper, Bonhoeffer believed temporal life was inherently valuable and worth preserving via the state.\textsuperscript{173}

However, he described the state’s legitimacy in different terms from most NL2K thinkers. Bonhoeffer began at the end. The ultimate destiny of the world is the justification of sinners by grace and the coming of Christ.\textsuperscript{174} And the ultimate must be preceded by the penultimate, including civil government.\textsuperscript{175} Thus, penultimate things like civil government are necessary means to arrive at the ultimate ends of Christian faith.\textsuperscript{176} Penultimate means should be used to remove temporal obstacles to Christian faith.\textsuperscript{177} In this way, the state preserves creation for Christ.\textsuperscript{178} So, civil government is justified not inherently, but derivatively.\textsuperscript{179}

Bonhoeffer also held that the state could negate its legitimacy by rejecting its duty to preserve creation for Christ. No other NL2K thinker we have considered\textsuperscript{180} described the conditions in which a state could negate its legitimacy:

Participation in this conspiracy (against Hitler and the Nazis) offered the greatest difficulty to somebody belonging to the Lutheran tradition, for this tradition provided the office of guardianship, but not the possibility of revolutionary interference as a conspirator. Luther did not exclude from justification opposition to a prince who infringes laws and constitution and thus has become a revolutionary himself. But Lutheranism forgot about and did not develop this

\textsuperscript{172} BONHOEFFER, supra note _, at 87; cf. VANDRUNEN, supra note _, at 57.
\textsuperscript{173} Cf. VANDRUNEN, supra note _, at 58, 305-06; BONHOEFFER, supra note _, at 131.
\textsuperscript{174} See BONHOEFFER, supra note _, at 110-19; JOEL LAWRENCE, BONHOEFFER A GUIDE FOR THE PERPLEXED, 70 (2010) (“Bonhoeffer describes the ultimate as the justification of the sinner by grace.”).
\textsuperscript{175} Id.
\textsuperscript{176} See BONHOEFFER, supra note _, at 111-12.
\textsuperscript{177} See BONHOEFFER, supra note _, at 113-14.
\textsuperscript{178} BONHOEFFER, supra note _, at 182.
\textsuperscript{179} See BONHOEFFER, supra note _, at 115.
\textsuperscript{180} Many Christian thinkers have believed in a “right of revolution.” Cf. Andrew C. Spiropoulos, Just Not Who We Are: A Critique of Common Law Constitutionalism, 54 Vill. L. Rev. 181, 227 (2009) (“This right to revolution is utterly at odds with the traditional Christian teaching that the established temporal authorities receive their mandate from God and should not be resisted. When one examines the sermons of the Revolutionary period, however, one finds sermon after sermon supporting Lockean principles of political obligation, including the right to revolution.”); cf. Edward Rubin, Judicial Review and the Right to Resist, 97 Geo. L. J. 61, 77-81 (describing Thomist and Calvinist strategies for responding to tyrannical leaders).
possibility, because for so long there had been no diabolically dictatorial
government.  

2. Two Institutions: Church and State

Bonhoeffer generally followed NL2K thought regarding the institutions of church and
state. He identified the Kingdom of God with the church, and the Kingdom of the World with
the civil government. The church rules by the Word of God; the state rules by the sword.
Echoing Gelasius, Bonhoeffer said the church and state mutually submit to one another based on
respective jurisdiction and competency. Christians are to obey the government, as long as the
government does not compel them to disobey God or interfere with the church’s mission.
Church and state are sovereign but interdependent. They must “neither be mixed together nor
yet be torn asunder.” Christians are to obey and support the government, and the
government should support religious practices. The church and state are allies against evil.
Undermining the church undermines the state, and vice versa. If necessary, the church should
point out to the state its failings that might jeopardize its legitimacy. Notice how this
counteracts aspects of the “spirituality of the church” doctrine considered in Section II(C). The

---

181 EBERHARD BETHGE, EXILE AND MARTYR 131 (1975); see also Schlingensiepen at 126 (Bonhoeffer was the first
Lutheran theologian to think this issue through).
182 See BONHOEFFER, supra note _, at 75. Sometimes Bonhoeffer described the church and state as two of “four
mandates,” representatives of God on earth (the other two mandates being marriage/family and culture/labor; these
four mandates loosely resemble Kuyper’s sovereign spheres ). BONHOEFFER, supra note _, at 181, 252, et. Seq; see
also Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Letters and Papers from Prison at 192 (Eberhard Bethge ed., 1971); Cf. Robin W. Lovin,
Religion And Political Pluralism, 27 MISS. C. L. R. 91, n. 21 (2007-2008); Robin W. Lovin, Church and State In An
Age Of Globalization, 52 DePaul L. R. 1, 10 (Fall 2002).
183 BONHOEFFER, supra note _, at 75.
184 BONHOEFFER, supra note _, at 75.
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spirituality doctrine taught that because the church was spiritual, it should not speak to the state regarding politics. Bonhoeffer agreed that the church’s jurisdiction is spiritual, but because of this spiritual concern the church must engage the state politically.

The church’s primary concern with the state is that it not impede Christian faith.194 The state is concerned with the “penultimate” and the church is concerned with the “ultimate.”195 From the church’s perspective, the state is primarily a means to the end of Christian faith and eternal salvation.196

But Bonhoeffer also saw dangers in thinking in terms of church/state “spheres” with static boundaries.197 These spheres should not be artificially separated. The state, though independent from the church, is still a servant of Christ.198 NL2K thought generally distinguishes between the state’s relating to God as Creator but the Church relating to Christ as Redeemer. Describing the state serving Christ carries many implications which we will explore in Section III(A)(7) and IV. For now, we note that Bonhoeffer was disinclined toward systematic thought.199 No law or rule can specify one’s exact duties, he believed.200 Thus, he rejected a static line between church and state that designated precisely their powers and duties. This prevents easily assigning matters to their proper jurisdiction, but it also prevents the imposition of a boundary like the one that kept some churches from speaking against American slavery or German Nazism.

194 See BONHOEFFER, supra note __, at 324.
195 Cf. BONHOEFFER, supra note __, at 102-03.
196 See BONHOEFFER, supra note __, at 103.
197 BONHOEFFER, supra note __, at 172.
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Yet Bonhoeffer also rejected the proposition that a person’s or institution’s scope of action was unlimited. Bonhoeffer believed one can go wrong both ways: by either allowing or prohibiting too much. It simply cannot be said with abstract precision what Bonhoeffer would allow or prohibit. “A traditional ethicist, particularly one skeptical of religion, might level the … charge of nihilism and irrationalism against Bonhoeffer.” But St. Paul himself was prone to drawing dynamic lines such as “[a]ll things are lawful, but not all things are profitable. All things are lawful, but not all things edify…” Paradox has been described as at the heart of Christianity. Such thinking may be native to Christianity rather than novel in Bonhoeffer. Though Bonhoeffer’s thought will not be easily formulated, it bears NL2K marks.

