

in bland bromides about the importance of peace and coexistence and having little actual impact” (247). Indeed, innumerable interreligious congresses have proceeded since 1893, yet today the world remains far *more* divided by nationalist retrenchments, economic disparity, and religious sectarianism than the organizers of the first World Parliament of Religions would have predicted! In a concluding section called “But Does Interreligious Dialogue Work?,” Howard notes nine factors making it hard to declare success. Yet at the same time, Howard never reductively writes off interreligious dialogue as simply the machinations of Christian universalism, colonial power, or NGO industry marketing. Especially in the conclusion, Howard carefully affirms the sincerity, meaningful achievements, and ongoing potential of interfaith initiatives.

In sum, Howard’s historical work offers a compelling account of how interreligious dialogue has succeeded as a discursive movement while still struggling to overcome the colonial heritage and intellectual limits of the world religions paradigm.

STEPHANIE M. WONG  
 Villanova University, USA  
[stephanie.wong@villanova.edu](mailto:stephanie.wong@villanova.edu)

*Just Marriage*. By Andrew Kim. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2023. xxiii + 119 pages. \$22.00.

doi:10.1017/hor.2024.16

In *Just Marriage*, Andrew Kim operates with two presuppositions. First, in sacramental marriages, there should be a presumption for endurance. Arguing against a cultural belief that marriages should be ended whenever they are not fulfilling, Kim says that Christians should stay together in almost every circumstance. However, staying together is not easy because, his second presupposition, there is a “sword between the sexes” (18). Thus, staying together means negotiating conflict.

These presuppositions lead to the primary argument of *Just Marriage*: just war criteria help to address conflict in marriage. For right intention, chapter 1, couples should intend forgiveness and reconciliation. For just cause, chapter 2, couples must discern the appropriate time to initiate conflict. Coupled with the right intentions, one spouse may begin a conflict to prevent a future, greater conflict. Think of this situation as one spouse addressing a problem before it builds to something worse. Before engaging in conflict, though, spouses

should calculate the probability of success, discussed in chapter 3. Some disagreements may not be resolved or may not be significant enough to engage, so it would be better to forgo conflict for the sake of the overall durability of marriage.

When conflict is engaged, however, the means should be proportionate. In chapter 4, Kim notes that there are “some forms of behavior that are to be ruled out as never proportionate to the end of reconciliation” (52). These forms include physical violence. The fighting should also be discriminate, per chapter 6, so spouses do not draw children into their conflict. A conflict should be initiated only by the proper authority, per chapter 7. Here, Kim moves away from the man being the head of the marriage and so the proper authority in marital conflicts. Instead, Kim argues for a “domain-specific” (74) authority, where the spouse that is more capable in the area of conflict is the proper authority. Also in chapter 7, Kim affirms that conflict should be a last resort but warns against self-deception. