

29 Hope Terrace,

Edinburgh 9

March 14th, 58

Dear Mr Terpstra,

It was good to get your letter and to know of your plans for returning to Edinburgh. Here briefly are the relevant facts about education

The schools here are of three categories

1. Corporation Schools, in which no fees are paid. They are run under the Education Authority by the City and are good. Our second child, Eileen, is attending a Corporation school at Bruntsfield.
2. Private schools, all the way from elementary to secondary (high school). These charge expensive fees (according to our standards) i.e. from about £30 to £100 per session. The fees are nearer the second figure.
3. A special type of school, roughly classed as Merchant Company, which is partly endowed and partly geared to Education Authority. These charge fees but not so expensive fees as the private schools. The secondary or post-eleven schools, they are generally better than the Corporation schools. Andrew is at one of these - George Heriot's. Fees are about £30 per session. There are boys schools and girls schools. The Corporation schools are all co-educational.

We suggest that Bruntsfield school would be most suitable for both Michael and Merrill and we would be glad to speak for you at once, if you let us know. My wife is a teacher and thinks well of Bruntsfield. I imagine the best thing would be for Michael to study for what we call the Qualifying or post eleven exam. He is likely to be about the same stage as the children some months younger here, because we start at 5 here. But all this can be looked into when he comes. If he wanted to go to a boys school, he might like to try Heriot's, although there is very serious competition for places. It is necessary to be over here for about the beginning of August in order that they may start Corporation schools in third week of August and other schools early September.

Do write and let us know whether we can do anything.

You have had a hard time, it seems. I trust that you will make good the losses and that you will find renewed faith and courage for your task.

Mrs Duthie is in Oxford at the moment where her sister has just had a baby. We miss our Mama!

Our love to you all and God's richest blessing

Yours sincerely,

Charles Duthie

AN AIR LETTER SHOULD NOT CONTAIN ANY ENCLOSURE; IF IT DOES IT WILL BE SURCHARGED OR SENT BY ORDINARY MAIL.

Sender's name and address:

21 C. S. Duthie  
29 Wye Ter  
Bundaberg Q.

Second fold here

Rev. Greater Testaments  
Paraphrase Duthie,  
Eastern Harbour Islands  
1 West Cemetery, Paraphrase



THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

A PERSONALIST DOCTRINE OF PROVIDENCE:  
KARL BARTH'S CHURCH DOGMATICS III.3  
IN CONVERSATION WITH PHILOSOPHICAL THEOLOGY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCE  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
SCHOOL OF DIVINITY

BY

DARREN M. KENNEDY

EDINBURGH, SCOTLAND

7 AUGUST 2007

In 1969, Charles Duthie wrote a brief summary of Barth's doctrine of providence.<sup>17</sup> He consistently criticizes Barth for the incoherence of his claim that God is fully transcendent and sovereign even as the human agent acts freely. Duthie asks, 'In his endeavour to do justice to the lordship of God, does [Barth] do less than justice to human freedom and activity?'<sup>18</sup> Duthie reasons,

Barth does not take proper account [sic] of what may be called the tensional because truly personal relationship between God and man. It is a relationship which by its very nature gives to man the opportunity either to co-operate or to resist. He can say yes or he can say no to God.<sup>19</sup>

Duthie's use of 'tensional', 'co-operate' and 'resist' all indicate an understanding of the divine and human agents in competition or conflict. In such a framework of conflict, Duthie concludes that Barth's emphasis on divine sovereignty must lead to the conclusion that nothing is left for the human agent: genuine freedom is an illusion. Duthie reasons that the human person is lost in Barth's doctrine of providence.<sup>20</sup>

Duthie's concluding remarks reveal his own presuppositions and over-riding concerns,

...we find it disappointing because it does not correspond to what we take to be reasoned and reasonable Christian apologetic. We find it too often to be full of confident assertions which are not properly grounded.<sup>21</sup>

This passage adds more criticisms. Barth's doctrine of providence does not fit Duthie's presupposed conception of 'reasoned and reasonable Christian apologetic.' Essentially, Duthie claims Barth's doctrine of providence lacks rationality.<sup>22</sup>

Duthie further accuses Barth of expounding a truth which 'is left suspended in the air, unrelated to the life which we live on earth'.<sup>23</sup> He reasons that unless God can be brought into the causal nexus of our lives, there cannot be any rational talk of God's agency in the world. This philosophical critique challenges the pastoral value

---

<sup>17</sup> Charles Duthie, 'Providence in the Theology of Karl Barth,' in Providence ed. Maurice Wiles (London: SPCK, 1969), 62ff.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 73.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 74.

<sup>20</sup> Hartwell is more sympathetic to Barth, but comes to the same basic conclusion: 'The proposition that man's acknowledgment of God's sovereignty is a necessary condition of his freedom is a contradiction in terms.'

of providence. Such a doctrine cannot comfort a suffering Christian. Barth consistently references the 1755 Lisbon earthquake as the experience which destroyed older, more optimistic understandings of providence, lamenting their pastoral deficiency.<sup>24</sup> Therefore, the pastoral value is important to Barth and the critique would be devastating if valid.