3. Antithesis

Bonhoeffer’s thoughts on antithesis evolved during his life. Earlier, he emphasized antithesis; later, he emphasized commonality. The discussion here focuses on Bonhoeffer’s Ethics, written later in his life. What is most notable about Bonhoeffer’s discussion of antithesis is how it differs from NL2K thought. At times, Bonhoeffer’s treatment of antitheses between Christians and non-Christians is similar to most NL2K thinkers’ (faith/disbelief,
righteousness/wickedness, salvation/perdition).\textsuperscript{208} He believed man was alienated from God because of sin and that the church was separate from the world.\textsuperscript{209} He believed the Kingdom of God must not be mixed with the Kingdom of the World.\textsuperscript{210} Commenting on Jesus’ saying, “He that is not with me is against me,”\textsuperscript{211} Bonhoeffer saw a great divide between those who profess allegiance to Christ and those who do not.\textsuperscript{212} Even near the end of this life, he spoke in terms of eschatological antithesis.\textsuperscript{213}

But more prevalent in his thought is a different type, or at least characterization, of antithesis: between those who justify themselves by their “knowledge of good and evil” and those who are justified by Jesus Christ.\textsuperscript{214} The antithesis is between the man who is “in Christ” and the man who is his own creator, judge, and restorer.\textsuperscript{215} These statements appear to be references to the Reformation doctrine of justification by grace through faith, that a person is justified before God only by Christ’s righteousness, which is credited to the person who has faith in Christ.\textsuperscript{216} For Bonhoeffer, it was not the individual’s conduct that determines whether he was righteous or wicked, but whether that person placed his faith in Christ. Bonhoeffer claimed that often there will be little that is externally visible to distinguish the true Christian from the non-
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What counts is true faith. And, for Bonhoeffer, whether one placed his faith in Christ determined one’s eschatological destiny. So, Bonhoeffer’s discussion of antithesis is compatible with NL2K thought. But it could never be reduced to a simple ethical antithesis of those who do good versus those who do evil. What is antithetical to Christianity is any ethic that attempts to define goodness based on human merit rather than on faith in Jesus Christ. Thus, virtue, consequentialist, and deontological ethics are all antithetical to Bonhoeffer’s ethics.

Bonhoeffer also described a different antithesis: that between the natural/penultimate and the unnatural. The penultimate state is often not antithetical to the church because it preserves creation for Christ. Rather, it may be that which undermines the state that is antithetical to both the church and state. This is similar to a point often made in NL2K thought, that the church and state are allies against evil. But Bonhoeffer enriches this idea by describing the alliance of the church and state on the redemptive-Christological grounds: that the penultimate preserves creation for Christ and the unnatural undermines the penultimate and hinders the coming of Christ.

Bonhoeffer’s discussion of antithesis also differs significantly from that found in NL2K thinkers. Commentators have suggested that Bonhoeffer moved away from the traditional notions of antithesis. Sometimes, he even seemed to suggest universalism, the idea that all
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people (not just Christians) are reconciled to God. He described the world as “loved, condemned and reconciled in Christ.”223 This idea seems inconsistent with NL2K thought on antithesis.224 Such statements even make Bonhoeffer inconsistent with himself; for he often used the concepts and language of antithesis.225 It is difficult to reconcile these conflicting positions.

4. Commonality

We saw Bonhoeffer’s treatment of Jesus’ antithetical saying “he that is not with me is against me.” But Bonhoeffer also wrote that this saying must not be separated from another: “He that is not against us is for us.”226 “These two sayings necessarily belong together as the two claims of Jesus Christ, the claim to exclusiveness and the claim to totality.”227 Thus, Bonhoeffer identified not only antithesis but also commonality between the two kingdoms.

The church and state are allies against evil and forces that undermine the state.228 If the unnatural attacks the state directly, it attacks the church indirectly because the state is a means to the church’s ends.229 And Christians and non-Christians share many penultimate goods, not just
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civil government. For example, Christians and non-Christians both need food and shelter.\textsuperscript{230} The Christian may view these things as penultimate means to ultimate ends; the non-Christian may not. But nothing prevents them from working together for food and shelter. Moreover, Bonhoeffer said the Christian must promote penultimate goods to facilitate his neighbor’s ultimate salvation.\textsuperscript{231} “The hungry man needs bread and the homeless man needs a roof; the dispossessed need justice and the lonely need fellowship; the undisciplined need order and the slave needs freedom … To provide the hungry man with bread is to prepare the way for the coming of grace.”\textsuperscript{232} Thus, Christians and non-Christians should collaborate in civil government to accomplish such tasks.\textsuperscript{233}

Christians and non-Christians also share reason.\textsuperscript{234} “… [M]an’s reason is the organ of the knowledge of the natural.”\textsuperscript{235} Reason and the knowledge of the natural are common to Christians and non-Christians, and they are useful in the tasks of both church and state. It follows that the church and state, Christians and non-Christians, can and should cooperate in tasks suggested by reason.\textsuperscript{236}

Yet these commonalities seem minor compared to the next.

One is denying the revelation of God in Jesus Christ if one tries to be ‘Christian’ without seeing and recognizing the world in Christ. There are, therefore, not two
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spheres, but only the one sphere of the realization of Christ, in which the reality of God and the reality of the world are united.\textsuperscript{237}

Bonhoeffer’s thought here is like Barth’s.\textsuperscript{238} Bonhoeffer still perceived the traditional two kingdoms (“reality of God” and “reality of the world”), but they are united in Christ. So, Christianity is never irrelevant even to a secular state. Christianity is always relevant because there is no reality outside of Christ.\textsuperscript{239} Bonhoeffer believed the church and the world’s unity in Christ is responsible for the interdependence of the penultimate and ultimate.\textsuperscript{240}

Though there are two kingdoms and two institutional representations of those kingdoms, there is only one reality in Christ, and it is common to Christians and non-Christians, church and state.\textsuperscript{241} Bonhoeffer recommended abandoning the two kingdoms imagery and instead understanding the relationship between the Church and world through the picture of the body of Christ Himself … In the body of Jesus Christ God is united with humanity, the whole of humanity is accepted by God. There is no part of the world, be it never so forlorn and never so godless, which is not accepted by God and reconciled with God in Jesus Christ … Everything would be ruined if one were to try to reserve Christ for the Church and to allow the world only some kind of law … \textsuperscript{242}

It is not that the traditional antitheses don’t exist. But they exist within Christ. “God and the world are thus at one in Christ in a way which means that although the Church and the world are different from each other, yet there cannot be a static, spatial borderline between them.”\textsuperscript{243}

Thus, Bonhoeffer applauded any good cause, not only Christian causes.\textsuperscript{244} And Bonhoeffer believed that even lawlessly obtained civil power is eventually used for justice.\textsuperscript{245}
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said civil government is beneficial to human beings, who are inherently valuable. Bonhoeffer believed Christians should cooperate with non-Christians in mutually beneficial projects like government. Thus, Bonhoeffer clearly contemplated Christians participating in government. More interesting is how Bonhoeffer dealt with issues of justice, sin, and guilt involved with government through what he called “responsible action”:

In all political decisions the historical entanglement in the guilt of the past is too great to be assessed, and it is therefore generally impossible to pass judgment on the justice of a single particular decision. It is here that the venture of responsibility must be undertaken …

Bonhoeffer doubted that governments come to power with clean hands. Yet he rejected any idealism that would prohibit Christians from participating in government for fear of sharing in guilt. The Christian should be willing to share guilt in order to help his neighbor. This is responsible action. He cited Christ as an example:

For the sake of God and of men Jesus became a breaker of the law. He broke the law of the Sabbath in order to keep it holy in love for God and for men. … He sat at table with sinners and outcasts; and for the love of men He came to be forsaken by God in His last hour. … Thus it is Jesus Christ who sets conscience free for the service of God and of our neighbor; He set conscience free even and especially when man enters into the fellowship of human guilt. The conscience which has been set free from the law will not be afraid to enter into the guilt of another man for the other man’s sake … And so conscience joins with the responsibility which has its foundation in Christ in bearing guilt for the sake of our neighbor.

