

Christianity and Hayek

Kenneth G. Elzinga

University of Virginia

Matthew R. Givens

Healthways, Nashville, TN

Abstract: *We discuss the influence of a Christian worldview on the work of F.A. Hayek. A classical liberal, Hayek spent his life defining and defending a standard of liberty that, while distinct from its Christian counterpart, nonetheless depended upon the creation and continuance of a moral society to uphold it. In fact, much of the Hayekian framework relies upon Christian presuppositions. Similar to Christianity, Hayek supported both a high and low view of man, but his ideas were rooted in orthodoxy as well as evolution. Though Hayek was a self-professed agnostic, we show that his treatment of individual liberty was more consistent with a Judeo-Christian worldview than with that of his naturalist peers and postmodernist successors. JEL: A13, B25, B53. Keywords: Hayek, Christianity, naturalism, evolution.*

Throughout his scholarly career, F.A. Hayek labored to understand the relationship between human behavior, individual liberty, and the economy. A Nobel laureate in economics, Hayek became the kind of economist of whom Keynes (1936) wrote:

The ideas of economists and political philosophers . . . are more powerful than is commonly understood. Indeed the world is ruled by little else. Practical men, who believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influence, are usually the slaves of some defunct economist (p. 38).

While people are not “slaves” to Hayek’s ideas, and Hayek is not a defunct economist, millions of ordinary people, (Keynes’s “practical men”) unwittingly live under the influence of this academic scribbler (see, for example, Hayek, 1948; 1960; 1988).

Authors’ Note: *Elzinga is Robert C. Taylor Professor of Economics at the University of Virginia. Givens is a Financial Analyst at Healthways in Nashville, TN. Much of this research was done while Givens was a Trinity Fellow in Charlottesville, Virginia. Part of it was completed while Elzinga was Vernon F. Taylor Visiting Professor at Trinity University. The authors are indebted to Peter Boettke, William Breit, Christopher J. Coyne, John D. Mason, those who made comments at the American Economic Association presentation, and especially Bruce Caldwell and David J. Theroux, il miglior fabbro.*

Notwithstanding his stature and accomplishments, little has been written to explain the impact that Christianity had on Hayek. Some Hayek scholars have argued that his ideas can be positioned *within* a Christian worldview (VanDrunen, 2002; Klay & Lunn, 2003).¹ Our research takes a different course and discusses whether Hayek's thought has been influenced *by* a Christian worldview.

It would be idle even to suggest that the Hayekian framework of analysis mimics Christian orthodoxy. For the most part, Hayek wrote as though the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob did not exist. In Hayek's adult life, he did not participate in worship services, confess a Christian creed, or take the sacraments. His philosophy of classical liberalism stressed the importance of liberty. But Hayek ascribed a different meaning to liberty than do the Christian scriptures. Hayek understood freedom to be the "state in which a man is not subject to coercion by the arbitrary will of another or others" (Hayek, 1960). Biblical freedom, on the other hand, can be understood as being set free from the curse and destructiveness of human sinfulness.²

Hayek was a self-pronounced agnostic, yet Christianity was influential in the Hayekian framework. Even though Hayek abandoned a personal faith in a revelatory God, his hope for a "constitution of liberty" depended upon the creation and continuance of a moral society that would extend and uphold liberty. Moreover, though Hayek did not have a high view of the Bible, his concept of mankind originated within the Judeo-Christian worldview. His constitution of liberty cannot be squared with naturalism where mankind is, at root, nothing more than the product of molecular processes and physical laws. Hayek's greatest contribution as a scholar was a life spent defining and defending a standard of liberty. In doing so, he often relied on Christian presuppositions to make his point (Ebenstein, 2001, p. 163).

1 Background

F. A. Hayek was born in 1899 to an aristocratic, well-to-do Austrian family. While he grew up in a nominally Roman Catholic home (Ebenstein, 2001, p. 13), several of his family members were scientists who adhered to an evolutionary worldview.³ His domestic environment led the young Hayek to be interested in biology, ecology, and physics (Hayek, 1994). Later, Hayek would study other subjects as he went through school and would become interested in economics, law, and psychology.

