

The State in Ecumenical Thought

J. Takashi Yashiro

I. Introduction.

The rather ambiguous theme of the paper needs some clarification before proceeding further. By 'ecumenical thought' I intend to mean a general trend of Christian thought within the ecumenical community, expressed partly through various ecumenical conferences and partly through influential theologians who have contributed to the formation of the World Council of Churches. It is, however, obvious that in a paper of this scope, not more than a cursory survey of the subject can be attempted. The purpose of this paper is, then, to make a brief summary of the different attitudes towards the State manifested by different churches and theologians in the ecumenical family.

II. The State in the Understanding of the World Council of Churches.

The rise of the Ecumenical Movement which finally culminated in the formation of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam in 1948 coincides with the first half of the twentieth century, the period that exceeds in importance any previous period in every reckoning except that in which our Lord lived his earthly life. The effects of rapid social change during this period on the churches' attitudes to secular authorities are tremendous. Differences in attitude were manifested more sharply and widely as the world moved fast from a period of optimism to one of

pessimism. Consequently, changing interpretations of the State are to be seen in various ecumenical conferences.

(a) C. O. P. E. C. (1924)

Strictly speaking, it is doubtful whether C. O. P. E. C. can be classified as one of the ecumenical conferences, but for lack of any precise statement regarding the nature of the State at Stocckholm, it may be allowed to start with this conference. The Commission Report on 'Politics and Citizenship' defines the real end of the State as "not merely any order, but a just order." ¹ "The action of the State is," the Report continues, "to be directed to an end determined by the moral and spiritual character of human nature." It seems clear that this Report tries to understand Rom. 13 from the view point of an 'Ethic of Ends.' ² What is presupposed here is man's capacity to discern "a difference between that which is fair and reasonable, and that which is unfair and inequitable." ³ However, since men are "moved by passions, desires, and even ideals, which bring them constantly into violent conflict with their fellows," ⁴ the coercive authority of the State is necessary "in the first place, to maintain order ; not any order, but a legal order, recognised and accessible to all ; and, in the second, to adjust the legal order continuously to the changing conditions of life, as the sense of justice in the community shall direct." ⁵ The State, though limited by its end, demands obedience from its citizens. The State can be challenged "when its authority is pressed beyond its rightful function, but exactly at what point the State can be so challenged, it is hard to say." ⁶

Here it may be well to remember that this conference took place in 1924, when the League of Nations seemed sufficiently strong and effective

to maintain international order. Despite the bitter experiences of World War I, men were still optimistic, and are confident of their ability to do good. The impending shadow of the Nazi uprising was not yet foreseen clearly enough to convince the men who drew up this Report of the demonic nature of the Modern State.⁷ Another decade had to pass before men could see the State in a different light.

(b) Stockholm (1925).

Despite the voluminous size (791 pp.) of the Report and the large amount of space allocated to the speeches made during the conference on 'the Church and International Relations' (147 pp.), only two papers have direct bearing on the question of the State: one by M Le Pasteur Ferrier (pp. 429—435) and the other by Bishop Gummerns of Tammerfors (Finland, pp. 512—515). In neither of them, however, can one see any real attempt to tackle the question of the State. Perhaps, the era in which this conference took place was such that Christians did not quite feel it necessary to think deeply about their tasks as Christians in a Modern State. Be that as it may, the failure on the part of those at the conference to come to grips with the true nature of the Modern State realistically was to prove fatal in the succeeding years.

(c) Oxford (1937).

No one who, having read the Report of the Stockholm Conference, begins to read the report of another conference held twelve years later at Oxford, will fail to see the vast changes which took place, both in the national and international scenes, in between these two conferences. The

optimistic atmosphere which prevailed at Stockholm has given way to a realistic, if somewhat pessimistic, attitude adopted at Oxford towards national and international disorders. The State is now seen against the disastrous background of the world tormented by general economic and social unrest and the threats of totalitarian states. ⁸

Having first acknowledged frankly the Church's failure to prevent the disintegration of the world, ⁹ the Report gives its understanding of the State in the following word :

We recognize the existing States as historically given realities, each of which in the political sphere is the highest authority, but which, as it stands itself under the authority and the judgment of God, is bound by His Will and has the God-given aim of upholding law and order, of ministering to the life of the people united within it or of the peoples or groups who are so united, and also of making its contribution to the common life of all peoples.

