

# A New Direction for Kuyperian Economics

Steven McMullen  
Hope College

October 2021

## Abstract:

One of the more recognizable projects in contemporary theological economics has been the development of the Reformed “Kuyperian” approach to economics pioneered by Neo-Calvinists in the middle and late 20th century. The project critiqued and ultimately rejected large parts of the dominant neo-classical approach to doing economics, aiming to develop a normative and distinctively Christian methodology. The project has been subject to some critique. In this paper I first summarize the elements of Kuyperian thought that are relevant to economics. Second I describe the 20th century Kuyperian economics project, and the attendant critique. I conclude that the Kuyperian project remains valuable, but that it should change its focus. Future Kuyperian work should preserve the normative critique of modern economic ideologies and institutions, and that we should maintain the insistence that economics is fundamentally moral, while investing less in the methodological critique of neoclassical rational-choice methods that animated many earlier scholars. I argue that that approach is consistent with the spirit of the longer Kuyperian tradition and still offers scholars a window through which economics can be integrated with Christian anthropology and worldview.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction .....	2
2. A Theology for Economics .....	3
2.1 God’s Sovereignty.....	4
2.2 A High View of Work as Christian Vocation.....	5
2.3 Antithesis .....	6
3. Kuyperian Economic Thought .....	6
3.1 The Neo-Calvinist Critique of Neoclassical Economic Methodology .....	8
<i>The Rejection of Positivism</i> .....	8
<i>An Inadequate Anthropology</i> .....	9
<i>A False Progress</i> .....	10
3.2 Evaluating the Neo-Calvinist Critique.....	11
4. A Proposal for the Future of Kuyperian Economics .....	13
4.1 Architectonic Critique.....	14
4.2 The Place of Theology, Ethics, and Neoclassical Theory .....	17
5. Conclusion .....	19
References .....	20

## 1. Introduction

Economics needs a theological foundation. The discipline is rich with questions about human behavior, social organization, human relationships, our interaction with non-human creatures, and of course, questions of justice. Instead of embracing this need for theology, however, the economics discipline has, in practice, embraced a kind of modern, liberal, positivist foundation that offers a minimalist metaphysics. In short, we economists have tried our best to avoid all of these deeper questions. Our retreat to positivism has not been complete, of course. When pushed, economists will usually fall back onto some kind of utilitarian ethic, and sometimes we end up doing moral philosophy without knowing it (McMullen, 2019). Our retreat, however, does not make these ultimate questions go away, it just leaves them to philosophers, theologians, and lawyers that have less of a background in how economic institutions function.

This arrangement has served the church poorly. The notion that economics is only a pragmatic, technical exercise is too easily, and improperly, translated into the idea that consumption, management, work, and taxation, are merely pragmatic activities or technocratic enterprises. In fact, they are all deeply moral. It feeds the notion that economic institutions, like markets, are morally neutral. This assumed neutrality has left Christians ill-equipped to think theologically about some of the most pressing economic and social questions of our day.

There is a remedy for this problem. There are a number of careful Christian theological approaches to thinking about economic questions, many of which I have found useful. In this paper, though, I want to make a case for renewed, and revised, scholarly investment in Neo-Calvinist or “Kuyperian” economics. This school of thought traces its lineage back to Abraham Kuyper, a 19th-century Dutch theologian, journalist, politician, and social entrepreneur. There has been a stream of economics scholarship that builds on Kuyper’s thought in the Netherlands, the UK, Canada, and the United States. There are a number of summaries of this thinking in print (Goudzwaard, 2013; Hoksbergen, 1992; J. Tiemstra, 1999; J. P. Tiemstra, 1990), and this paper will not replicate that work. Nevertheless, it is important to note, a few distinctive elements of this tradition. First, this school of thought, has followed Kuyper himself in emphasizing the essentially *ethical* nature of economic questions. Second, it has been deeply suspicious of the underlying anthropology, assumptions, and methodology of modern economics, particularly what is usually called neo-classical or rational-choice economics. Third, it has often encouraged a kind of deep institutional critique of our economic lives.

The argument of this paper is threefold. First, this strain of Neo-Calvinist Reformed theology is particularly well-suited to offering a helpful foundation for the study of economics. Second, Kuyperian economists have, in the past, been too dismissive of neo-classical economic methodology, which can be very helpful to Christian thinking. Third, the Kuyperian “architectonic critique,” which combines traditional economics with systemic and theological thinking, is an important and under-emphasized way of doing Christian economics.

It may well be that a Kuyperian economics, deeply steeped in the language of creation, grace, idolatry, and sin, will never be accepted as a replacement for secular mainstream economics. That, however, does not preclude this Christian approach from being used as both motivation for more narrow secular scholarship in economics, and also a framework for thinking deeply about economic life for the church.

This paper proceeds in three parts, beginning with a brief description of the major emphases in Kuyperian thinking that have proven to be relevant for economics. Second, I will summarize the direction that Kuyperian economics took in the 20th-century emphasizing their critique of economic methodology and the reaction by their contemporaries. Third, I will argue for a change in focus of Kuyperian economics, away from methodological critiques, and toward structural or architectonic ethical analysis of economic institutional arrangements.

## **2. A THEOLOGY FOR ECONOMICS**

While many theological traditions have much to offer to economists, the Reformed Neo-Calvinist tradition is particularly well-suited to help social scientists think theologically about their subject matter. The timing of the reformation and the social location of John Calvin meant that this tradition was formed in the crucible of social upheaval and the growth of a commercial society. In contrast to the Christian thought of the time -- even that of Martin Luther. Hardy notes that for Reformed Christians (1990, p. 65):

In the face of these astounding changes on all fronts of social life, it became increasingly apparent that the structure of human society is in part a product of human activity. In turn, to the degree this activity is motivated by sinful desires and worldly ambitious the society thus formed is likely to be structurally unsound and in need of drastic reform.

The Reformed emphasis on God’s Sovereignty, along with this critical eye toward social structures, was taken up with particular enthusiasm by Dutch Neo-Calvinists in the 19th

century. Over time, a few key themes came to the fore that we can say are particularly “Kuyperian,” because Abraham Kuyper was influential in their articulation and application.