At the age of ten, Hayek was wrestling with questions most boys did not take seriously until they were young men. He began to consider the

case for Christianity because of an influential and persuasive teacher at the *Gymnasium* he attended (Hayek, 1994, p. 41). Through the guidance of his godly teacher, Hayek came under the conviction of sin and began to question his need for a Savior (Hayek, 1994, p. 41). But by the age of fifteen, Hayek's inquiries about God came to an end because no one could respond satisfactorily to his questions (Hayek, 1994, p. 40; Ebenstein, 2001, p. 13). In addition, his family discouraged any commitment to Christianity. Hayek remembers being given a Bible for the first time as a child, but the book had disappeared by the time he became interested in reading it (Hayek, 1994, p. 40).

After forsaking Christianity to become an agnostic,⁴ Hayek stated later in life that he was hostile to religion: "So far as I do feel hostile to religion, it's against monotheistic religions, because they are so frightfully intolerant (Hayek, 1994, p. 42)."⁵ While this was Hayek's spoken view, his writings reveal a more conciliatory position. He rejected religion personally, but thought it was necessary within the social context of liberty, leading some to claim this was a contradiction. Indeed, while Hayek claimed that he thought no one could know and understand God,⁶ the question of religion never fully left him.

In *The Fatal Conceit* (1988), the last book written before his death, Hayek describes the influence of religious beliefs in a functioning society.

Like it or not, we owe the persistence of certain practices, and the civilization that resulted from them, in part to support from beliefs which are not true—or verifiable or testable—in the same sense as are scientific statements, and which are certainly not the result of rational argumentation.... They did help their adherents to "be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it" (Gen. 1:28). Even those among us, like myself, who are not prepared to accept the anthropomorphic conception of a *personal divinity* [emphasis added] ought to admit that the premature loss of what we regard as nonfactual beliefs would have deprived mankind of a powerful support in the long development of the extended order that we now enjoy, and that even now the loss of these beliefs, whether true or false, creates great difficulties (p. 137).⁷

In the West, the "personal divinity" that Hayek referenced in *The Fatal Conceit* was found in the Christian faith, which is centered on the One True God, displayed in His Son Jesus. Moral deterioration within a nation or society, in Hayek's words, "creates great difficulties." He conceded that religion and morality established by tradition could not only

help spontaneously govern the affairs of men but also provide a “powerful support of the extended order.” He believed it was through spontaneous order (i.e., trial and error) that society developed the religious institutions and moral fiber necessary for liberty to thrive.⁸ While Hayek doubted the existence of a “personal divinity,”⁹ he acknowledged the contribution of religious belief to a free society.

2 Influences

In Hayek’s development as a child in Austria, he was surrounded by a Catholic Christian culture that affected him throughout his younger years. The religious tradition that existed in pre-World War I Austria trained young people in the catechism of Catholicism. Hayek necessarily was a part of this tradition’s passage from one generation to the next. He understood that such traditions influenced even those who did not perceive them to be important or true (Hayek, 1988, ch. 9).¹⁰

Another influence in Hayek’s development was evolutionary thought. His family was brimming with scientists who believed strongly in evolution. This family milieu helped form and generate his convictions about social evolution and spontaneous order. Nevertheless, Hayek did not begin writing explicitly about evolution and its social implications until the 1950s.¹¹

As a young man, Hayek was a Fabian socialist (Ebenstein, 2003, p. 41). His views changed after sitting under the influence of Ludwig von Mises and attending Mises’s famous seminar.¹¹ Mises and Hayek became friends and discussed economic ideas together. The two of them represent the twin pillars of twentieth century Austrian economics. They had their differences because Mises was a utilitarian rationalist and Hayek was a social evolutionist (Ebenstein, 2003, p. 54), but Mises’s influence on Hayek was considerable, and Hayek always respected his teacher. Both men kept their eyes on the same goal: understanding the case for individual liberty. Christianity, as well, makes a case for a “constitution of liberty.” Indeed, Christianity claims that Jesus Christ came to set men free.¹²

Mises was not Hayek’s only significant teacher. Hayek wanted to study under Max Weber, whose book, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, had argued that Christianity was the soil that enabled capitalism to grow and thrive. Weber’s iconic thesis was that the Protestant Reformation had generated a religious influence that supported the growth and development of capitalism. In contrast, Weber claimed, earlier medieval Catholic influences were more hostile to the market system. Weber made a lasting impression on all who came after him, Hayek

included.¹³ Unfortunately for Hayek, Weber died the summer after Hayek's graduation, before he had the opportunity to study one-on-one with him (Caldwell, 2003, p. 141).¹⁴ Nonetheless, Weber's influence helped Hayek make the connection that Christianity is important (1) for the protection of liberty and (2) for providing society with a moral compass by which it could facilitate the production of wealth.

Notwithstanding his personal rejection of Christian belief and piety, Hayek was willing to identify with other liberal thinkers who were Catholic Christians. One example involved the origin of the Mont Pelerin Society and how this influential group would choose to name itself. According to Ebenstein (2001),

Recalling how Frank Knight of the University of Chicago blocked his [Hayek's] proposal to name the emerging association the "Acton-Tocqueville Society," Hayek later mentioned "one amusing episode about Frank Knight." When I called that first meeting on Mont Pelerin, I had already the idea we might turn this into a permanent society, and I proposed that it would be called the Acton-Tocqueville Society, after the two most representative figures. Frank Knight put up the greatest indignation, "You can't call a liberal movement after two Catholics!" And he completely defeated it; he made it impossible. Cockett reports that "only a few support[ed] Hayek's original proposal of the 'Acton-Tocqueville Society,' others favoring the names Burke and Smith" (p. 146).

The creation of the Mont Pelerin Society was not only in response to socialist economic policies, but it also was "fostered by the growth of a view of history which decries all absolute moral standards."¹⁵ The society Hayek helped found wanted to promote the "essential *moral* and economic origins" (Machlup, 1976, pp. xii–xiii, emphasis added) on which the foundation of a free and virtuous society was to be established and sustained.

Many discussions amongst the members of the Mont Pelerin Society were centered on topics of morality, Christianity, and liberty. There was a consensus that the emergence and protection of liberty could not have taken place apart from a nation's moral foundations. In the West, Christianity supplied that moral foundation.

Though Hayek personally rejected the Christian faith, he did not reject the connection between law and morality, and markets and liberty.¹⁶ Hayek acknowledged that law and morality were central to the success of liberty.¹⁷ His later writings put the horse of morality before the cart of liberty.

3 View of Man

The most striking connection between Hayek and Christianity is their common view of man. Hayek understood that individual economic agents were limited in their understanding of the world about them. Based on this fundamental premise, Hayek constructed a case for freedom and a case against central authority. He sought to undermine the socialist doctrine that someone, purportedly possessing superior knowledge, could centrally order the affairs of others. Hayek showed that the spontaneous ordering of systems and institutions that freedom allowed would be the means of progress in society. This is central to Hayek's view of economics and his understanding of liberty.

At the time, due to the impact of the Enlightenment and the onset of modernity many years before, the conventional wisdom was anthropocentric — focused on a high view of man and his ability to reason. Hayek re-examined this conventional wisdom and instituted a reversion to a view that was first articulated in the Judeo-Christian worldview. When Hayek wrote “Economics and Knowledge,” he split from the prevailing intellectual norm whose view of mankind was based on rationalistic-positivistic philosophies. The direction he took was Biblical.¹⁸

The Bible claims that the heart of man is “deceitful above all things” (Jer. 17:9), yet at the same time describes man as having been “created a little lower than the angels” (Ps. 8:5; Heb. 2:9). This congruity runs through the Old and New Testaments. The genius of Hayek is that he also was able to hold this same balanced perspective of reality, adhering both to a high and a low view of man.

Hayek's *low* view of man is derived from his understanding of man's limitations. He understood that human action was systemically bounded by ignorance and uncertainty. Hayek put it this way: “Our necessary ignorance of so much means that we have to deal largely with probabilities and chances” (Hayek, 1960, p. 29).

Hayek's *high* view of man is seen in his unwillingness to consider men and women as automatons. Horowitz (2001) summarizes Hayek's view:

The market is not the arena in which atomistic maximizers blindly collide, hoping against hope to produce some sort of optimal static equilibrium outcome. Rather, it is part of the human conversation, a process through which we overcome the limits of our minds and engage in cooperative behavior to create, produce, and exchange. By providing others with indirect knowledge via market prices, we allow them to make use of that knowledge and construct their plans accordingly” (pp. 94–95).

In his later years, Hayek explained:

What is essential to the functioning of the process is that each individual be able to act on his particular knowledge, always unique, at least so far as it refers to some particular circumstances, and that he be able to use his individual skills and opportunities within the limits known to him and for his own individual purpose (Horowitz, 2001, p. 29).

Hayek believed that the limitations of man's knowledge are diminished through market processes because economic agents share information through the price mechanism. By this sharing of information, individuals can better (as he put it) "construct their plans." These individual "plans" are not centrally directed. Nor are the plans of individuals fully realized. Hayek contended that "our faith in freedom does not rest on the foreseeable results in particular circumstances but on the belief that it will, on balance, release more forces for the good than for the bad" (Horowitz, 2001, p. 31). Hayek wrote that, "Man learns by the disappointment of expectations" (Horowitz, 2001, p. 30).

And what does man learn through this disappointment? Disappointments reveal that each person is in fact limited in his or her capabilities. Whether in the Hayekian system or that of Christian theology, no individual is positioned at the center of society. A "disappointment of expectations" is basic to the Hayekian system. A "disappointment of expectations" also is fundamental to the Christian religion. It is nothing more and nothing less than the doctrine of the Fall.¹⁹

While Hayek places his faith in liberty, it is a faith in the outcome of the spontaneous coordination of all individuals because no one person has sufficient knowledge to be the coordinator. This view is parallel to, but not orthogonal to, the Christian belief that God orchestrates the economy for His purposes because no one has enough knowledge to do so. Ebenstein (2003) recognized this nexus between the Hayekian system and the Christian faith when he wrote:

Hayek's view of humanity had congruities with Christianity, to the extent that the latter, too, emphasizes human insignificance or inadequacy. The gulf between God and man is absolute in the Old Testament. While Hayek's view of human insignificance was more from an intellectual perspective than from a moral one (though he certainly recognized human weakness in this area), his general emphasis on individual human inadequacy is shared by many conservative and religious thinkers and writers (p. 195).

Another way of putting it is this: Hayek's *The Fatal Conceit* and the Bible's Tower of Babel teach much the same lesson. The result of man's thinking too highly of himself leads to the destruction of society, whether (as in Hayek's case) that destruction is via the centralized and subversive controlling of the state which undermines the spontaneous order, or (as in Christianity's case), by the destruction resulting from the denial of the existence of a sovereign God who rules over all things and upholds them for His purpose.²⁰

4 Christian View of Man

The Christian view of man is established upon the principle that mankind, created in the image of God²¹ (Gen. 1–2), has been designed to rule and subdue the earth (Gen. 1:28) and to reflect the image of God in creation. Mankind has inherent worth and value, and is designed with a unique blend of mind, body, and soul. This squares with Hayek's high view of individuals.

In Christianity, because of the influence of original sin, all people come up short of the glory of God (Rom. 1, 3:10–18, 3:23). This squares with Hayek's low view of mankind. The high-low nexus is both Hayekian and Christian. The low view supports Hayek's *The Fatal Conceit*; the high view provokes Hayek's *The Constitution of Liberty*.

The mechanics of social order, according to Hayek, involve spontaneous coordination and are the consequence of a social evolution of trial and error. The Christian view drills deeper. The social order, at its taproot, involves a sovereign God who created all things for His own glory and apart from Him nothing exists or holds together (Col. 1:27; Acts 17:25).

In establishing a Christian view of economics there are many Biblical concepts that are not found specifically in the Hayekian system (see Novak, 1982). Nevertheless, consistent with Hayek, a Christian view of the economic order presupposes freedom based on economic agents having a moral compass. According to the Christian faith, one of God's purposes in creating mankind was to have viceroys on earth who would "rule and subdue" (Gen. 1:28). But the Christian view of the economic order is not utopian; because of the shortcomings of mankind, there will always be "the poor among us" (John 12:8), corruption, and the abuse of power. These have been present since the Fall of Adam.