At the same time we recognize that the State as a specific form and the dominating expression of man's life in this world of sin, by its very power and its monopoly of the means of coercion, often becomes an instrument of evil. Since we believe in the holy God as the source of justice, we do not consider the State as the ultimate source of law but rather as its guarantor. It is not the lord, but the servant of justice. There can be for the Christian no ultimate authority but very God. ¹⁰.

Furthermore, in its longer Report, it is acknowledged clearly that "the principle of sovereignty, which is essential to the modern State, is potentially totalitarian." ¹¹ For the first time in the history of ecumenical thinking a serious attempt to deal with the possibility of the State becoming "demonic" ¹² is here made.

Convinced that "it is only the Church that in the last resort can show

the State the limit of its power,"¹³ the Report warns churches and their members that their first responsibility is to God, not to the State. "The attitude of Christians to the actual States in which they live will in consequence have a double character. It will be at the same time positive and critical."¹⁴ Here we can see an unmistakable echo of the New Testament teaching on the State.¹⁵

There can be little doubt about the greatness of this conference, in comparison with other conferences both before and after it, which is due to its acute analysis of the current conditions of the world, and its realistic understanding of the nature of the State. This being so, one cannot help feeling today that the churches have not been able to follow the wisdom of this conference in the twenty odd years following the conference.

(d) Amsterdam (1948).

The ten years that separate Amsterdam from Oxford saw the fear of the Oxford Conference come true in its worst form. With the possible exception of America, both the winners and losers of World War II came out of it literally exhausted, economically, politically, socially, and even religiously. The Church is under no delusion about the nature of the world in which she is placed, nor of her own nature. Like the Oxford Report, the Amsterdam Report begins by acknowledging, in a spirit of deep repentance, the part played by the churches in bringing about the present disorder of society,¹⁶ and then goes on to discuss the role of the Church in this chaotic world. What distinguishes Amsterdam from its predecessors, however, is the use of a new concept, 'The Responsible Society,' to deal with the Christian's responsibility not only to the State

but to a wider economical and social environment.

'The Responsible Society' is, in the words of the Report, "one where freedom is the freedom of men who acknowledge responsibility to justice and public order, and where those who hold political authority or economic power are responsible for its exercise to God and the people whose welfare is affected by it." ¹⁷ "Man is not made for the State," the Report continues, "but the State for man." ¹⁸ The Report is very precise and firm in its stand against any measure of the State that may deny liberty to men. "We utterly oppose totalitarianism," it declares, "... in which a State arrogates to itself the right of determining men's thought and actions instead of recognizing the right of each individual to do God's will according to his conscience." ¹⁹ It is clear that, although little is said about the nature and function of the State, ²⁰ the two-fold New Testament attitude towards the State, the attitude at once positive and critical, is implied here. The Church's task in the age in which most States tend to become more collectivistic, if not totalitarian, is grave indeed, as the Report takes pains to emphasize. ²¹

(e) Evanston (1954).

The six years that lie in between Amsterdam and Evanston were a period in which John Foster Dulles, a delegate both to Oxford and Amsterdam, led the West in its conflict with the East largely on principles based on his understanding of the nature of world communism. In the eyes of the Eastern Christians, the W. C. C. came to be a spokesman for American Imperialism. Whether this is true or not, the Report of the Evanston Conference does reflect, to a certain extent, the tense atmosphere between East and West. Because of its consistent attempt not to

offend either side, the Report makes less definite pronouncements regarding the grave issues that confront Christians everywhere, thereby giving them not much guidance in solving the dilemma caused by mutually conflicting loyalties. ²²