## **2.1 GOD’S SOVEREIGNTY**

While Calvinists are mostly known for asserting God’s sovereignty in soteriology (how are we saved?), Neo-Calvinists have asserted that the *breadth* of God’s sovereignty should motivate us to care deeply for all areas of creaturely existence. This is expressed in the strong emphasis placed on the doctrine of creation, and the associated doctrine of common grace. The key instinct here is expressed in Kuyper’s famous “Every Square Inch” quote,<sup>1</sup> which, fittingly, was a part of a speech at the opening of the Vrije Universiteit (Free University of Amsterdam). In this view, economics is not outside the scope of Christian concern, because no part of God’s creation is outside the scope of Christian concern. Reformed Christians, therefore, should consider it a part of their Christian calling to deeply explore, understand, and critique all areas of life. Moreover, after exploration and critique comes the call to build and transform the world. Wolterstorff refers to this Reformed movement as “World-Formative Christianity” (1983, p. 3). Economics is not merely a subject of interest, in this view, it is necessary for the work God has called us to do.

One of the implications of this view of God’s sovereignty is a suspicion of the distinction between the sacred and the secular. This operates on two levels. First, the sacred-secular distinction can tempt Christians to spend too much time focusing on concerns that are strictly spiritual, and then to neglect the kinds of concerns that animate the discipline of economics. Kuyperians push back on that, insisting that we need to be deeply invested in “worldly” and material things. Second, this sacred-secular distinction has a kind of ethical counterpart: we are tempted to separate the world into things that have ethical significance and those that do not. The world of business and economics is often thought to be comprised of technical exercises that are amoral. We might think that, for example, the choice of a production technology in a firm is not a moral matter, but is, instead, a concern with narrowly pragmatic implications. Neo-Calvinists tend to think that the realm of things that are amoral is small, or at least much smaller than is commonly thought. The choice of production technology, the Neo-Calvinist

---

<sup>1</sup> One translation of the quote, according to James Bratt is “There’s not a square inch in the whole domain of human existence over which Christ, who is Lord over all, does not exclaim, ‘Mine!’” Bratt (2013), a Kuyper scholar, expresses some hesitance at the popularity of this quote.

might say, may not be an item of moral controversy, but making the wrong choice could be wasteful or irresponsible, and would thus be a (possibly minor) moral failing.

## **2.2 A HIGH VIEW OF WORK AS CHRISTIAN VOCATION**

A second emphasis of this Neo-Calvinist tradition is a high view of human work. This is partly due to the aforementioned view of God's sovereignty, but it also has a root in the particular eschatological vision. Neo-Calvinists usually envision continuity between this world and the world Christ will establish. Accordingly they will often adopt the view that human work, while perhaps not actually building the Kingdom of God, does point the way toward the coming kingdom, and in some way participates in a coming kingdom that incorporates and redeems the work that humans do here and now (Mouw, 2002). Neo-Calvinists see Christ's redemption as a story of progress: Christ does not restore the world to the state of the Garden, but instead a City, complete with all of the technological, cultural, and artistic progress that was possible at the moment of creation, but not yet realized (Ashford & Bartholomew, 2020, p. 262; Kuyper, 1991, pp. 29–30). Alsdorf phrases this particularly evocatively (2021, p. 94): "Reformed theology conceives of creation as a seed that is filled with growth potential or as a flower whose petals are slowly unfolding. God embedded in creation diverse patterns and potencies that human beings are always discovering, exploring, and developing."

Even more directly, though, Reformed Christians have embraced a wide view of calling that includes a holy vocational call to serve God in mundane human work. This was an egalitarian vision of work, in which God equally honored the work magistrate and the chambermaid, the pastor and the merchant. In this the reformers are echoing Augustine (Ashford & Bartholomew, 2020, p. 271). Importantly, though, this vision of vocation also included the conviction that all occupational structures and practices were fallen and corrupted, and so the faithful Christian was called to be diligent and faithful in their practice, and to discern their calling, rather than merely accept it, with the help of God (Wolterstorff, 1983, pp. 17–18).

This high view of work is now a real ecumenical project and has never been limited to Reformed Christians (Hardy, 1990, p. 76). The key observation of contemporary theology of work is that secular occupations and the marketplace are places where Christians can live into the image of God, do the broader work of the Church, and serve creation through the provision of real goods and services (Ashford & Bartholomew, 2020, p. 272; Mouw, 1980). This theology can also serve as a grounding narrative for much of what is studied in economics, offering both a

motivation for understanding economic institutions and an ethic for calling out dysfunction and directing reform, particularly in work related to labor economics (McMullen & Steen, 2017).

### **2.3 ANTITHESIS**

The theological themes discussed so far paint a broadly positive picture of Christians' engagement with culture. There is, however, a deep pessimism in the Neo-Calvinist worldview that prompts Christians to be every wary of investing too deeply in any movement or ideology. Rooted in the Reformed conviction that the fall has impacted every part of the created world, every creature, and every artifact, Kuyperian thinkers often label the misdirection of a created good with the term "antithesis." Kuyper, in particular, warns that human ideologies that fundamentally misdirect human action are rooted in idolatry, and that this deep idolatry puts Christians at odds, in small ways or large ways, with any worldly philosophy or institution (Pahman, 2016).

For Kuyper, this instinct resulted in a real suspicion of the dominant economic ideologies of his day. He was keen to learn from the liberals, who had great influence at the time, particularly in England,<sup>2</sup> and also from the burgeoning socialist thinkers. He thought both the liberals and the socialists made fundamental theological errors, however, that resulted in deep problems for both schools of political economy, and these ultimately created problems for the real functioning of economic life.<sup>3</sup> It also motivated his call for Christians to be deeply engaged in every area of academic life, since he believed that part of the response to the antithesis was for Christians to be active in this theological and scientific work.

### **3. KUYPERIAN ECONOMIC THOUGHT**

While Kuyper was not a social scientist, he dealt regularly with economic themes in his writing and work. Perhaps out of frustration with the dominant schools of economic thought in

---

<sup>2</sup> Kuyper studied the classical liberal writers, including Smith, Malthus, and Ricardo, and was a contemporary of Mill and Marshall.