Bonhoeffer believed responsible action was “vicarious action” on behalf of one’s neighbor where, like Christ, one vicariously takes responsibility – even sin and guilt – for the
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good of their neighbor. “We are certainly not Christ; we are not called on to redeem the world by our own deeds and sufferings … .” But he believed Christ had set Christians free from guilt and sin so that they could act responsibly and vicariously for their neighbors.

Bonhoeffer was not claiming there is no law or guilt or good or evil. But “necessity knows no commandment.” There is ethical law, but sometimes it must be broken. There is guilt, but sometimes it must be incurred. Neither guilt nor necessity can be denied. And God forgives sin: “Only now are the Germans beginning to discover the meaning of free responsibility. It depends on a God who demands responsible action in a bold venture of faith, and who promises forgiveness and consolation to the man who becomes a sinner in that venture.”

Responsible action was Bonhoeffer’s basis for conspiring against Hitler, even taking “duplicitous action” by working as a double-agent in the German military intelligence. He was careful to note that this type of necessary, responsible action should be the rare exception, never the rule.

So, Bonhoeffer was no Kantian. But neither was he a consequentialist. He rejected universally valid systems. No fixed rule can specify one’s exact duties. But the case of
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“necessity” is peripheral and extraordinary, and it cannot be treated as typical.264 One can go wrong in necessity as well as in principle.265 One can only be advised listen to the “concrete call of Jesus.”266

5. Coercion in religious matters

Bonhoeffer followed NL2K thought regarding coercion in religious matters. “The kingdom of God is being revealed, not brought in by force.”267 “In His Church, Christ rules not by the sword but soley with His word. … the sword is the property of the secular government ….”268 “The sword can never bring about the unity of the church and of the faith.”269 The church must preach Scripture and the Gospel to people in government, but the civil government is never expected to be Christian.270 “It is only when Christian faith is lost that man must himself make use of all means … in order to secure by force the victory of his cause.”271

Bonhoeffer generally refused to draw bright lines, but there is little indication that he was interested in imposing Christianity by force. However, a few ambiguities exist. He did follow NL2K thought in the belief that the content of the Decalogue is appropriately enforced by the state.272 Theoretically, this position can be reconciled with the rejection of using coercion in
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religious matters by finding the Decalogue to be part of the natural law. But Bonhoeffer always rejected religious coercion. Even in the context of commenting on the Decalogue’s relationship to civil law, Bonhoeffer reiterated that the state is not to be ruled by the church.\textsuperscript{273} The government should support religion, by which he meant “upright conduct,” while itself remaining religiously neutral.\textsuperscript{274}

6. Is the state redemptive?

Bonhoeffer broke with NL2K thought and followed Barth on whether the state is ruled by God as Redeemer. Like Barth, he always described God as acting simultaneously as Creator and Redeemer, including when God relates to the government.\textsuperscript{275} He opposed separating the world into “two orders of creation and of salvation.”\textsuperscript{276} All of reality is “embedded in … God, the Creator, Reconciler, and Redeemer.”\textsuperscript{277} There are no realities outside of Christ, and we cannot place Christ and the world in “two spheres.”\textsuperscript{278} It is consistently suggested by Bonhoeffer that the world is reconciled to God through Christ.\textsuperscript{279} “(Jesus Christ) is the center and the strength of the Bible, of the church, and of theology, but also of humanity, of reason, of justice and culture.”\textsuperscript{280} Values like truth, justice, and freedom find protection and justification in Christ.\textsuperscript{281}

Bonhoeffer believed the church cannot disregard that God has reconciled the world to Himself through Christ the Redeemer and only think of the world in relation to God as
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There can be no principles, like natural law, to govern the world that are autonomous or isolated from Christ. The Church does not proclaim two different messages, a message of universal reason and natural law for unbelievers, and a Christian message for believers. The church must preach the gospel to the government.

Doesn’t it then follow that the state should be Christianized? No, because Bonhoeffer rejected “Christianizing” the state. The state is not to be formed in accordance with “Christian principles.” The church cannot encroach on the authority of the government. Though the government is subject to Christ and the Decalogue, it is not subject to the church.

There are tensions here. Bonhoeffer claimed that the purpose of the penultimate state is to prepare the way for the ultimate coming of Christ and remove hindrances to the Gospel. But how can we distinguish government actions that are Christian from those that are neutral? For example, religious liberty might create opportunities for people to adopt religions besides Christianity. Is Buddhism a hindrance to Christian faith?

Bonhoeffer did not expressly answer such questions, but we can infer them. He held that the church must limit forms of government that impede faith in Christ. Bonhoeffer’s concern is that faith in Christ not be impeded by forms of government. The presence of other religions does not prevent Christianity from being proclaimed or accepted. A person might choose another
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religion, but the government has not impeded him from choosing Christ. Bonhoeffer is only opposed to the government impeding Christian faith; he rejects abrogating individual choice or non-Christian religion.\(^{293}\)

But won’t the penultimate purpose of preparing the way for Christ exercise a Christianizing influence on the state? For example, should tax incentives be offered to Christian clergy? Would they be denied to non-Christian clergy? Bonhoeffer rejected discriminating in this way or suppressing non-Christian religion.\(^{294}\) Again, government must be religiously neutral.\(^{295}\)

How can the idea of government neutrality be squared with the idea of the penultimate preparing the way for Christ? Consider Bonhoeffer’s alternate phraseology for the penultimate: that it “preserves creation” for Christ.\(^{296}\) Government should not impede Christian faith, but it is not meant to promote a Christian agenda. Though the “prepares the way” language is malleable, when we consider Bonhoeffer’s alternate language of “preserving creation,” along with his position on government neutrality and impediment, his meaning becomes clear enough. The government is not to impede Christian faith, but it also is not to become Christian or promote Christianity. It prepares the way for Christ, but only by preserving creation in a religiously neutral way.