In so far as the State is concerned, the Evanston Report is a re-affirmation of the Oxford-Amsterdam position on the State, though its approach seems more akin to that of Oxford than of Amsterdam. ²³ Since "the State alone has the power and the authority under God to act as trustee for society as a whole," ²⁴ it must endeavour to establish social justice and freedom, though it must never forget that it "is not the source of social justice but ... its guardian, ... the servant not the lord of social justice." ²⁵ In order to avoid becoming an oppressive tyranny, the State, while it endeavours to establish social justice, must honour human rights which include the freedoms of speech, faith and association. ²⁶ Christians, therefore, must always watch the State carrying out its functions and must never blindly consent to the demands of the State. They must not allow the State to make its claims on them absolute, for "no one form of government has a universal claim on Christians." ²⁷

(f) New Delhi (1961).

The concept originated at Amsterdam and developed at Evanston, namely 'the Responsible Society,' is further discussed at New Delhi in the section on 'Service', one of the three marks of the mission of the Church, the other two being 'Witness' and 'Unity'. After having warned Christians of wrongly invoking Rom. 13 in justification of *de facto* rulers, the Report says :

The basic attitude of the Christian towards the state must be positive. He is called to be a citizen and in his membership of the state to obey God and love his fellowmen. In the actual situation in which God places him he is called to judge and act as a Christian man. ²⁸

And for judging political institutions, the Report upholds the criteria set forth by Evanston. ²⁹ At the same time, the Report draws our attention to the fact that "many new nations have come into being and are in the early stages of establishing political institutions," ³⁰ and gives a further advice :

Recognition of the limitations under which Christians must live and work in many nations does not mean that one form of government is as good as another, that Christians can be indifferent to the nature of political institutions. It is possible for a Christian to live (or die) with integrity under any political system ; it is possible for the Church to obey its Lord in all kinds of external circumstances. But some political structures are more favourable than others for the development of responsible citizens... Love for the neighbour must move Christians to use whatever opportunities may exist, to work for political institutions which encourage participation by all citizens, and which protect both the person's freedom of conscience and his freedom to express his convictions. ³¹

The Report further goes on to declare regarding the task of the Christians in the State :

Christians can never give the State their ultimate loyalty. The Church must always see both nation and state under the judgment as well as the mercy of God as known in Christ. Churches must be prepared for conflicts with the state in any nation and under any political system. They should hope and pray and work for a political

system, within its own structure, expresses its recognition that man is not the creature of the state, that the state is not the Lord of the conscience. ³²

“If the Church is true to itself,” the Report still continues, “it will continually seek to remind all rulers and citizens that the state has essential limitations under God.” ³³ Finally, as the basis of the Christian’s political action, the Report gives us three criteria :

- i) the Christian must remember always that he is by his action witnessing to Jesus Christ before men ;
- ii) at the same the Christian must always act in accordance with the particular local or historical situation in which he has been called to serve God and his fellow-men ;
- iii) the Christian must always recognize that *Jesus Christ is the Lord of History and he is at work today in every nation of the world* in spite of, and through, the ambiguous political, economic or social structures and actions in any given country. ³⁴

We have briefly examined the nature and function of the State and the Christian’s right attitude towards the State, as discussed in major ecumenical conferences. It can be said without doubt that at least from the Oxford Conference onward, the State has been understood in the light of the teaching of the New Testament on the State. The question, however, arises in our mind : Why then has the Church so far failed to bring about necessary changes in its relations with the State despite its right understanding of the nature of the State. ? The three general assemblies of the W. C. C. have all re-affirmed emphatically the position of the Oxford Conference on the State, and yet, twenty years after that conference, the general situation of the world seems not much changed. As

Duff has pointed out, ³⁵ the W. C. C., as a non-authoritative organ with no coercive power over its member churches, can only leave the matters relating to the State to each member church for concrete action. It is not until each member church of the W. C. C. comes to grips with this problem whole-heartedly that any Christian witness regarding secular authorities will be made on a world scale. It is, however, not solely due to this fact that the Church lacks its united front; underneath the statements of the W. C. C. concerning the State, there are seemingly irreconcilable differences which are, in the final analysis, due to the theological differences among the member churches of the W. C. C. In the rest of this paper an effort will be made to understand these differences.

III. An Ethic of Ends and An Ethic of Inspiration.

The fact that the W. C. C. includes most of the major churches of the world except those which are in communion with the See of Rome, points to a wide divergence of view on matters of social and political ethics as well as on matters of faith. Generally speaking, however, the attitudes of these churches to social and political problems fall into two broad categories. The one finds its source of social criticism in the Natural Law, the other in biblical insights; one is 'Catholic' in emphasis, the other 'Protestant'; or to use the phrases of Bishop Oldham, ³⁶ one is an 'Ethic of Ends,' the other an 'Ethic of Inspirations.' This difference was manifested clearly in the Oxford Conference, and it has been so from Amsterdam onward. ³⁷ Duff rightly thinks that this difference has prevented the effectiveness of W. C. C. pronouncements from being felt

among the member churches.³⁸ In what follows, a brief sketch of the teachings of major denominations on the State will be given, with this broad difference in emphasis in mind.

(A) An Ethic of Ends.³⁹

According to Duff an 'Ethic of Ends' is :
based on an idea of the proper order of society and its parts whose overall purposes and particular functions are discoverable by a rational examination of their nature and operation. . . . It supposes a meaningful universe and, in the light of that general conception of teleology, assigns goals for economic and political institutions, appraises programmes, projects personal action according to norms derived from a fixed hierarchy of values.⁴⁰

Generally speaking, therefore, 'Catholic' churches take their stand on social and political questions according to the line of this approach.

(i) The Roman Church.

No serious person today will doubt the sincerity of Pope John XXIII in calling the Second Vatican Council to tackle the question of *aggiornamento*, or the adaptation of the Church to the changing conditions of the world so as to make the Gospel relevant in the lives of the masses. What this brings forth in the course of its sessions will no doubt affect the future of not only the Roman Church but also of Christianity at large. But, to what extent the traditional Roman view of the State undergoes modifications through the council meetings, it is not yet clear. As it stands today, the Roman view of the State is still based on "the Thomistic synthesis of medieval ecclesiastical tradition and Aristotelian-

Stoic philosophy.”⁴¹

According to the Roman view, “the State is the natural institution which secures the just balance between all social impulses and purposes, and sees that each has its due.”⁴² The State is not the product of man’s Fall ; “even if man had not fallen into sin, a State would have been required to direct the common life of human beings.”⁴³ The civil authority is “a moral power, which is binding on the conscience, because it is based upon natural law, and is ultimately a reflection of the Majesty of God.”⁴⁴ Therefore, “it is always a moral duty to render obedience to every legitimate political authority.”⁴⁵ In so far as the State belongs to the order of nature, however, the aim of the State, i. e., the common good, “can only be apprehended and correctly defined from the point of view of the supernatural good.”⁴⁶ Therefore, it is necessary that “the end of the State is determined by the end of the Church, which is of a higher order because it is supernatural.”⁴⁷

Needless to say, this theory of the State stands or falls with the Thomistic doctrine of the Law of Nature.⁴⁸ As far as the Roman Church is concerned, it is most likely that the Angelic Doctor will continue to occupy the same authoritative position that he has hitherto occupied. What discredits the Roman view of the State is rather the actual attitude of that church to secular authorities through the ages. Ever since the time when the papal power was overshadowed by the rising national monarchs of the West in the fourteenth century, the Roman Church has been ever ready to make compromise on the terms of secular rulers, e. g., Charles V, Louis XIV, Napoleon, Hitler and Mussolini, to mention only a few. True, there have been many Catholics who have witnessed heroically to Christ in face of immediate threats to their lives. On the whole,

however, the Roman Church has discredited itself by its attitudes towards the State, which were not always consistent with its teachings on the State.