<sup>3</sup> Some of his critiques of these dominant schools of political economy can be found in his address to the Social Congress, translated by James Skillen into English and published as *The Problem of Poverty*. His critique socialists appears on pages 55 and 60, liberalism on pages 44-46. A more complete translation (with all of Kuyper's footnotes) appears in a new volume of his edited works *On Business and Economics* (Kuyper, 2021). All page numbers from Kuyper's address in this essay come from the Skillen translation.

his day, Kuyper called for “the development of a genuine Calvinist science of economics.”<sup>4</sup> It is somewhat difficult to say this far removed, exactly what Kuyper thought this would look like, but Pahman convincingly argues that it would, at minimum, leave a larger place open for ethical and theological inquiry (2016). In fact, the Neo-Calvinist movement spurred a number of different scholarly contributions to economics with a variety of different methodological approaches. Goudzwaard and Jongeneel (2014) offer four different kinds of Reformed economics scholarship, ranging from thematic reflections on economics motivated by biblical or theological themes, to systematic treatments of economic theory and institutions that they dub “renewed normative analysis.”

For the purposes of this argument, it is enough to distinguish between two strains of work, both thoroughly Kuyperian. One kind of work focused on developing a Christian economic methodology, often premised on an explicit rejection of (i) the positivist move in economics, which separated normative and positive elements of analysis and often rejected the former, and (ii) contemporary neoclassical economic theory. A second kind of Neo-Calvinist work focuses instead on economic institutions, subjecting them to what Kuyper might have called an “architectonic critique,” which is characterized by a deep examination of the nature of a set of economic institutions, their theological/ideological foundation, and the outworking of those institutions in economic life. These two approaches often occurred together, but the conceptual separation between the two approaches is important.

While attention to both methodology and institutions is important, there has been, at least among American economists, a much closer association of between Neo-Calvinism and the first of these two streams of work. Tiemstra noted that “Hoksbergen puts more stress on the Kuyperian critique of and attempt to renew economic theory, and in my own literature review I argue...that neoclassical economic theory is more the issue than capitalism itself is” (1999, p. 88). This can be seen reflected in much of the writing that came from North American Neo-Calvinists during this period (Cramp, 1975; Hoksbergen, 1992, 1994; Storkey, 1993; J. Tiemstra, 1999; J. P. Tiemstra, 1990).<sup>5</sup> While this particular focus may have been warranted in the second half of the 20th century, when neoclassical theory was at its zenith, I will argue that the emphasis on economic methodology has received too much attention, and that Neo-Calvinist

---

<sup>4</sup> From Pahman (2016, p. 66), quoting Hengstmengel (2013, p. 418).

<sup>5</sup> There are, of course, scholars who are clearly Neo-Calvinist whose approach to these questions is very different, John Bolt (2013) and Brian Fikkert (Corbett & Fikkert, 2014; Fikkert & Kapic, 2019) are two good examples.

economic thought should, moving forward, reorienting scholars' energy toward a Christian analysis of the most pressing problems in economic life.

### **3.1 THE NEO-CALVINIST CRITIQUE OF NEOCLASSICAL ECONOMIC METHODOLOGY**

The Neo-Calvinist critique of neoclassical economics has both an ethical and a methodological component. The *ethical critique* focused on the consequentialist ethics implicit in welfare economics and the resulting support for economic growth as a goal. The methodological critique focused on assumptions of rationality and the positivist divide between normative and positivist economics. In some cases Vickers' macroeconomic critiques were included as well (Vickers, 1994, 1995, 1997). This critique, Neo-Calvinists argued, was important enough that Christians should either find a different school of economic thought -- usually some kind of institutionalism (Hoksbergen, 1994; J. Tiemstra, 1993; J. P. Tiemstra, 1994) -- or start to build an economic methodology with an explicitly Christian anthropology and philosophical foundation (Cramp, 1975; Hoksbergen, 1994; J. P. Tiemstra, 1990, 1994).

A full description of the Neo-Calvinist critique is beyond the scope of this paper, since different scholars in this school of thought made a variety of sustained arguments that interact with many parts of economic methodology. However, it is worthwhile to summarize some of the key points, which I will divide into three parts, each of which touch on the ethical and methodological arguments.

#### *THE REJECTION OF POSITIVISM*

One of the primary criticisms of neoclassical economics has long been to reject philosophical positivism, a school of thought that holds that knowledge is only gained through empirical evidence or logical proof. Some version of this philosophy has been extremely influential in the natural sciences and in economics, leading scholars to minimize the importance and validity of ethics and theology. In an influential set of lectures, A. B. Cramp (1975) names this approach, and the separation of "positive" and "normative" economics, as one of the key failures of modern economic theory. This argument is echoed by other Neo-Calvinist scholars and is counted by many of these scholars as a cornerstone of the Kuyperian critique (Hoksbergen, 1992, 1994; J. Tiemstra, 1999; Vickers, 1997). The core of the Kuyperian argument is that it is not possible to engage in the work of economics without first accepting

some foundational ethical premises about human well-being, freedom, and the nature of human progress. The positivist move in economics is thus ultimately unsuccessful, and often serves to hide the real ethical foundations of a given theory, whether or not the theory's proponents realize it.

The main criticism here is loosely connected to the philosophically influential "Reformed Epistemology," which holds that some foundational propositions about God can best be considered as "properly basic" and need not to be justified with evidence in order to be rational (Plantinga, 2000; Wolterstorff, 1988). This in turn fits nicely with Kuyper's insistence that there was a coherence to the Reformed Christian world and life view that could not be broken down into individual separable pieces, and that it made sense of much of our social experience (Kuyper, 2009). It also fits with Kuyper's insistence that a Christian economics should be characterized by close attention to ethical questions (Pahman, 2016).

#### *AN INADEQUATE ANTHROPOLOGY*

A second element of the Neo-Calvinist critique is the insistence that economics be built upon a Christian anthropology. The argument here is twofold. First, economic models offer only a thin account of human motivations (rationality). Second, they argue, economics is methodologically (and ideologically) individualistic. The assumption of rationality in economics leaves little room for sin or sanctification and makes the individual preferences the yardstick against which behavior is judged. This in turn undermines even the possibility of self-sacrifice (Cramp, 1975, p. 56). While rational choice theory can, in practice, be consistent with a wide variety of human motivations (Klay, 1994; Klay & Lunn, 1994; Richardson, 1988). In practice, however, as Tiemstra has responded, actual work in economics tends to assume simple, myopic, and selfish preferences (1993, pp. 234–235). In contrast, Neo-Calvinists prefer to start with the norms of stewardship and justice and to highlight moral and social motivations for economic action (Hoksbergen, 1992; J. P. Tiemstra, 1990, p. 24).