Though his theology of the state is different than other NL2K thinkers, Bonhoeffer’s application turns out similarly. He described a sovereign state that rules according to the

\(^{293}\) See BONHOEFFER, supra note __, at 312-13. (“(The government) remains religiously neutral … It affords protection to every form of service of God which does not undermine the office of government. It takes care that the differences between the various forms of service of God do not give rise to a conflict which endangers the order of the country. But it achieves this purpose not by suppressing one form of service of God … (Christians in government) must know that the Christian proclamation is delivered not by means of the sword but by means of the word.”)
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Decalogue and natural law. Though he described the government serving Christ, this service consists of the enforcement of outward justice by the sword. He notes that it is only in the Church that Christian “renewal” and the forgiveness of sins occurs. Is it consistent to say that Christ is relevant to the state, but that the state shouldn’t be Christianized? Bonhoeffer described the natural/penultimate as a form of life that directs the fallen world toward redemption and renewal through Christ, mirroring another Pauline discussion of the law as a “tutor” that leads people to Christ. So the natural/penultimate state plays a role in redemption but itself is not redemptive. The distinction to be drawn between Bonhoeffer and other NL2K thinkers is mostly at the theoretical level: NL2K thinkers generally describe God’s different relationships with state and church (Creator versus Redeemer), but Bonhoeffer insisted that everything, including the state, is in Christ. But even to the extent that the government is in Christ, its role is similar to that contemplated by NL2K thought. Jesus sets the government free so it can fulfill its allotted function. He does not impose Christianity on the state. What Bonhoeffer meant, then is not that the government is redemptive or a tool for making people Christians but that the government finds its justification and essence in Christ as opposed to elsewhere, like natural law. He also seems to have meant that the church cannot merely preach “natural law” to the government; law must always be preached alongside Gospel. But he did not say that the government should
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become Christian or redemptive, only that the “proper relation of the Church to the world cannot be deduced from natural law or rational law … but only from the gospel of Jesus Christ.”

7. Natural law as the standard for civil law.

Bonhoeffer often spoke of the “natural” rather than “natural law,” but the terms are close synonyms. In NL2K thought, natural law was synonymous with the Decalogue and the Mosaic moral law. For St. Paul, the Decalogue and Mosaic Law directed human beings toward Christ. Bonhoeffer’s concept of the “natural” is the penultimate that is directed toward the coming of Christ. Thus, the “natural” for Bonhoeffer is akin to the natural law described by NL2K thought. The natural is the form that God has given to life. Such form is embedded in life itself. Alluding to Rom. 2:14-15, the primary text for the NL2K thinkers on natural law, Bonhoeffer said natural law is innate in the human heart.

NL2K thought holds that natural law is the standard for civil law. Bonhoeffer generally agreed, but with some variations. He believed the government learns the morality it should promote primarily from the Decalogue and the church. However, Bonhoeffer emphasized the second table of the Decalogue. The first table states human duties toward God and seems patently religious: thou shalt have no other gods before me, keep the Sabbath day holy, etc. But the second table restricts actions among people: thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not commit
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adultery, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear false witness, thou shalt not covet.\(^{314}\) Bonhoeffer said the second table is meant to preserve and protect life.\(^{315}\)

In accord with NL2K thought, Bonhoeffer said “man’s reason is the organ of knowledge of the natural.”\(^{316}\) Reason is part of the “preserved form of life,” and it perceives the universal.\(^{317}\) It is through reason that natural law takes effect.\(^{318}\) But because reason can be overcome by evil, the Decalogue, not reason, is the final arbiter of the content of natural law.\(^{319}\) Bonhoeffer believed the content of the natural law included the Decalogue and also the “natural,” which can be known by reason.\(^{320}\)

We have now considered the seven NL2K themes in Bonhoeffer’s thought. Section V will argue that Bonhoeffer thought in NL2K terms, but also developed and deviated from them in significant ways. We will now consider the application of the NL2K themes in Bonhoeffer’s struggle against the Nazis and Hitler.

IV. WOULD JESUS KILL HITLER?

The question “Would Jesus Kill Hitler?” is meant to symbolize questions about the church/state relationship based on Bonhoeffer’s Christological thought. Jesus Christ was the unifying theme of Bonhoeffer’s life and theology, and he believed life must be viewed through Christ.\(^{321}\) The Christian is to be conformed to and “live the life of Jesus Christ.”\(^{322}\) The Christian

\(^{314}\) See Exodus 20:1-17.
\(^{315}\) BONHOEFFER, supra note __, at 305.
\(^{316}\) BONHOEFFER, supra note __, at 122.
\(^{317}\) BONHOEFFER, supra note __, at 122-23.
\(^{318}\) BONHOEFFER, supra note __, at 276.
\(^{319}\) BONHOEFFER, supra note __, at 276, 278.
\(^{320}\) BONHOEFFER, supra note __, at 123-25, 133-35, 144, 149-50, 157-60.
\(^{321}\) Cf. JOEL LAWRENCE, BONHOEFFER A GUIDE FOR THE PERPLEXED, 5 (2010); Christology is what is central to Bonhoeffer’s thought. DAVID H. HOPPER, A DISSERT ON BONHOEFFER, at 29-34, 80 (1975).
must give himself for others as Christ did for humanity.\textsuperscript{323} Christ is present in the world as the church: “Here Christ has come in the closest proximity to humanity.”\textsuperscript{324} “Christ … is the shape of the ethical life.”\textsuperscript{325} And Bonhoeffer was concerned with how Christ was to be understood in the specific context of Nazi Germany and World War II.\textsuperscript{326} He not only lived through the rise of Nazism, he opposed the Nazis and participated in a conspiracy against Hitler that included multiple assassination attempts.\textsuperscript{327} In this section we will analyze select events in Bonhoeffer’s opposition to the Nazis and Hitler based on his Christological approach to the NL2K themes.

On January 30, 1933, Adolf Hitler was elected German Chancellor.\textsuperscript{328} Two days later, Bonhoeffer gave a radio address called “The Younger Generation’s Altered Concept of Leadership,” addressing an idea called the Fuhrer Principle.\textsuperscript{329} This address was not directed toward Hitler, his personification of the Fuhrer Principle was central to Bonhoeffer’s objection to Hitler.\textsuperscript{330} Bonhoeffer said Germans were seeking a strong leader, a Fuhrer, to guide them out of Germany’s post-World War I troubles.\textsuperscript{331} But unlike legitimate leadership, which derived its authority from God, a Fuhrer’s authority was self-derived.\textsuperscript{332} A Fuhrer submitted to no one,

\begin{footnotes}
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\textsuperscript{323} JOEL LAWRENCE, BONHOEFFER A GUIDE FOR THE PERPLEXED, 29-30, (2010); see also id. at 37-38, 70.
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\textsuperscript{326} See JOEL LAWRENCE, BONHOEFFER A GUIDE FOR THE PERPLEXED, 11-12, 18, 25 (2010).
\textsuperscript{327} See SCHLINGENSIEPEN at 310-13, 356-59, 428; EBERHARD BETHGE, DIETRICH BONHOEFFER: THEOLOGIAN, MAN FOR HIS TIMES at 767-68, 778-80 (2000).
\textsuperscript{328} METAXAS, supra note _, at 138; FERDINAND SCHLINGENSIEPEN, DIETRICH BONHOEFFER 1906-1945, MARTYR, THINKER, MAN OF RESISTANCE at 114 (Trans. Isabel Best, 2010)
\textsuperscript{329} EBERHARD BETHGE, DIETRICH BONHOEFFER: THEOLOGIAN, MAN FOR HIS TIMES at 259-60 (2000); METAXAS, supra note _, at 139; Schlingensiepen at 117.
\textsuperscript{330} METAXAS, supra note _, at 139-41.
\textsuperscript{331} METAXAS, supra note _, at 141; see also Geoffrey Kelly, BONHOEFFER AND ROMERO, in THEOLOGY AND THE PRACTICE OF RESPONSIBILITY at 94 (Wayne Whitson Floyd, Jr. and Charles Marsh eds., 1994) (describing Hitler’s appeal to Germans on the basis of making “Germany a proud, secure nation once again.”).
\textsuperscript{332} METAXAS, supra note _, at 141.
\end{footnotes}
including God.\textsuperscript{333} A leader’s authority is legitimate “[o]nly when a man sees that office is a penultimate authority in the face of an ultimate, indescribable authority, in the face of the authority of God … . Leaders or offices which set themselves up as gods mock God … and must perish.”\textsuperscript{334}

Thus, even before the enormous evils of Nazism became manifest, Bonhoeffer was applying his notions of government legitimacy and the penultimate to the political situation in Germany. Bonhoeffer believed that civil government was God ordained. But as a penultimate entity, its legitimacy was derived from its relationship to God. But a Fuhrer rejected the basis for legitimate authority and created the possibility of a government that had to be opposed, not obeyed.