(ii) The Eastern Orthodox Church.

Since what we call the Eastern Church consists of different national churches, each with its own distinctive historical background, it is dangerous to make any hasty generalization about the Orthodox view of the State from what a few Orthodox theologians teach. The Orthodox attitude towards the State can best be seen in the actual relations between Church and State that have developed in the East since the time of Constantine's conversion to Christianity in the fourth century. The relations between the two took a form of a politico-religious system, usually called 'Caesaro-papism', "in which the authority of the State becomes an effective, normal and centralising authority in the Church, though from outside, while the authority of the Church shares directly, though in a non-autonomous and often subordinate form, in the exercise of secular power." ⁴⁹ The Church of Constantinople was organized according to the pattern of the secular state : "to the last, the Church remained a department of the State." ⁵⁰ The Emperor was supreme both in the Church and State. "With such relations between State and Church, the Church came even to lose her autonomy of organisation and to suffer political restriction in her sacramental and liturgical function." ⁵¹ It is little wonder, therefore, that for the Eastern churches it has been almost impossible to take any critical attitude towards the State. The Russian Orthodox Church is, at least in this respect, a perfect heir of the Byzantine Church.

It is, however, unfair to blame the Eastern Orthodox Churches for their

failure to maintain a critical attitude towards the State. What seems to us an apparent failure is to a large extent due to the mentality of the Orthodox people. "To understand Byzantine history," says Runciman, "it is essential to remember the unimportance of this World to the Byzantine."⁵² The State which has to do with this life can never be as important as "tiny points of theological doctrine. . . . which (have) eternity at stake."⁵³ Consequently, no serious attempt has been made to construct a theology of the State among the Orthodox Christians except those Russian Christians in exile.⁵⁴ This fact, however, does not allow the Orthodox Churches, most of which are now in the ecumenical community, forever to refrain from tackling the question of the State, however trivial it may seem to them, at the time when a great portion of the Orthodox Christians now lives under the states which tend to undermine the freedom of faith.

(iii) The Anglican Church.

Seen from a sociological point of view, the Church of England is a national church which took its present form in the reigns of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I. Because of the Establishment, the Church of England has always been on intimate relations with the State. Nevertheless, we search in vain for *the* Anglican theory of the State, for there is none.⁵⁵ The following is a resumé of what a few representative Anglicans teach about the State.

Man as a natural being tends towards community and finds its expression through all kinds of cultural associations such as the family, universities, etc., in accordance with the aims given by the Creator.⁵⁶ The State is thus an outgrowth of man's social tendencies, and as such,

is a natural phenomenon. It has its rightful place in the order of creation, and is rightly regarded as ordained of God.⁵⁷ Its chief function is to order and regulate man's affairs in society for the good of all concerned. Since man is also a sinner, conflicts are bound to occur among men. Hence, if needs be, the State has to enforce law to create and preserve peace and order in society.⁵⁸ Yet, to regard the State as the necessary outgrowth of man's Fall is a mistake, though one must be careful not to over-estimate the importance of the State nor to make it absolute. The State has the God-given function to create 'just' order, and for that end, it can rightly demand obedience from its citizens.

It is obvious that the view expressed here on the State falls under the category of the 'Ethic of Ends.' At the Oxford Conference, Archbishop William Temple, forced to choose between the two conflicting views, "opted for the Natural Law as the single conceivable basis of social criticism."⁵⁹ Whether his option was right cannot easily be judged;⁶⁰ we can only say that "the Natural Law as the single conceivable basis of social criticism" did not always drive Christians towards a unified action in witness to Christ.

(B) An Ethic of Inspiration.

In contradistinction to what we have seen under the heading of the 'Ethic of Ends,' the whole viewpoint of the 'Ethic of Inspirations' is pivoted around the total depravity of man. Man's reason is, according to this view, utterly incapable of discerning good from evil. The Bible alone is "the exclusive source of ethical standards. . . , (and) the kingship of Christ . . . is a criterion for judging social institutions."⁶¹ Two men, more than any others, stand out as the chief exponents of this view,

namely, Karl Barth and Emil Brunner.