One particular part of the anthropology assumed in economic theory that has drawn critique is methodological individualism. Cramp (1975, p. 9) traced the individualism in economics back to Hobbes. This is an echo of Kuyper's own critique of classical liberalism, which he associated with the dangerous individualism of the French revolution (1991, p. 44). When economists see only individuals interacting in market exchange, Hokesbergen noted (1994, p. 136), they are not able to adequately examine or explain social relationships and

solidarity. It is not surprising then when economists give social interaction and solidarity less attention; methodological individualism has already baked in a kind of normative individualism.

### *A FALSE PROGRESS*

The third pillar of the Neo-Calvinist critique is a rejection of the conception of progress common in the discipline. The dominant conception of progress, they argue, idolizes individual satisfaction and material progress, and ends up unintentionally smuggling a kind of utilitarian ethics into economic analysis. The two big components of economic thought that receive particular scrutiny are welfare economics and support for economic growth. The discipline of welfare economics is based on the idea that the main goal of social interaction is to increase the ability of individuals to meet their own preferences. Trade is beneficial when a person purchases a good for a lower price than what they are willing to spend, or when they sell for a price above their own individual valuation. The good of society is just some weighted aggregate of the well-being of individuals. Neo-Calvinists argued that this approach reduced human good to hedonism, and thus contained its own impoverished ethic. Human preferences could be good or bad, but fulfilling those preferences always counted the same in this theory of welfare.

Hoksbergen emphasized the ways in which the underlying assumptions of economic theory tended to be materialistic and individualistic. Even if these assumptions were not intended to be an ultimate statement about human anthropology, they resulted in economic thinking that prioritized a particular way of achieving economic ends -- individual choice and market mechanisms -- over any particular moral goals for the economy (Hoksbergen, 1994, p. 135). This theme appears heavily in Goudzwaard's work as well. He argues that market economies prioritize means over substantive ends (1984). Maximizing this limited kind of welfare, pursuing economic growth, and aiming for economic efficiency became the default goals of economics in part because they fit neatly with the underlying minimalist framework.

Goudzwaard (1979), in turn ties broad economic framework to an underlying idolatry of human progress, where progress is interpreted in terms of economic growth and freedom. These counterfeit goods, he argues, are really best thought of as means to the real goods of Christian ethics. In the realm of economics, the most relevant of these are stewardship and responsibility. So while almost none of the Neo-Calvinist economists argue that freedom, growth, welfare, or efficiency are bad things, all of them are given to much attention in modern economics, and the result is a distortion of the way we think about progress.

### **3.2 EVALUATING THE NEO-CALVINIST CRITIQUE**

This Neo-Calvinist approach to economics gained considerable attention among Christian economists in North America, particularly in the second half of the 20th century. As might be expected for a movement that so forcefully critiqued the discipline, it also was the subject of heavy criticism. The most common critique came from those Christians who simply found the reasons for rejecting neoclassical economics unconvincing. Richardson (1988, 1994) and Klay and Lunn (1994) represent, most likely, the modal response of Christian economists, most of whom are trained to do neoclassical economics, and see relatively little need to reject the approach. Others have been critical of the way in which the normative framing seems to impact the Neo-Calvinists analysis of how the economy works (Waterman, 2021). While I will not try to adjudicate these debates here, many of which are decades past, some critiques offer useful advice for those of us who are interested in continuing to think about economics in the Neo-Calvinist tradition.

Oslington (2020), for example, critiques the Neo-Calvinist work for drawing too distinct a line between Christian economics and the rest of the discipline. By working to build an explicitly Christian approach to the discipline, and by rejecting neoclassical economics for not being consistent with Christian theology, he argues that Kuyperian scholars make a couple of deep theological errors. First, he thinks the demarcation of a separate Christian economic method misunderstands sphere sovereignty and overstates the antithesis between a Christian worldview and competing ways of thinking. Second, he argues that this approach draws too hard a line between the knowledge available to secular economists, violating Kuyper's doctrine of common grace. In Oslington's reading of Kuyper and Calvin, Christian theology should be relevant, and even foundational to economics, but Christians should be able to draw heavily from secular thinking and contribute to it as well. That is, Christians who study economics might benefit from having a community of Christian scholars with a common language and set of concerns, but the economics they practice would be a part of the larger discipline.

It appears to me that Oslington's critique applies well to some of the Neo-Calvinist work, particularly when the authors are offering the hardest dichotomies between Christian thinking and the neoclassical mainstream. In practice, though, these scholars often ended up doing economics in a manner in line with what Oslington proposes. They used their theological commitments to make judgments between different schools of thought and economic tools.

Tiemstra's economics textbook (1999), for example, leans heavily on comparative advantage and gains from trade, which is a standard part of the neoclassical economic framework. You will not, however, find any sustained treatment of welfare economics or price theory in the text. In many ways, the calls for a separate "Christian" school of economic thought functioned as an invitation to critique and practice economics in explicitly Christian terms, even if the ideas were almost always borrowed from economists and other social scientists operating at the time.

A second critique of the Neo-Calvinist approach to economics is that these authors inappropriately placed theological weight on methodological debates that may not have actually been theologically important. Oslington (2020, p. 14) points out that much of the Neo-Calvinist critique of formal models was based in an underlying belief that scientific models should, as accurately as possible, reflect reality. This is not the normal view in economics, where scholars are more likely to adopt an instrumentalist view, in which models are judged by their predictive power or some other criteria. The key thing to note is that this methodological difference need not be a theological one. The Neo-Calvinist might rightly respond that the particular dominance of a particular kind of model of human behavior is dangerous, but their position need not entail the critique of formalization and mathematics that it often included.

The biggest challenge to the Neo-Calvinist critique, however, has been a kind of obsolescence. The economics profession has changed over the last 20 to 30 years, and those changes have made many of the arguments of the Kuyperians less forceful. Three big changes are worth mentioning. First, the Neo-Calvinist economists spent most of their time interacting with formal micro and macro theory. This makes sense, given that theory had a strong defining place in the discipline at the time. However, in almost every respect, in both microeconomics and macroeconomics, theory has become steadily less important for the discipline since then. Far fewer economists specialize in micro theory, instead economists have moved strongly in an empirical direction. Even in the empirical work, however, research methods that make use of strong theoretical restrictions or modeling have fallen out of favor, with empirical researchers moving toward atheoretical and experimental approaches. Famously, Raj Chetty, a star economist at Harvard, has developed an introductory economics course that is light on theory and heavy on data analysis.