Shortly thereafter, the Nazis put forward the Aryan Paragraph,\textsuperscript{335} which required government employees to be Aryan, and Jews to be dismissed from government.\textsuperscript{336} The German church was state-sponsored, and therefore Jewish pastors would be dismissed.\textsuperscript{337} Many in the church did not know how to respond to the Aryan Paragraph; some believed they should accept it.\textsuperscript{338} Some thought Jewish Christians could simply form their own churches.\textsuperscript{339} But Bonhoeffer opposed the Aryan Paragraph from the beginning.\textsuperscript{340} He wrote an essay, \textit{The Church and the Jewish Question}.\textsuperscript{341} He acknowledged the deep-seated Lutheran attitude toward government:

“There is no power, but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. … the Church of the

\textsuperscript{333} METAXAS, supra note _, at 141.
\textsuperscript{334} METAXAS, supra note _, at 142; EBERHARD BETHE, DIETRICH BONHOEFFER: THEOLOGIAN, MAN FOR HIS TIMES at 259-60 (2000).
\textsuperscript{335} METAXAS, supra note _, at 150.
\textsuperscript{336} METAXAS, supra note _, at 150-51; Schlingensiepen, 121.
\textsuperscript{337} METAXAS, supra note _, at 151.
\textsuperscript{338} METAXAS, supra note _, at 151.
\textsuperscript{339} METAXAS, supra note _, at 152.
\textsuperscript{340} Cf. J. DEOTIS ROBERTS, BONHOEFFER AND KING: SPEAKING TRUTH TO POWER 89-90 (2005); see Schlingensiepen, 121, 125.
\textsuperscript{341} METAXAS, supra note _, at 150-52; see Schlingensiepen, 125.
Reformation has no right to address the state directly in its specifically political actions."\(^3\) But the Church must “ask the state whether its action can be justified as legitimate action of the state … ” and alert the government if it is failing in its God-ordained role.\(^4\) Further, the government may not interfere with the Church’s mission.\(^5\) “The state which endangers the Christian proclamation negates itself.”\(^6\) Bonhoeffer outlined three possible actions the church could take: (1) encourage the state to act within its God-ordained parameters, (2) aid the victims of wrongful state action, or (3) disable the state from doing further evil.\(^7\) This third option was permissible only when the Church’s existence was threatened, but this condition did exist when the German state forced the “exclusion of baptized Jews from our Christian congregations or in the prohibition of our mission to the Jews.”\(^8\) Bonhoeffer insisted that if the Aryan Paragraph were adopted, the church’s mission to preach the gospel to the Jews would become impossible.\(^9\) However, few in the church accepted his arguments.\(^10\)

This situation is reminiscent of the “spirituality of the church,” the notion that on two kingdoms grounds the church cannot address political issues. Many German churches felt that, in principle, they could not speak against the government regarding the Aryan Paragraph because of that aspect of NL2K thought that requires the church to submit to the state in the state’s...

\(^3\) **METAXAS**, supra note __, at 153.
\(^4\) **METAXAS**, supra note __, at 153.
\(^5\) **METAXAS**, supra note __, at 153.
\(^6\) **METAXAS**, supra note __, at 153.
\(^7\) **METAXAS**, supra note __, at 155-54; see also Schlingensiepen at 126; Bonhoeffer called for solidarity with victims of oppression, even over against other Christians, such as the so-called German Christians, if those Christians support oppressive forces. John W. De Grucy, *Christian Witness in South Africa*, in THEOLOGY AND THE PRACTICE OF RESPONSIBILITY at 287 (Wayne Whitson Floyd, Jr. and Charles Marsh eds., 1994). “[M]any Nazi leaders considered themselves and their agenda to be basically Christian.” JONATHAN MALESIC, SECRET FAITH IN THE PUBLIC SQUARE 125 (2009); see also **EBERHARD BETHGE**, EXILE AND MARTYR 68, 106 (1975).
\(^8\) **METAXAS**, supra note __, at 154; cf. **EBERHARD BETHGE**, EXILE AND MARTYR 132 (1975).
\(^9\) **METAXAS**, supra note __, at 154.
\(^10\) cf. **EBERHARD BETHGE**, EXILE AND MARTYR 66, 106 (1975) (when the paper was read to a group of Berlin ministers, one objected to it, and another walked out of the room); Cf. Schlingensiepen, 125.
jurisdiction and areas of competence.\textsuperscript{350} Remember Gelasius’s Two Swords. Bonhoeffer acknowledged this is true to an extent. The state is not subservient to the church. However, the state as a penultimate entity is not autonomous or inherently legitimate. Its legitimacy is derived from God. And if the state’s actions threaten its legitimacy, the church must protest. Bonhoeffer maintained the state’s authority but also authorized the church to speak against the state when necessary. Moreover, the state is to preserve creation for Christ. The Aryan Paragraph hindered the church’s mission. The church could not preach Christ to Jews against whom it was discriminating by exclusion. Through the Aryan Paragraph, the state was undermining the church and also its own legitimacy. The German state was becoming “unnatural” by destroying the natural and hindering Christianity. As the German state forsook its God-ordained purpose and became unnatural, Bonhoeffer advised an escalating response from the church.

Later, an ecclesiastical struggle ensued when Hitler sought to have his ally, Ludwig Muller, installed as bishop of the German church.\textsuperscript{351} When this failed, there was agitation from a group called the German Christians, who supported Hitler and believed in a national church.\textsuperscript{352} Muller then used Nazi troops to occupy church offices in Berlin.\textsuperscript{353} In response, Bonhoeffer suggested the churches protest the state’s interference by refusing to perform weddings and funerals.\textsuperscript{354} His suggestion went unheeded.\textsuperscript{355} Later, Bonhoeffer helped pioneer the Pastors’ Emergency League, which, among other things, committed to showing solidarity with non-Aryan clergy, rejecting the Aryan Paragraph, and providing financial assistance to those persecuted by
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the Nazis. Bonhoeffer began to act against the German state which was undermining its legitimacy, hindering the church’s mission, and harming Jews.

By 1934, Muller was bishop. He nominated as legal administrator of the German church Dr. August Jager, an anti-church lawyer, who had said “The appearance of Jesus in world history ultimately represents a burst of Nordic light in the midst of a world tormented by symptoms of degeneracy.” Bonhoeffer believed Jager’s appointment meant “that all power of the church government has been handed over to political and party authorities.” Indeed, it was Hitler’s intent to control “the whole man” to the exclusion of the church. Bonhoeffer now believed that being Christian and National Socialist were mutually exclusive. Here, Bonhoeffer crossed a Rubicon. Why? He had been patient in seeking to call the German state to acknowledge its God-ordained parameters of authority. But we have seen that NL2K thinkers, including Bonhoeffer, always opposed the state encroaching on church authority. When Bonhoeffer saw that church authority had been handed over to a state official who was a Nazi fanatic, he realized the state’s negation of its authority was complete. The German state had abrogated the church and its mission. It was now mutually exclusive to be Christian or National Socialist.
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Yet many in the church were cautious about opposing the German Christians. Bonhoeffer believed the church was experiencing a “theologically based restraint towards the state’s actions,” that is, the German Lutheran tendency to defer to the state on political matters. So, the problem of the church deferring to the state on two kingdoms grounds persisted. Bonhoeffer wished the church would break with this restraint and “[s]peak out for those who cannot speak.” Here we see the absence in Bonhoeffer’s thought of a static line between church and state. The “static line” was preventing the church from responding appropriately to the Nazis. But Bonhoeffer often used his position with the church to resist Hitler and the Nazis and urge others to do the same. He rallied members of the ecumenical church movement to condemn the Aryan Paragraph, and Bonhoeffer kept the ecumenical movement informed of “the horrors unfolding in Germany,” pleading with its members to take action against the German Christians and the Nazis.

The Nuremberg Laws were enacted on September 15, 1935. They forbade marriages and sex between Jews and Germans. They prohibited German women under the age of 45 from working for Jews. And they prohibited Jews from displaying Germany’s flag and
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colors. The church tended to think that it was to oppose the state only when the state encroached on the church, not when it acted politically. This position might justify opposition to the Aryan Paragraph, which required churches to fire Jewish pastors, but not justify opposition to the Nuremberg Laws which addressed civil society. Bonhoeffer, of course, drew no bright line between church and state. He believed the church must aid victims of illegitimate state action because the state was negating its authority by destroying rather than preserving creation. He believed it was very much the church’s role to speak for Jews who were being politically persecuted by the Nazis. Thus, when the church actually proposed a resolution recognizing the legitimacy of the Nuremberg Laws, Bonhoeffer opposed the resolution, and the resolution ultimately failed (though not because of Bonhoeffer’s opposition). "Declarations of solidarity with the victims of injustice … were precisely what Dietrich Bonhoeffer had demanded from the churches … . Bonhoeffer goaded the churches finally to act like the true church of Jesus Christ and to defend those brutalized by governmental injustice."

Later, Bonhoeffer ran a church seminary. There he pushed his students to reconsider their support of the German state. He asked them to forego the financial and social advantages of working for the state church and not to allow the Nazis to tamper with their ministries. Once again, he was working against the German Lutheran tendency (similar to that of the church
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in the American Antebellum South) to automatically concede the legitimacy of state action and fail to act on behalf of the Jews, and this on two kingdoms grounds.

In 1939, Bonhoeffer learned of mass murders committed by the SS, enslavement of Poland, and plans to exterminate Jews. Bonhoeffer had become frustrated with the church’s failure to oppose Hitler and the Nazis, and these atrocities drove him to join a conspiracy to oppose the Nazis and remove Hitler from power. Actively joining the political resistance was a serious decision for Bonhoeffer because he thought in NL2K terms, viewing the role of Christian minister as basically complementary to that of the civil magistrate. If Bonhoeffer had been content with general NL2K thought, he may have found himself stuck with a doctrine like the spirituality of the church. But his theoretical innovations facilitated his joining the conspiracy. Thus, he tried to help Jews escape from Germany and secure Allied support for the conspiracy.

Bonhoeffer joined the Abwehr, the German military intelligence agency, so he could work as a double-agent against Hitler. He used his position with the Abwehr to carry out illegal pastoral activities and help the conspiracy. He was acting simultaneously as a pastor and a political conspirator. At this point, it would be impossible to assign Bonhoeffer’s activities
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to one of the two kingdoms. He was acting for both simultaneously. This may have created an
insurmountable ethical dilemma for some NL2K thinkers, but not for Bonhoeffer. He rejected
any static line between church and state action. Bonhoeffer was acting at the nexus of the
penultimate and the ultimate. Acting for one was acting for the other because they are
interdependent. By opposing the Nazis, Bonhoeffer was supporting the penultimate and also the
church. The Nazis were negating the state’s legitimacy, and so there were no two-kingdoms
grounds for Bonhoeffer to submit to their authority, as a Christian or as a German. The Nazis
were acting unnaturally, destroying creation rather than preserving it. Bonhoeffer had to act to
preserve creation and life for their own sakes, but also for the Kingdom of God. His actions were
political and spiritual simultaneously, and there was no need or way to separate the two
kingdoms because they were interdependent. Moreover, he believed Christ set him free so that he
could act responsibly for others, even if it meant incurring the guilt of acting “duplicitously” as a
double-agent.388

One of Bonhoeffer’s roles within the conspiracy was acting as “theologian and moral
compass.”389 In 1942, Wolf-Dieter Zimmermann, who would eventually attempt to assassinate
Hitler, discussed killing Hitler with Bonhoeffer.390 Zimmerman was a staff lieutenant at the
Army High Command.391 He had access to Hitler, and he asked whether he should shoot him.392
Bonhoeffer gave no simple answer.393 Another conspirator, Werner von Haeften, who would
eventually lead the July 20, 1944 attempt on Hitler’s life, also asked Bonhoeffer if he should kill
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Hitler. Bonhoeffer emphasized the need to have a clear plan and foresee the consequences. But von Haeften was more interested in whether it was morally permissible for him to kill Hitler. Bonhoeffer said he couldn’t decide this for von Haeften. But he certainly did not forbid killing Hitler.

Ethics for Bonhoeffer were not abstractions that could be definitively stated. What mattered was learning in one’s particular circumstances what the will of God is. “Preoccupation with the practical, to the extent that it means giving precedence to the concrete rather than the abstract, is critically important to Bonhoeffer’s own approach to ethics.” Bonhoeffer could not tell Zimmerman or von Haeften in the abstract “yes, you should kill Hitler,” though Bonhoeffer himself was ready to kill Hitler. But whether Zimmerman or von Haeften should do so was between them and God. But Bonhoeffer also did not say “no, you should not kill Hitler.” What was he thinking? He believed human life was inherently good and should be preserved. He might have argued for killing Hitler on philosophical grounds. But he didn’t believe in justifying actions that way. He believed in responsible action: that sometimes it was necessary to take guilty action for the sake of other people. Bonhoeffer probably believed that the
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assassination of Hitler was a sin, but a necessary sin.\textsuperscript{406} And, while he tried to “live the life of Jesus,”\textsuperscript{407} Bonhoeffer participated in the conspiracy that culminated with multiple attempts on Hitler’s life. Bonhoeffer seemed to think Jesus would kill Hitler.\textsuperscript{408}

V. CONCLUSION

A. Bonhoeffer and NL2K thought

We have surveyed NL2K thought looking at Augustine, Ockham, Luther, Calvin, Kuyper, Barth and others including Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Though he differed with and developed it in significant ways, NL2K thought more often than not was the framework for Bonhoeffer’s thought and action. He recognized the existence of the two kingdoms and their institutional expressions of church and state. He recognized the God-given legitimacy of the state. He endorsed the different powers and jurisdictions of the church and state, the church governing spiritual matters by spiritual means and the state governing worldly matters by the sword. He rejected imposing Christianity by force or Christianizing government. He encouraged Christians to cooperate with non-Christians by participating in civil government and accomplishing projects of common interest. He recognized both antithesis and commonality between Christians and non-Christians. He recognized the roles of natural law and reason in civil law.