(i) **Karl Barth.** ⁶²

Just as his whole theological outlook is determined by the universal sovereignty of the transcendental God who needs no human defenders, so also is his view of the State coloured by the total rejection of any independent value to be ascribed to man and his world apart from God. The State belongs not to the order of creation as those who start with the Natural Law regard it, but to the order of redemption. ⁶³ Hence the Barthian position does not recognize any intrinsic value in the State, but it only allows "a narrow and negative function to the State, one principally founded on its obligations to assure freedom of the gospel." ⁶⁴ The State is an effort by man to give order to man's external life. ⁶⁵ The just State is a State where order, freedom, cooperation, power, responsibility are held in balance, and none of these elements is made absolute over the others. ⁶⁶ Though it is desirable that the State is just, the Church which is based on the faith in Christ has no fear even if the State should become unjust. ⁶⁷ "It (the Church) can accompany every political system... (but) it can offer absolute and abstract obedience or resistance to none but to each only the relative concrete obedience or resistance which it is commanded to offer by the Word of God... The Christian Church must be guided by the Word of God and by it alone." ⁶⁸

Barth's view being what it is, it is easy for non-Barthians to criticise his view as less concrete and hence less helpful to ordinary Christians. ⁶⁹ It seems to me, however, what Barth stood for during the devilish years of World War II shows, perhaps more ably than his words, what a Christian cannot dismiss lightly if he takes his calling seriously.

(ii) Emil Brunner.

Though Brunner should also be classified as a theologian belonging to the 'Neo-Reformation' school, his approach to the question of the State seems less abstract than that of his fellow Swiss theologian. Brunner starts with the rejection of the 'Catholic' view of the State based on the Natural Law. The nature of the State Brunner explains in the following words :

The existence of the State is justified solely and entirely by the fact of sin: that is, the State is a means of counteracting the destructive influence of sin upon life and society, by means of coercion, in order that it may provide the basis for a life which is at least in some measure human. The organized inhumanity (organized force or coercion) of the State is the means by which the essentially *human* quality of life is preserved. ⁷⁰

He goes on to say : "the compulsive character of the State... is not an expression of the will of the Creator." ⁷¹ And yet, without the State, culture and religion are unable to flourish. The State should therefore be understood as "a God-given order of sinful reality." ⁷² He adds :

The State is a secular order ; it is not sacred. But it possesses real authority by divine appointment in spite of all that we have said about the unholy ways in which all state have come into existence. ⁷³

Consequently, the Christian's attitude towards the State is dialectic ; it is both affirmative and negative at one and the same time.

IV. The Task Ahead.

We have briefly surveyed the different understandings of the State

embraced by different churches and theologians within the ecumenical community. One thing is quite clear even from this brief sketch: despite a seeming agreement among the churches in the ecumenical meetings, there is yet no single view of the State on which a unified action of Christians in face of today's grave political and social issues can be based. In writing before the Second World War, Dr. Ehrenström has this to say:

The necessity for a united front in the struggle with the anti-Christian forces of this generation becomes more urgent every year and every month. A resigned acceptance of the diversity of conflicting views, whether individual or denominational, resulting in the weakness of division and disintegration would therefore be treason against the divine commission of the Church. ⁷⁴

Today, after nearly a quarter of a century, the situation seems no better, as I have already emphasized. In this age of rapid social change, it is obvious that the need for a single Christian view of the State is far more urgent than twenty-five years ago. The formation of the W. C. C. has undoubtedly done great services to the Churches' effort in arriving at a consensus on many a political issue. Yet the day is still far off when we Christians can stand together in united witness to Christ who is Lord not only of His Church but of the world. If the attitudes of the churches to the State are not much different from what they were twenty-five years ago, it is partly because of the 'unwillingness' of the W. C. C. to deal with the underlying theological differences among the churches for fear that the unity already achieved among the member churches may be lost. This fear, however, must be thrown out and the risk must be taken, for it is impossible to arrive at a single view of the State until the tension between the 'Ethic of Ends' and the 'Ethic of Inspirations' is resolved.