Second, the theories that have been in vogue in recent years have broken strongly away from the rigid rational choice framework that the Neo-Calvinists critiqued. Behavioral economics, which explicitly rejects the economic rationality in favor of a kind of empirical psychological approach, has been both popular and productive at the highest levels of the

discipline. Similarly, game theory, while doubling down on strict definitions of rationality, has incorporated a wide variety of models for human cooperation, the development of norms, and the existence of multiple equilibria. The economic theorists that are left writing today are actually doing much of what the Kuyperians asked for in the 1980s -- writing about psychological biases, the development of cooperation, market power, and social learning.<sup>6</sup>

Third, the practice of economics has become far more open to the pursuit of alternative normative goals than might have been common in the past. Ironically, perhaps, figures like Gary Becker, who brought rational choice theory to the study of discrimination, crime, the family, and education, opened the door for economists to study these topics. In doing so, economists adopted a much more varied set of economic outcomes worth studying. It is normal now to read economic literature that implicitly assumes the good of environmental preservation, child nutrition, access to public goods, decreased violence, and greater social connection. In most cases the discipline still leans pretty materialistic when compared to Kuyper's writing, but then Kuyper was a minister, so some gap is to be expected.

Neo-Calvinists are not oblivious to this progress in the economics discipline. Tiemstra's 2009 plenary address to the Association of Christian Economists was about 50% a victory lap and 50% call to further action (2009). He notes that heterodox economists remain marginal in the discipline, but that is partly because the mainstream has become broader, pushing those who still count themselves as dissenters further toward the periphery. This broad change in the discipline does not leave Neo-Calvinists without work to do, however. On the contrary, the need for a theologically-rich economics is still important, but the way in which the tradition moves, from here, needs to be examined.

#### **4. A PROPOSAL FOR THE FUTURE OF KUYPERIAN ECONOMICS**

As noted before Kuyperian economists have had two targets for critique: (1) the dominant methodology in economics, and (2) economic institutions that violate the moral standard that these authors pull from scripture and tradition. The much stronger emphasis in North America, however, has been on the first kind of critique. As a result, these Kuyperian economists are often writing, quite explicitly, for the benefit of other economists. This makes

---

<sup>6</sup> I pulled this list directly from the table of contents of the latest issue of *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, (Volume 13, number 3, August 2021).

sense, given that they were often more interested in changing the way economists did their work than they were changing something fundamental about the economic system.<sup>7</sup> Neo-Calvinist economics in the Netherlands has a slightly different path, as exemplified in the work of Bob Goudzwaard (1979, 1984), among others.<sup>8</sup> Kuyper himself addressed both economic methodology and economic institutions, but for Kuyper the emphasis was on the latter. As a minister and a politician, Kuyper was heavily invested in whatever questions the Church was facing in public life at that moment. This, it seems to me, is a healthy posture for Christian scholars, and it offers us a kind of a course correction for Neo-Calvinist economics. In order to serve the Church better, Kuyperians should maintain their commitment to thinking theologically and thinking ethically about economic questions, but they should turn their attention more heavily toward what Kuyperians have called the “architectonic critique” of our current economic institutions. In pursuing this agenda, there may be places where mainstream economic theory needs to be expanded, amended, or rejected, but the end goal is not to change the economics profession, but instead to aid the church in contributing to the task of serving God in the world.

#### **4.1 ARCHITECTONIC CRITIQUE**

When Kuyper took on the “social question” of his time, giving a famous 1891 address to the first social congress in the Netherlands, he notes that the problem of poverty that accompanied the industrial revolution was a structural problem. By this he meant that it required, of the church, more than charity, and more than a revival of virtue or piety. It required an “architectonic critique of human society, which leads to a desire for a different arrangement of the social order” (Kuyper, 1991, p. 51). In this he is calling Christians to move toward the biggest social problems of our age with all of the tools that the best social science and theology have to offer us. It is not enough to understand the proximate causes of a particular problem; we need to understand how social institutions and elements of our culture make that problem persist.

---

<sup>7</sup> This is a contestable conclusion, depending on whose work you examine. In the case of John Tiemstra’s work, for example, the explicitly Christian writing often focused on economic methodology, but his larger body of work includes work examining government regulation, economic growth, market accountability, among other topics. You can see both all of these emphases in his book *Stories Economists Tell* (2012).

<sup>8</sup> Note, as an example, the excellent collection in the special issue of *Philosophia Reformata* (issue 78, 2013), which came out of a seminar titled “Economics, Christianity, & the Crisis: Towards a New Architectonic Critique.”

Goudzwaard describes Kuyper’s “multi-layered” approach to questions about poverty as having three parts (2013, pp. 95–96):

- a) Concrete social facts
- b) Structural causes
- c) Cultural and spiritual causes

Each of these levels of understanding require us to examine a problem with a different set of questions. Taken together, they prevent some common errors and encourage a kind of transformational engagement with public life. With Kuyper’s own analysis of poverty as a guide, let us take each of these layers in order.

First, the identification of concrete social facts requires an observation of a kind of pressing problem. For Kuyper this meant facing the reality that “Then, just as now, defiant luxury existed alongside crying poverty, immense accumulations of capital alongside beggarly poverty” (1991, p. 36). In a complex society, this stage in the process is not merely one of observation, though, but of careful and responsible measurement. It can require a level of scholarly attention that warrants a lifetime of specialization. Consider the difficulty of measuring the changes in income inequality in the United States over the last century, a century for which we have a wealth of detailed data.<sup>9</sup> This is a kind of work in which economists have traditionally excelled, and for which the empirical turn toward econometrics in the discipline is quite helpful.

Second, the analysis of structural causes requires an understanding of the institutions which guide economic activity. For the study of poverty, this would entail studies of educational institutions, changes in the labor market over time, access to financial markets, and questions about market power. The turn toward careful causal analysis in economics can be a huge help here. We know much more about the impact of minimum wage laws on wage rates and employment opportunities because economists have embraced careful quasi-experimental work.<sup>10</sup> There is a danger, however, in relying solely on narrow empirical causal studies. Kuyper warns us that there are structural elements that rise above simple policies, and require a broad

---

<sup>9</sup> There has been considerable debate on the point. See for example disagreements between Piketty & Saez (2003), Auten & Splinter (2019), Mechling et al. (2017), and Saez & Zucman (2020).

<sup>10</sup> Even though the topic of minimum wage changes is one of the most heavily-studied questions, there is still a thriving empirical literature refining our ability to understand the effects of these policies, with a number of good studies coming out in the last few years (Callaway & Sant’Anna, 2020; Cengiz et al., 2019; Clemens & Strain, 2021; Meer & West, 2016).

analysis of the larger institutional context in which individuals and institutions exist. We must also ask questions about the political and social context that gives rise to particular set of institutions. It is not enough, for example, to estimate the impact of lending practices on the black-white wealth gap; we must also understand the political and social context that made a particular set of racist lending rules possible.

These first two kinds of analysis would include much of the work that is done in the social sciences, but Kuyper asks that we go deeper. He never describes a problem in merely social-scientific terms, but always also in terms of culture, worldview, and theology. The third kind of analysis, thus, asks us to dive beneath the observable social structures and outcomes and think about culture and theology. What kind of idolatry underlies the false narrative of socialism? It is not merely that socialists have too inadequate an appreciation for the price system. For Kuyper, the problem is a humanistic idolatry. The socialists of his time (and our time) saw (see) all social structures as arbitrary and optional. In doing so they rejected the structure built into creation, and ignored the organic way in which society develops (Kuyper, 1991, p. 60). The root of socialism's failure, in Kuyperian terms, had more to do with the underlying worldview than it did a faulty understanding of wage determination and profits. This underlying worldview, moreover, could not be separated from the socialist rejection of the doctrine of creation.

As an early pioneer of Christian Democratic politics in Europe, Kuyper also took issue with classical liberalism. He associated the liberalism of his contemporaries in Great Britain with the excesses of the French Revolution, where he saw radicals willing to throw off all social constraints in their pursuit of individual liberty. This, he thought, would leave societies without the cultural resources to push back against materialism and mammon (1991, p. 40). Kuyper's own anti-revolutionary political commitments leaned toward institution building, economic compromises, and a priority on stability for communities.

This Kuyperian approach pushes against some of the most common weaknesses that appear in Christian work about economics. Consider, for example, the concept of "structural sin" or "social sin" that grows out of the Catholic liberation theology of the late 20<sup>th</sup> century (Davis & McRorie, 2021). It is important to be able to talk about laws, traditions, and institutions that are marred by sin, and are thus not consistent with God's purpose for these institutions. These kinds of structural problems cannot be reduced to individual sins, and must be considered differently. It is possible for an institution that was created and developed with entirely good intentions to nevertheless reinforce or require behavior by individuals that is harmful to the good of others. In

this case, the participants in said structure might be blameless – participating honorably in an institution with a good purpose. As such, the direction of the critique must be at the institution, or the social structure.<sup>11</sup> The danger inherent in the invocation of “structural sin” is that Christians can start to view sin entirely as a result of improper social structures, leaving individual moral agency entirely out of their analysis. On the other hand, the opposite mistake is also possible. It is easy to place so much emphasis on individual sin and individual salvation that any concept of a structural or collective sin is seems like a theological error. This might be an example of a particular soteriology crowding out the broader doctrine of creation and doctrine of the fall that would be helpful for Christians trying to understand the world.

Kuyper’s own approach avoided both of these errors. Kuyper saw the problem of poverty as one that required radical charity, changes in behavior, changes in laws, and an interrogation of the underlying economic structure. Moreover, he saw the problem as ultimately a spiritual problem for the Church, not just a technocratic problem for the government to solve. This is exemplified in his multi-layered approach, but also in the kind of language he uses, which juxtaposes Christian piety with abstract social science and historical narrative. The Neo-Calvinist economists studied here also avoid both errors, happily jumping between condemnations of sin on the part of individuals and businesses, while also discussing large structural changes that were needed in the economy.

#### **4.2 THE PLACE OF THEOLOGY, ETHICS, AND NEOCLASSICAL THEORY**

Given Kuyper’s own insistence that a proper Calvinist study of economics ought to be ethical (Pahman, 2016), what are we to make of the modern turn toward positivism in economics? What role must theology and ethics play in an architectonic critique? In order to do the kind of economics that takes idolatry and social structures seriously, we must follow earlier Neo-Calvinists in rejecting the proposition that all questions of ethics are outside of the proper study of economics. The demarcation between questions that are “normative” and those that are “positive” does not hold up well in a methodology that requires movement from description to evaluation and then backwards from evaluation to description. There are normative criteria that enter in the measurement phase as much as the final evaluation, since the measurement must always be carefully crafted to be able to adjudicate any ethical evaluation.

---

<sup>11</sup> It is also to remember that Catholic thinkers have often noted that participation in sinful structures can corrupt individuals (Davis & McRorie, 2021).

This is not to say, however, that we cannot make useful distinctions between methods of investigation and useful conclusions. Most of the proponents of a positive-normative distinction are keen to separate the method of investigation from the final question being asked. This is merely the enforcement of a logical order to an argument. In an empirical study, the data and experimental design should ideally be chosen in such a way that it would be counted as good evidence both by people who believe that one result should be true and those that believe the opposite. That is, the method of adjudication should be neutral with respect to the question that the researcher is trying to answer. This is not an embrace of positivism, but it does allow economists to adopt, in practice, many of the standard methods of research in the economics discipline, whether it be in terms of data use or econometric techniques. Kuyper thought that there was some realm of measurement in scholarship that would not be subject to the antithesis (Pahman, 2016, p. 71), meaning that there could be broad agreement on some basic things despite wide differences in worldview.

Theology can be helpful at every level of analysis, but particularly helpful in Goudzwaard's third layer of Kuyperian analysis in which you identify the cultural/spiritual causes of a social problem. In Neo-Calvinist economic literature, theology generally enters in two ways. First, theology is a source of ethical norms, like stewardship and economic justice that can guide economic action and allow us to evaluate states of affairs and institutions. These norms can be used as a check on means and ends, since injustice could happen in each. Second, theology can offer us a Christian anthropology that helps us develop a better understanding of human behavior. Finally, though, Neo-Calvinist theology has often used theology as a guide for how different parts of human culture should function. As an example, Kuyper's theory of "sphere sovereignty" can be helpful way of guiding reflection about the purposes of different kinds of human institutions. There is considerable room, though, for a richer interdisciplinary that integrates theological work in a much more nuanced manner than has been done thus far.