Even when his thought differs from NL2K thought, often he is building on the NL2K template. His concepts of the penultimate and the ultimate can be seen as developments of traditional NL2K ideas like God relating to the world as Creator and the church as Redeemer or that the church and state are allies against evil. His position that there is no static line dividing
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church and state presumes the NL2K position that there are two kingdoms with different powers and jurisdictions and finds precedent even in Augustine’s teaching that citizens of the two kingdoms often mingle in the church and state. His teaching on the state potentially negating its God-given authority may be seen as a development of the traditional position that the state may not encroach on the jurisdiction of the church. In fact, his only significant break with NL2K thought was rejecting the Creator/Redeemer distinction. Admittedly, this is a profound break which influenced many of the themes we have considered.

The descriptive purpose of this article has been to demonstrate the role of NL2K thought Bonhoeffer’s life, and we have found Bonhoeffer in substantial continuity with the NL2K themes, if with developments and deviations.

**B. Bonhoeffer’s development of NL2K thought**

1. **No static line**

Bonhoeffer recognized the line between the two kingdoms and the church and state, but he did not believe this line was fixed. Bonhoeffer believed a misinterpretation of two kingdoms theory had left German Christians unprepared to resist the Nazis. We saw a similar problem in the Antebellum South and the doctrine of the spirituality of the church. For Bonhoeffer, the two kingdoms and the church and state were independent and *interdependent*. So the church cannot simply draw a line around the state and ignore politics. Sometimes the church *acting properly as the church* must act politically.

---
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Bonhoeffer gave multiple theoretical justifications for this. One was his great break with NL2K thought. NL2K thought held that the state did not relate to God through Christ as Redeemer. For Bonhoeffer, everything was in Christ. Thus, the church could not concern itself only with the church. The state is also “in Christ” and is a proper matter of church concern. Bonhoeffer also relied on the relationship between the penultimate and ultimate. They are distinct but interdependent. The ultimate justifies the penultimate, and the penultimate is a means to the ultimate. One cannot undermine one without undermining the other. Therefore, the church cannot fail to concern itself with state action that affects ultimate matters.

This teaching has dangers. If there is no static line between church and state, on what grounds could church influence on state ever be limited? Does Bonhoeffer’s teaching underwrite John Cotton’s theocratic notion that the state must concern itself with people’s souls by suppressing other religions? No. Bonhoeffer insisted the state be religiously neutral and that Christianity be advanced only by spiritual means. Also, Bonhoeffer’s “no static line” position assumes that the church and state are normally independent. It assumes there is a line between church and state, but it is dynamic. Also, Bonhoeffer was not facing the problem of theocracy. He was facing the problem of church quiescence before Nazism. We will consider shortly whether Bonhoeffer has provided sufficient resources to solve the problem of church on state influence.

2. Responsible action

Bonhoeffer’s concept of responsible action is unprecedented in NL2K thought. It is both helpful and problematic. It helps the church avoid failing to oppose wrongful state action on two-kingsdoms grounds. It is problematic because its theological basis is foreign to NL2K thought.
Because Christ became a vicarious representative for human beings, taking guilt on himself, Bonhoeffer claims the church should do likewise. But NL2K thought nowhere teaches that the church is like Christ in this way.

Perhaps “responsible action” could be based on other biblical teachings. St. Paul taught that “all things were permissible,” only they must be “beneficial.”⁴¹⁰ A Lutheran interpreter of Paul has said

> [I]t is folly to insist on doing things just because they are lawful when these things bring no benefit but rather hurt and harm either me or others. It is absurd to insist on doing things just because they are lawful when these things do not build up and further the Christian life but damage and destroy it for me or for others.⁴¹¹

Here, we can see a concern for the lives of others that would have been familiar to Bonhoeffer. Further, St. James described arguably “sinful” actions as justified because they were done in “faith.”⁴¹² Some have argued that Christians might be required to violate lesser norms like truth-telling for the sake of greater norms such as preserving life.⁴¹³ Augustine noted that in such cases, God rewards the upright conduct but not the wrongful conduct, which was excusable because of the moral immaturity of the person committing the wrongful act.⁴¹⁴ Thus, it is possible to agree with Bonhoeffer that some actions which are technically “unlawful” should be taken to benefit or preserve life. This does not require endorsing Bonhoeffer’s concept of responsible or vicarious action.

⁴¹⁰ 1 Corinthians 10:23  
3. The unnatural and the negation of the state’s legitimacy

Bonhoeffer described an antithesis not previously considered in our survey of NL2K thought: the antithesis of the natural and the unnatural. Bonhoeffer noted that antithesis was generally located between the spiritual and the worldly/natural. But he believed the antithesis between the natural and the unnatural was often overlooked. To put it concretely, NL2K thought usually describes antithesis between Christians and non-Christians. But Bonhoeffer experienced a different antithesis: between the Nazis and everyone else. Christians and non-Christians alike were allies against this unnatural evil that undermined and destroyed the natural without discriminating between Christians and non-Christians.

The concept of the unnatural overlaps with another NL2K theme, and here we see further innovation by Bonhoeffer. Bonhoeffer described how a state could negate its God-given authority by rejecting its commission to preserve creation and instead acting unnaturally and destroying creation. This respected the traditional position that the state was a legitimate authority but described conditions in which evil regimes like the Nazis should be rejected. Thus, Bonhoeffer developed NL2K thought on the legitimacy of government as he responded to Hitler and the Nazis.415

4. The Christological interdependence of the penultimate and ultimate

Many NL2K thinkers have said the church and state should assist one another and oppose evil together, but for Bonhoeffer the relationship between them was even closer. Bonhoeffer’s redemptive Christology drove his analysis of the relationship between the penultimate and ultimate and the church and state. The penultimate state is primarily a means to an ultimate end,
the coming of Christ. The ultimate justifies the penultimate. But without the penultimate means there is no getting to the ultimate ends, and thus the ultimate requires the penultimate. Likewise, for Bonhoeffer, the church and state are interdependent, and undermining one undermines the other.

These developments are redemptive-Christological, yet they do not require accepting Bonhoeffer’s argument that the state is reconciled to God or is “in Christ.” There is some evidence even Bonhoeffer did not think so. Bonhoeffer’s position on the natural/penultimate and their relationship to Christ can be understood as a version of the biblical teaching that “the law is a tutor leading to Christ,” discussed in Section III(A)(7). NL2K thinkers could endorse Bonhoeffer’s concepts of the penultimate and ultimate without accepting his positions that God relates to the state as Redeemer or that the state is reconciled to God through Christ.