Needless to say, this is a problem to be considered in much deeper perspective, that is, in the light of a right understanding of the Church vis-à-vis the world. Here a theology of nature is just as indispensable as a theology of history. It is obvious that only competent theologians on both sides can tackle this problem in consultation with each other. But they must do it without delay, or the rapidly changing world may not wait for them.

FOOTNOTES

1. C. O. P. E. C. Commission Report Vol. X. *Politics and Citizenship*, Longmans, Green & Co., 1924, p. 4.
2. See p. 44 below.
3. C. O. P. E. C., p. 5.
4. *ibid.*, p. 14.
5. *ibid.*
6. *ibid.*, p. 8.
7. Charles E. Raven, looking back upon the Conference, says : "it was also due to our failure to judge the changes in the meaning of time—changes still hardly realized. We thought—and all history seemed to vindicate our faith—that no second war could possibly come for half a century, till a full new generation had been bred up. We thought we could afford to go slow.... The economic slump of 1930 and Hitler's advent to power three years later fell upon us before we had begun to realize that we had been too late." (*Crucible*, A Quarterly Review, January, 1963, p. 12).
8. Acute analyses of the world condition in the late 30's are given in *The Churches Survey Their Task*, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1937, pp. 67, 167, 188, 241.
9. *ibid.*, p. 182. See also p. 69.
10. *ibid.*, pp. 78—79.
11. *ibid.*, p. 246.
12. For a definition of 'demonic', see p. 197, footnote : "The demonic is something finite, something limited, which puts on infinite, unlimited dignity. Its demonic character is evident therein, that sooner or later

another finite reality with the same claim will stand in opposition to it (Tillich).

13. *ibid.*, p. 258. 14. *ibid.*
15. For the writer's understanding of the New Testament [attitude towards the State, see "The Things That are Caesars" in *Kiyo*, Shoin Junior College, Vol. 4, 1962, pp. 9—23.
16. *The Message and Reports of the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches*, SCM Press, London, 1948, pp. 49, 69.
17. *ibid.*, p. 51. 18. *ibid.*
19. *ibid.*, p. 65.
20. Amsterdam seems to be more concerned with the churches' role in international disorder. The preoccupation of the conference with the East-West conflict which was fast becoming intolerable has somehow obscured the responsibility of the churches in their respective States. It is true that the Church as a supra-national fellowship can do much about healing the present disorder of society (cf. p. 70), but this will not be accomplished fully unless each church plays its part in the State in which she is placed.
21. W. A. Visser't Hooft (ed.), *The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches*, SCM Press, London, 1949, p. 79.
22. Duff, Edward, *The Social Thought of the World Council of Churches*, Longmans, London, 1956, pp. 290ff.
23. "The delineation of the Responsible Society, adumbrated at Amsterdam and depicted in larger detail at Evanston, supposes an 'ethic of ends,'" Duff, *op. cit.*, p. 94.
24. W. A. Visser't Hooft (ed.), *The Evanston Report*, SCM Press, London, 1955, p. 116.
25. *ibid.* 26. *ibid.*, p. 115.
27. *ibid.*
28. W. A. Visser't Hooft (ed.), *The New Delhi Report*, SCM Press, London, 1962, p. 99.
29. *ibid.* Cf. *The Evanston Report*, p. 116.
30. *The New Delhi Report*, p. 100. 31. *ibid.*, pp. 100—101.
32. *ibid.* 33. *ibid.*