Once we move past the rejection of normative concerns in economics, much of the rest of the neoclassical economics toolkit is potentially useful. We can pursue an ethical economics that is engage in deep structural and cultural critique, while also using the standard economic toolkit, where applicable, to better understand economic behavior. We should follow other Kuyperians by leaning toward methodological pluralism, adopting the tools and modes of analysis that seem best suited to the questions we ask. That said, if used carefully, there is no reason to make the rejection of rational choice theory a central element of Kuyperian critique. Overall, it seems that Kuyperian economists could maintain a strong ethical/theological

grounding and shift attention toward institutional critique while maintaining most of the theological concerns that have motivated Neo-Calvinists.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The kind of architectonic critique that I am advocating has been a regular part of Christian research. Some of the best Christian scholars are doing this kind of multi-layered cultural and economic critique. The first, and most obvious example is Goudzwaard's work (1979, 1984), which fits squarely in the center of Neo-Calvinist economics, and has served as an inspiration for Kuyperian scholarship for a couple of decades. Goudzwaard offers a sweeping account of the way which the idea of progress has become an idol in the industrialized world, driving a kind of capitalism that disregards higher ethical values and creating a cultural and ecological crisis. Around the same period Wilkinson collaborated on *Earthkeeping* project (1980), which is another fine example of this kind of work. It focuses on Christian environmental thought, including important insights about ecology, economics, and technology. Another example is Monsma et al.'s (1986) work on technology. Though not explicitly writing in this Neo-Calvinist tradition, you could make a good case for including Novak (1990), Barrera (2005), and Tanner (2019) in this list as well.<sup>12</sup>

If more scholars adopted this way of doing economics, they could make good use of the specialized tools economists have developed while also engaging the work of philosophers, theologians, and scholars across other disciplines. When done well, the result is a great service to the church, because it makes use of the best scholarship to better understand and respond to the most pressing problems facing us. It appears to me that there are a number of topics that would lend themselves particularly well to this kind of analysis. There is great work waiting to be done by economists exploring social media, finance, industrial animal agriculture, climate change, government regulation, inequality, government spending and debt, higher education, health care, and likely many other topics. These are the kinds of topics that spur reflection by Christians, but require considerable economic analysis to understand really well.

---

<sup>12</sup> There are a large number of works that are kindred spirits, in terms of the kind of critique they offer, but they are not explicitly Christian, such as McCloskey (2007, 2010, 2016), Piketty (2020), McMullen (2016), Claar and Forster (2019), and Deneen (2018), to choose just a few that have crossed my path recently. While these authors are ideologically quite diverse, they all share a desire to do economic/political analysis with a deep dive into the underlying philosophy and culture that supports a particular set of institutions.

The impact of Neo-Calvinist theology of culture is valuable well outside of this kind of transformative critique as well. It could be an excellent foundation for approaching more focused questions in economics, business ethics, and public policy. By offering a theologically grounded way of talking about structural problems, it could serve as a helpful common ground, perhaps between conservative and progressive Christians, much as Catholic social thought has done in some cases as well.

## REFERENCES

- Alsdorf, K. L. (2021). A Reformed Theology of Work in New York. In M. Kaemingk (Ed.), *Reformed Public Theology: A Global Vision for Life in the World* (pp. 85–96). Baker Academic.
- Ashford, B. R., & Bartholomew, C. G. (2020). *The Doctrine of Creation: A Constructive Kuyperian Approach*. IVP Academic.
- Auten, G., & Splinter, D. (2019). Top 1 Percent Income Shares: Comparing Estimates Using Tax Data. *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, 109, 307–311. <https://doi.org/10.1257/pandp.20191038>
- Barrera, A. (2005). *God Evil Scarcity: Moral Foundations of Economic Agency*. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Bolt, J. (2013). *Economic shalom: A Reformed primer on faith, work, and human flourishing* /. Christian's Library Press,.
- Bratt, J. (2013, October 12). Why I'm Sick of "Every Square Inch." *Reformed Journal: The Twelve*. <https://blog.reformedjournal.com/2013/10/12/why-im-sick-of-every-square-inch/>
- Callaway, B., & Sant'Anna, P. H. C. (2020). Difference-in-Differences with multiple time periods. *Journal of Econometrics*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.12.001>
- Cengiz, D., Dube, A., Lindner, A., & Zipperer, B. (2019). The Effect of Minimum Wages on Low-Wage Jobs\*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 134(3), 1405–1454. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjz014>
- Claar, V. V., & Forster, G. (2019). *The Keynesian Revolution and Our Empty Economy: We're All Dead*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Clemens, J., & Strain, M. R. (2021). *The Heterogeneous Effects of Large and Small Minimum Wage Changes: Evidence over the Short and Medium Run Using a Pre-Analysis Plan* (Working Paper No. 29264; Working Paper Series). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w29264>
- Corbett, S., & Fikkert, B. (2014). *When Helping Hurts: How to Alleviate Poverty Without Hurting the Poor . . . and Yourself*. Moody Publishers.