5. An Indication of Natural Law: Proper Conditions for the Proclamation of the Gospel

NL2K thought generally holds that natural law is known by human reason. Bonhoeffer agreed but went further. Bonhoeffer’s concept of the natural/penultimate suggests an indication of natural law not previously considered. The natural/penultimate is the proper conditions of human life for the proclamation of the Christian Gospel. The natural is the form of life that allows the proclamation of the Gospel. Natural law is the form human life must take so that the Gospel may be proclaimed “freely and unhindered.”

---

416 The world’s and the nations’ guilt is never forgiven by God. BONHOEFFER, supra note __, at 95-96; L. Gregory Jones, The Cost of Forgiveness, in THEOLOGY AND THE PRACTICE OF RESPONSIBILITY at 158 (Wayne Whitson Floyd, Jr. and Charles Marsh eds., 1994).
417 See Ethics, at 110-19.
418 See Ethics, at 111-12.
Bonhoeffer gave us concrete examples of what he means. If a slave is sufficiently deprived of his freedom, he cannot hear the Gospel preached. Human bondage, poverty, and ignorance can impede human beings from receiving the Gospel. A full analysis of this Gospel-centered inquiry into natural law is outside the scope of this paper, and it is by no means suggested that the “proper conditions for the Gospel” is an exclusive indication of natural law. But it is interesting to consider: Does abortion hinder Christian faith? Does same sex marriage? Does social or economic inequality? Bonhoeffer provided a new line of inquiry into the content of natural law.

C. Church Influence on the State: Too Much or Too Little.

NL2K thought has had problems with determining the appropriate quantity and quality of church influence on the state. NL2K theory holds that the state’s coercive power should not be used to impose the church’s agenda. But Augustine, Luther, Calvin, and Cotton all allowed or called for the persecution of heretics. And Calvin and Cotton engineered societies with strong theocratic leanings. Yet, the pendulum also swings in the other direction. Some Christians in the Antebellum South were restrained from speaking out against slavery on the theory that politics was the purview of the state, and German churches failed to oppose the Nazis for similar reasons. If the church is only spiritual, on what grounds can it oppose social evils like slavery or Nazism? But if the church is to act socially and politically, how is it to refrain from imposing religious values by force? Here we will consider whether Bonhoeffer offered any solutions to this problem.

---

419 Ethics, at 111.
420 See Ethics, at 112.
Bonhoeffer’s life seems to strike the right balance. He insisted on the state’s religious neutrality and never considered imposing religion by force. Yet he opposed the Nazis literally unto death, participating in a plot against Hitler for which he was executed. “[W]ho would not have wanted the spiritual leadership of … Dietrich Bonhoeffer … during the human rights struggles of their day?”421 “One can find no better example of individual Christian conscience stirred to political action than that of Dietrich Bonhoeffer.”422 Reinhold Niebuhr noted that Bonhoeffer’s example “enabled people to learn to overcome the one disastrous mistake of German Protestantism: that is, the complete separation of faith from political life.”423 But does Bonhoeffer’s thought help NL2K theory?

The NL2K thought that the content of the natural law includes the Decalogue tends toward imposing religion by force. If the Decalogue is part of the natural law, and if natural law is the standard for civil law, then the persecution of heretics and blasphemers is reasonable. A possible solution to this problem is suggested by Bonhoeffer’s emphasis on the second table of the Decalogue. For while the first table contains “religious” content, the second table contains neighbor-oriented content like prohibitions on murder, stealing, and lying. Granted, some of the prohibitions of the second table such as ‘thou shalt not covet’ or ‘commit adultery’ would be controversial. But Bonhoeffer’s emphasis on ‘neighbor-duties’ as natural law is better suited for contemporary law and ethics than traditional NL2K thought on the Decalogue.

Bonhoeffer’s categories of the penultimate and ultimate help limit the encroachment of church on state and vice versa. The ultimate is the coming of Christ; the penultimate precedes the ultimate by preserving creation for Christ or allowing the proclamation of the Gospel. The state

423 EBERHARD BETHGE, COSTLY GRACE 185 (1979) (quoting testimony from Reinhold Niebuhr).
preserves creation for Christ but does not impose Christianity. Bonhoeffer insisted that the state must remain religiously neutral. This implies limitations on pro-religious state action. The state should not impede Christian faith, but neither should it become Christian or impose Christianity. To the extent the state were to impede Christian faith, Bonhoeffer believed the church should oppose the state. And Bonhoeffer commended religiously neutral projects that facilitate Christian faith, such as the provision of basic necessities for human life. But Bonhoeffer never suggested the state impose or regulate religious doctrine. Why? Because these are ultimate matters to be administered by the church. Unlike Calvin and Cotton (in some instances), Bonhoeffer had faith that the spiritual means of the church were sufficient to accomplish spiritual ends.

But how does Bonhoeffer help us with the problem of a church that is too deferential to state action? By referring us to the interdependent nature of the penultimate and ultimate and rejecting a static boundary between the two kingdoms. If one were to accept that the two kingdoms were completely independent and separate, it would be difficult to explain why the church, with its spiritual nature, should take action against the state in the social or political arenas. Bonhoeffer recognized the different natures, powers, and jurisdictions of the church and state, but also found them interdependent. Thus, the church cannot ignore political realities, especially those like slavery and Nazism that destroy the natural order and impede the Gospel. This does not mean there is no boundary line between the church and state, but it does mean there is state action to which the church must respond because of the interdependent nature of the penultimate and ultimate. Relatedly, Bonhoeffer’s concept of the unnatural, which is antithetical to both the church and state, provides a way for NL2K thought to acknowledge the God-given legitimacy of the normal state but distinguish a normal state from a state that negates its legitimacy and must be opposed.
Also, central to taking action against the unnatural is Bonhoeffer’s concept of “responsible action.”\textsuperscript{424} For the good of human beings, Jesus Christ took human guilt and punishment on himself. By doing so, Jesus created a new humanity that is free to also act responsibly. Human beings should not hesitate to act on behalf of others for fear of incurring guilt; rather, they should be willing to take sin on themselves as they act for the benefit of others. “The one who would follow Christ must be willing to take on guilt, must be willing to bear the cross, and so suffer with Christ in his bearing of guilt for others.”\textsuperscript{425} Bonhoeffer’s concept of responsible action frees a person from the fear of incurring guilt or sin by crossing the two-kingdoms line and encourages action for the benefit of one’s neighbor.

In summary, Bonhoeffer described natural law based on neighbor duties, avoiding the NL2K rationale for religious persecution. He described a state that may not impede Christian faith yet is religiously neutral, creating the necessary room for the church without requiring the state to impose Christianity. He acknowledged the authority and jurisdiction of the state yet opposed a state that acts unnaturally and yet required church action against grave social and political evils. Bonhoeffer thought in NL2K terms, yet he also developed NL2K thought largely to its benefit.

\textsuperscript{424} See Joel Lawrence, Bonhoeffer A Guide for the Perplexed, 30-33, 36 (2010).
\textsuperscript{425} Joel Lawrence, Bonhoeffer A Guide for the Perplexed, 87 (2010).