34. *ibid.*, p. 102.
35. Duff, *op. cit.*, pp.66ff.
36. Visser't Hooft and Oldham (eds.), *The Church and its Function in Society*, Allen and Unwin, 1937, pp. 234ff. See Duff *op. cit.* pp. 30ff., 3.
37. *The First Assembly*, p. 52. See also *The Church and Its Function in Society*, pp. 234ff.
38. Duff, *op. cit.*, pp. 93ff., pp. 309ff.
39. *ibid.*, Cf. Ehrenström, Nils, *Christian Faith and the Modern State*, SCM, London, 1937, ö p. 34.
40. Duff, *op. cit.*, p. 94.
41. Ehrenström, *op. cit.*, p. 41.
42. *ibid.*, p. 47. See also Thomas Gilby, *Between Community and Society*, Longmans, London, 1953, pp. 218f.
43. Ehrenström, *op. cit.*, p. 48.
44. *ibid.*, p. 50.
45. *ibid.*
46. *ibid.*, p. 62.
47. *ibid.*
48. *ibid.*, p. 53.
49. Sturzo, Luigi, *Church and State*, The Centenary Press, London, 1939, p. 47.
50. Runciman, Steven, *Byzantine Civilization*, Cleveland (Meridian Books), U. S. A., 1956, p. 88.
51. Sturzo, *op. cit.*, p. 47.
52. Runciman, *op. cit.*, p. 87.
53. *ibid.*
54. Dr. Ehrenström approves the positions of such Russian Orthodox theologians as Berdyaev, Solovyev and Vycheslavtsev, as the sources from which he draws a picture of an Eastern Orthodox view of the State. Although I accept some of the things these men say about the nature of the State, it is doubtful whether they can represent the mind of the Russian Church, not to mention that of the Greek Church.
55. Ehrenström, *op. cit.*, pp. 79—80: "As a rule the attitude of the Anglican Church has been decided practically... in relation to historical events and circumstances, without much reflection on the inner connection between basic affirmations and practical conduct... Here therefore there can be no question of giving an outline... of the Anglican doctrine of the State, because nothing of the kind exists.'
56. Cf. Temple, William, *Christianity and the State*, MacMillan, London, 1928, pp. 100ff.

57. "I cannot sympathise with a view which denies Divine Right for fear of State absolutism," Temple, William, *Essays in Christian Politics and Kindred Subjects*, Longmans, London, 1927, p. 32.
58. *ibid.*, p. 33
59. Duff, *op. cit.*, p. 101.
60. Visser't Hooft rejected the position of Archbishop Temple in his *The Kingship of Christ*, 1947, p. 140. See Duff, *op. cit.*, p. 101 n.
61. Duff, *ibid.*, p. 104.
62. *ibid.*, p. 152.
63. Barth, Karl, *Against the Stream*, SCM Press, London, 1954, p. 94.
64. Duff, *op. cit.*, p. 104.
65. Barth, *op. cit.*, p. 95
95. *ibid.*, p. 96. Cf. Ehrenström, *op. cit.*, p. 51.
67. *ibid.*, p. 99.
68. *ibid.*, p. 87. For [a fuller treatment of the nature and function of the State, see Barth, Karl, *The Knowledge of God and the Servant of God*, Hodder and Stoughton, London, pp. 217ff.
69. "His message has not helped appreciably in the difficult task of indicating which precisely are the things that belong to Caesar and which to God nor in discovering to what positive tasks the State should address itself." (Duff, *op. cit.*, p. 153). But Robert M. Brown has this to say for Barth : "Barth's theology... is emphatically not one of lofty man's specific situation, but precisely an attempt to show how at all points the gracious God relates himself to man's situation and how man is to live in the light of the fact that the gracious God has done this." (Barth and Hamel, *How to Serve God in a Marxist Land*, Association Press, New York, 1959, p.27.)
70. Quoted by Ehrenström, *op. cit.*, p. 184. See also p. 193.
71. Brunner, Emil, *The Divine Imperative*, Westminster, Philadelphia, 1947, p. 445.
72. *ibid.*, p. 444.
73. *ibid.*, p. 447.
74. Ehrenström, *op. cit.*, pp. 19—20.