- Cramp, A. B. (1975). *Notes Toward a Critique of Secular Economic Theory* [Lectures].
- Davis, A., & McRorie, C. (2021). *Liberation Theology and Development Economics: Unlikely Allies?* [Unpublished Manuscript].
- Deneen, P. J. (2018). *Why Liberalism Failed*. Yale University Press.
- Fikkert, B., & Kapic, K. M. (2019). *Becoming Whole: Why the Opposite of Poverty Isn't the American Dream*. Moody Publishers.
- Goudzwaard, B. (1979). *Capitalism and Progress: A Diagnosis of Western Society*. Eerdmans.
- Goudzwaard, B. (1984). *Idols of our time*. Inter-Varsity Press.
- Goudzwaard, B. (2013). ECONOMICS, CHRISTIANITY AND THE CRISIS: KUYPER'S HERITAGE AND RELEVANCE TODAY. *Philosophia Reformata*, 78(2), 95–101.
- Goudzwaard, B., & Jongeneel, R. (2014). Reformed Christian Economics. In P. Oslington (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Christianity and Economics* (1 edition, pp. 206–223). Oxford University Press.
- Hardy, L. (1990). *The Fabric of This World: Inquiries into Calling, Career Choice, and the Design of Human Work*. Eerdmans.
- Hengstmengel, J. W. (2013). THE REFORMATION OF ECONOMIC THOUGHT DUTCH CALVINIST ECONOMICS, 1880–1948. *Philosophia Reformata*, 78(2), 124–143.
- Hoksbergen, R. (1992). A Reformed Approach to Economics: The Kuyperian Tradition. *Bulletin of the Association of Christian Economists*, 20, 7–27.
- Hoksbergen, R. (1994). Is There a Christian Economics?: Some Thoughts in Light of the Rise of Postmodernism. *Christian Scholars Review*, 24(2), 126–142.
- Klay, R. (1994). Comment on Tiemstra. *Bulletin of the Association of Christian Economists*, 23(Spring), 37–38.
- Klay, R., & Lunn, J. (1994). The Neoclassical Economic Model in a Postmodern World. *Christian Scholar's Review*, 24(4), 143–163.
- Kuyper, A. (1991). *The Problem of Poverty* (J. Skillen, Trans.). Baker Books.
- Kuyper, A. (2009). *Lectures on Calvinism, The Stone Lectures of 1898*. Cosimo Classics.
- Kuyper, A. (2021). *On Business & Economics* (J. J. Ballor, M. Flikkema, & P. Heslam, Eds.). Lexham Press.
- McCloskey. (2007). *The Bourgeois Virtues: Ethics for an Age of Commerce* (1st ed.). University Of Chicago Press.

- McCloskey, D. N. (2010). *Bourgeois Dignity: Why Economics Can't Explain the Modern World* (Illustrated edition). University of Chicago Press.
- McCloskey, D. N. (2016). *Bourgeois Equality: How Ideas, Not Capital or Institutions, Enriched the World* (Illustrated edition). University of Chicago Press.
- McMullen, S. (2016). *Animals and the Economy*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- McMullen, S. (2019). Objectivity and Ethics in Economic Methodology: Dialogue with Theologians. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, XXXI, 73–92.
- McMullen, S., & Steen, T. P. (2017). Does Current Economic Theory Impose a Materialistic View of Work? *Journal of Markets & Morality*, 20(1).  
<http://www.marketsandmorality.com/index.php/mandm/article/view/1255>
- Mechling, G., Miller, S., & Konecny, R. (2017). Do Piketty and Saez Misstate Income Inequality? Critiquing the Critiques. *Review of Political Economy*, 29(1), 30–46.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09538259.2017.1255439>
- Meer, J., & West, J. (2016). Effects of the Minimum Wage on Employment Dynamics. *Journal of Human Resources*, 51(2), 500–522. <https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.51.2.0414-6298R1>
- Monsma, S. V. (Ed.). (1986). *Responsible Technology: A Christian Perspective*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Mouw, R. J. (1980). *Called to Holy Worldliness*. Fortress Press.
- Mouw, R. J. (2002). *When the Kings Come Marching In: Isaiah and the New Jerusalem* (Revised edition). Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Novak, M. (1990). *The Spirit of Democratic Capitalism* (Revised). Madison Books.
- Oslington, P. (2020). The Kuyperian Dream of Reconstructing Economics on Christian Foundations. *Faith & Economics*, 75(Spring), 7–36.
- Pahman, D. (2016). Toward a Kuyperian Political Economy. *Faith & Economics*, 67.  
<http://christianeconomists.org/2016/07/01/toward-a-kuyperian-political-economy-pahman/>
- Piketty, T. (2020). *Capital and Ideology* (A. Goldhammer, Trans.). Belknap Press: An Imprint of Harvard University Press.
- Piketty, T., & Saez, E. (2003). Income Inequality in the United States, 1913–1998. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(1), 1–41.
- Plantinga, A. (2000). *Warranted Christian Belief* (1st edition). Oxford University Press.
- Richardson, J. D. (1988). Frontiers in Economics and Christian Scholarship. *Christian Scholar's Review*, XVII(4), 381–405.

- Richardson, J. D. (1994). What Should (Christian) Economists Do? *Economics! Bulletin of the Association of Christian Economists*, 23(Spring), 12–15.
- Saez, E., & Zucman, G. (2020). *Trends in US Income and Wealth Inequality: Revising After the Revisionists* (No. w27921; p. w27921). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w27921>
- Storkey, A. (1993). *Foundational Epistemologies in Consumption Theory*. VU University Press.
- Tanner, K. (2019). *Christianity and the New Spirit of Capitalism*. Yale University Press.
- Tiemstra, J. (1993). Christianity and Economics: A Review of the Recent Literature. *Christian Scholar's Review*, XXII(3).
- Tiemstra, J. (1999). Every Square Inch: Kuyperian Social Theory and Economics. In J. M. Dean & A. M. C. Waterman (Eds.), *Religion and Economics: Normative Social Theory* (pp. 85–98). Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Tiemstra, J. P. (Ed.). (1990). *Reforming Economics: Calvinist Studies on Methods and Institutions*. Edwin Mellen Pr.
- Tiemstra, J. P. (1994). What Should Christian Economists Do? Doing Economics, But Differently. *Faith & Economics*, 23(Spring), 3–8.
- Tiemstra, J. P. (1999). *Economics: A developmental approach* (2nd edition). Mohican.
- Tiemstra, J. P. (2009). Notes from the revolution: Principles of a new economics. *Faith & Economics*, 54(Fall), 19–29.
- Tiemstra, J. P. (2012). *Stories Economists Tell*. Pickwick Publications.
- Vickers, D. (1994). *Economics and the Antagonism of Time: Time, Uncertainty, and Choice in Economic Theory* (1st edition). University of Michigan Press.
- Vickers, D. (1995). *The Tyranny of the Market: A Critique of Theoretical Foundations*. University of Michigan Press.
- Vickers, D. (1997). *Economics and Ethics: An Introduction to Theory, Institutions, and Policy* (First Printing edition). Praeger.
- Waterman, A. M. C. (2021). On Economics, Theology, and Religion. *Journal of Economics, Theology and Religion*, 1(1), 13–24.
- Wolterstorff, N. (1983). *Until Justice and Peace Embrace: The Kuyper Lectures for 1981 Delivered at the Free University of Amsterdam*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Wolterstorff, N. (1988). *Reason within the Bounds of Religion* (2nd edition). Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.