Hayek implicitly adopted the Biblical presupposition of the Fall of Adam. He never hinted that humans were perfectible; he never hinted that there was a utopia to be humanly engineered. As a consequence, Hayek believed it was better to have a free society which tolerated these evils than to give up liberty in a futile attempt to suppress all human shortcomings.

Indeed, at the end of the World War II, Hayek acknowledged (in a speech at the University College Dublin), that economic progress depends as much on moral development as it does on any other economic factor.²² This parallels the conviction of one of Hayek's Christian colleagues who also was an original member of the Mont Pelerin Society: the German economist Wilhelm Röpke. In describing the challenge of modernity, Röpke wrote "we shall certainly need a high amount of technical progress and international political and economic organization, but we also shall need values which transcend supply and demand" (Schasching, 1996).

For Hayek and many classical liberals, the idea of liberty is framed primarily as restraining central authority and giving individuals the freedom to choose. This begs the question: how is moral society created and sustained if authority is limited? Hayek would say (1) the process is evolutionary and (2) there is no guarantee that moral progress will occur.²³ For Christians, freedom is to obey the moral commands of God and by God's power to bear good fruit. This fruit includes love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control (Gal. 5:22–23).

The Hayekian system of evolving moral traditions,²⁴ like all evolutionary systems, cannot generate an external standard of evaluation. Christianity, as a religion that claims divine revelation, affords an external benchmark. This is an important difference between a Christian view of economics and Hayek's view.

5 Hayek and Naturalism

Notwithstanding the influence of evolution on Hayek's thinking and Hayek's rejection of personal faith in God, he was unable to take atheism to the destination it now has traveled: where man is a natural organism in a self-contained physical universe that functions without destiny or ultimate purpose (for examples, see Dawkins, 1989; 2006; Dennett, 1995). Hayek never explicitly adopted the reductionism and relativism inherent in such a naturalistic worldview. David Theroux accurately describes Hayek as a "naturalist" but one who "always kept one foot in pre-modernism."²⁵ Hayek's foot in pre-modernism is a foot in a Christian worldview.

Hayek would have been uncomfortable describing humans as essentially survival machines. To be sure, he also would have been uncomfortable describing humans as children of the living God. Hayek was caught between the two and never resolved the dilemma. But his pre-modern view kept him from post-modern flirtations with the nihilism of a purposeless universe.

In spite of his exposure to the natural sciences, Hayek never became a

thorough-going naturalist. He never believed (like Nietzsche) that man is “beyond good and evil” or (like B.F. Skinner) that man is “beyond freedom and dignity.” *The Fatal Conceit* and *The Constitution of Liberty* make no sense in a world beyond good and evil and beyond freedom and dignity. Hayek’s *The Road to Serfdom* makes no sense in a universe without purpose—one that cares not if men become serfs.

What Hayek lacked is what C. S. Lewis (2001a), the erstwhile skeptic, found when he examined the Christian faith: a way out of the reductionism of naturalism. Lewis, describing naturalism, writes:

The Naturalist thinks that nothing but Nature exists, the word *Nature* means to him merely “everything” or “the whole show” or whatever there is ... [so that any event] happens because some other event has happened None of them exists “on its own” or “goes on of its own accord” [Consequently] no thoroughgoing Naturalist believes in free will: free will would mean that human beings have the power of independent action, the power of doing something more or other than what was involved by the total series of events. And any such separate power or originating events is what the Naturalist denies. Spontaneity, originality, action “on its own,” is a privilege reserved for “the whole show,” which he calls *Nature* (pp. 6–8).

Theroux (2007) shows how C. S. Lewis offers an escape for Hayek.²⁶ Lewis’s *The Abolition of Man* (2001b) is antithesis to the thesis that man’s ideas and behavior are purely and only the consequence of physical events. Rodney Stark’s *The Victory of Reason* (2005) offers further escape. Stark shows how the Christian invention of the university promoted the scientific revolution in the West, rendering not only compatible but synergistic the pursuit of scientific inquiry *and* the practice of religion.

Though he rejected the Christian faith, Hayek adopted the position, unique to Christianity, that every person is “a child of God” and therefore has value apart from his family, tribe, clan, or nation. This affords a foundation for modern economic analysis because methodological individualism makes little sense apart from a person “who has a free will and is responsible for the choices he or she makes” (Theroux, 2007).

Hayek implicitly understood this. But he saw, as it were, through a glass darkly. Unlike Lewis, Hayek never openly adopted the dualism that would have given meaning to human action and not reduced free will to an illusion. Theistic dualism, as Theroux explains, allows both “material and immaterial, natural and supernatural, physical and metaphysical reality” (Theroux, 2007, p. 53).

6 Hayek's Death

In Ebenstein (2001) there is a photograph of Hayek's tombstone in the Neustift am Wald Cemetery in Vienna.²⁷ Given Hayek's proclamation of agnosticism, the cross, clearly visible on his tombstone, is also visibly jarring. Was there a last-minute conversion? Did the unanswered questions of his boyhood find answers? To the best we can tell, the cross on Hayek's tombstone reflects the preferences of his wife and not his own.²⁸ While it is not "left to man to judge," Hayek probably died an agnostic. Nonetheless, by being one of the twentieth century's greatest scholars of liberty, Hayek's writings helped nurture a society in which followers of the Christian faith have the freedom to pursue the teachings of their faith.

7 Conclusions

Christianity made a lasting impression on F. A. Hayek as he developed his views on liberty. Part of this influence came through his upbringing in the Christian West. Hayek also was influenced by evolutionists who helped him define the limitation of man's knowledge and the spontaneous order tradition. Many of Hayek's conclusions about liberty square with the Christian faith, though Hayek, as an agnostic, would have no credal conviction as to the chief end of man.²⁹

Hayek and the Christian faith both acknowledge a high and a low view of man. While Hayek would not recognize man as "being a little lower than the angels," he clearly believed man had a value worthy of being accorded liberty. Those created in God's image merit freedom from "bad men." But in a world affected by the fall of Adam, how can this happen? This is the question Hayek sought to answer.

For Hayek, individuals did not exist to serve the state. On the other hand, Hayek recognized the limited abilities of men and women. He never acknowledged human beings as "fallen" in the Genesis sense of that term.³⁰ But Hayek understood that no man had the omniscience to rule others. Early in his career, he wrote these words:

It would scarcely be too much to claim that the main merit of the individualism which [Adam Smith] and his contemporaries advocated is that it is a system under which bad men can do least harm. It is a social system which does not depend for its functioning on our finding good men for running it, or on all men becoming better than they now are, but which makes use of men in all their given variety and complexity, sometimes good and sometimes bad, sometimes intelligent and more often stupid (Hayek, 1948, p. 12).

“Sometimes good and sometimes bad” is not the total depravity of man propounded by the Reformers. But it is a doctrine of man much closer to the Christian scriptures than the Enlightenment perspective held by many of Hayek’s intellectual peers and the postmodernist perspective held by many of Hayek’s intellectual successors.

Endnotes

- 1 Hayek’s interdisciplinary research program allowed him to be open to the role of religion and Christianity as an important influence in social processes. We are indebted to Christopher Coyne for underscoring this point.
- 2 See Is. 61:1; Rom. 8:21; Gal. 5:1; 1 Pet. 2:16. Christians believe that freedom only comes by faith in Jesus Christ, the God-man who lived a perfect life and died in order to take the place of sinners, consuming God’s just wrath against sin (Rom. 3:21–28).
- 3 Historically, the Roman Catholic view of evolution has entailed less hostility than the current status of the debate around the American culture wars. Catholics have professed faith in God as Creator but leave open the possibility of God-directed evolution, excluding the creation of the soul, which cannot have evolved.
- 4 An example of Hayek’s agnosticism has been discussed in Macedo (1999), quoting Hayek from *The Fatal Conceit*: “The conception of a man-like or mind-like acting being appears to me rather the product of an arrogant overestimation of the capacities of a man-like mind. I cannot attach meaning to words that in the structure of my own thinking, or in my picture of the world, have no place that would give them meaning.... The source of order is not outside the physical world but one of its characteristics” (pp. 139–40).
- 5 Christianity, whose godhead is Trinitarian (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit), would have been considered a “monotheistic” religion by Hayek.
- 6 Within the Christian worldview there is a distinction made concerning the knowledge of God. There is both general revelation (what is revealed in creation) and special revelation (what is revealed in the Bible). Rom. 1:18ff concludes that through creation this is enough knowledge of God (including being created in God’s image) that a person is without excuse when it comes to knowing God, generally. However, because of the depth of man’s sinfulness and his limitation, special revelation is required for one to truly know God in His person. This includes the necessity that God transforms a person’s heart in order that he might believe (Eph. 2:1–9; 2 Cor. 4:4–6). See also chap. 14 of *The Westminster Confession* (Williamson, 1964).

- 7 David J. Theroux cautions against relying on *The Fatal Conceit* as representing Hayek's views. Because the manuscript was rewritten by William Bartley after Hayek's death, "it is unclear what in the book is Hayek and what is Bartley" (D.J. Theroux, personal communication, December 18, 2006). In their paper about Hayek and the role of religion in the social order, Iannaccone and Subrick (2006) reference only *The Fatal Conceit* among Hayek's writings.
- 8 The prolonged process of trial and error was consistent with Hayek's evolutionary worldview. This view runs counter to Christian orthodoxy that a triune God acting in history revealed a moral code to a chosen people who in turn were to be a light to the nations.
- 9 For Hayek to acknowledge a "personal divinity" would require him to give an account for his own morality, as it does for each of us. This is a major reason that his rejection was so strong and yet he held out hope that through religion, liberty would be established within a society.
- 10 This theme is consistent throughout the entire chapter that Hayek dedicated to it.
- 11 B. Caldwell, personal communication: "Given his background, this was a puzzle that I tried to unravel in the book [Caldwell, 2003]."
- 12 Caldwell (2003) writes: "After 1924, and until he left for England in 1931, Friedrich Hayek was a regular participant" (p. 120).
- 13 John 8:32; Rom. 6:22, 8:2; Gal. 5:1; Heb. 9:15.
- 14 B. Caldwell, personal communication: "You may wonder, then, why I spent so much time on Weber in the book. There were a couple of reasons. Weber was important as an internal critic of the German Historical School, and the Austrians accepted his criticisms and repeated them. Next, he was important for Mises, whose own methodological position may be viewed in part as a response to, criticism and further development of, Weber's position. All of this was important in a book on Hayek's methodological thinking, which is a big part of what my book is about, because it is the background that he knew about but that would not be familiar to most readers of today."
- 15 "Statement of Aims of Mont Pelerin Society, April 8, 1947," as reprinted in Machlup (1976, pp. xii–xiii).
- 16 This was even more the case with Frank Knight, who could never escape the question of religion. See Nelson (2001, p. 525).
- 17 See Hayek (1988, chap. 9 and appendix G), as well as Hayek (1960, chap. 4), where he develops this argument and the direct relationship between morality and liberty.
- 18 One of the testimonies that the Bible makes for itself is that it describes reality accurately. When Hayek reverted to the Biblical view of man, he was doing so to describe the reality about man. Though he did not claim to follow Christianity, one cannot disconnect the relationship that exists in describing this reality.

- 19 The Christian doctrine of the Fall is best described as the transfer of humans, in Adam and Eve, from a holy and happy state with God into a state of complete sinfulness because of man's free choice to disobey God. All of humanity is by nature sinful and in need of a complete reversal, only possible because of Jesus Christ's death and God's gift of faith in Him. The disappointment of expectations in the Christian understanding is the inability of sinners to please God apart from His work to redeem them. This orthodoxy is displayed in *The Westminster Confession*, chap. 6 (Williamson, 1964).
- 20 This is the discussion in Rom. 1:18–32 of man exchanging the glory of God for the glory of man.
- 21 Imago Dei, the image of God, is the foundation for understanding what it means to be human as well as the support for liberty, freedom, and rights.
- 22 "Individualism: True and False," the Twelfth Finlay Lecture, delivered at University College, Dublin, on December 17, 1945. Published in Hayek (1948).
- 23 Sacks (2000) describes both the case for support of markets and the case against limitation of markets, from a Jewish perspective. Sacks describes the tension that exists within markets that is analogous to the tension in the two-fold view of man both in Christianity and in Hayek. This tension is answered only when the outcomes of freedom and economy are addressed. We are indebted to John Mason for calling this article to our attention.
- 24 "Of these conventions and customs of human intercourse, the moral rules are the most important but by no means the only significant ones. We understand one another and get along with one another, are able to act successfully on our plans, because, most of the time, members of our civilization conform to unconscious patterns of conduct" (Hayek, 1960, p. 62). The complement that Christianity brings to Hayek's description of religious values and morals (patterns of conduct) is an actual benchmark to measure the moral status of society. We are indebted to Christopher Coyne for this quote.
- 25 David J. Theroux, personal communication, December 18, 2006.
- 26 For other economists who have one foot in naturalism's de-humanization of man and the other foot in what Mises called "human action," Theroux shows the link between Lewis and classical economists from Say to Buchanan and Tullock. See also Aeschliman (1998).
- 27 Picture 12 (no page).
- 28 Our entreaties for information to the Neustift am Wald cemetery went unanswered. We are indebted to Bruce Caldwell for the hypothesis presented here.
- 29 While Hayek's spontaneous order was evolving and adapting, it had no end-game objective. In *The Westminster Confession*, the chief end of

man is said to be “to know God and enjoy Him forever” (Williamson, 1964).

30 For a brilliant commentary on the Adamic fall, see Kass (2003, chaps. 1–3).

References

- Aeschliman, M.** (1998). *The restitution of man: C.S. Lewis and the case against scientism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Caldwell, B.** (2003). *Hayek's challenge: An intellectual biography of F.A. Hayek*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dawkins, R.** (1989). *The selfish gene*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dawkins, R.** (2006). *The God delusion*. London: Bantam Books.
- Dennett, D. C.** (1995). *Darwin's dangerous idea*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Ebenstein, A. O.** (2001). *Friedrich Hayek: A biography*. New York: Palgrave.
- Ebenstein, A. O.** (2003). *Hayek's journey: The mind of Friedrich Hayek*. New York: Palgrave.
- Hayek, F. A.** (1948). *Individualism and economic order*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hayek, F. A.** (1994). *Hayek on Hayek: An autobiographical dialogue* (S. Kresge & L. Wenar, Eds.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hayek, F. A.** (1960). *The constitution of liberty*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hayek, F. A.** (1988). *The fatal conceit: The errors of socialism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Horowitz, S.** (2001). From Smith to Menger to Hayek: Liberalism in the spontaneous order tradition. *The Independent Review*, 6(1), 81–97.
- Iannaccone, L., & Subrick, J. R.** (2006). *From Smith to Hayek to Smith: Lessons for the social order* (George Mason University Working Paper). Fairfax, VA: George Mason University.
- Kass, L.** (2003). *The beginning of wisdom: Reading Genesis*. New York: Free Press.
- Keynes, J. M.** (1936). *The general theory of employment, interest, and money*. London: Macmillan.
- Klay, R., & Lunn, J.** (2003). The relationship of God's providence to market economics and economic theory. *Journal of Markets & Morality*, 6(2), 541–64.
- Lewis, C. S.** (2001a). *Miracles: A preliminary study*. San Francisco: Harper Collins.
- Lewis, C. S.** (2001b). *The abolition of man*. San Francisco: Harper Collins.

- Macedo, S.** (1999). Hayek's liberal legacy. *Cato Journal*, 19(2), 289–300.
- Machlup, F.** (Ed.). (1976). *Essays on Hayek*. New York: New York University Press.
- Nelson, R. H.** (2001). Frank Knight and original sin. *The Independent Review*, 6(1), 5–25.
- Novak, M.** (1982). *The spirit of democratic capitalism*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Sacks, J.** (2000). Markets and morals. *First Things*, 105, 23–28.
- Schasching, S. J.** (1996). The Church and the market. *Religion & Liberty*, 6(6), 9–10.
- Stark, R.** (2005). *The victory of reason: How Christianity led to freedom, capitalism, and western success*. New York: Random House.
- Theroux, D. J.** (2007). *Mere economic science: C. S. Lewis and the poverty of naturalism*. (Independent Institute Working Paper 67). Oakland, CA: The Independent Institute.
- VanDrunen, D.** (2002). Aquinas and Hayek on the limits of law: A convergence of ethical traditions. *Journal of Markets & Morality*, 5(2), 315–37.
- Williamson, G. I.** (1964). *The Westminster confession of faith for study classes*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed. ■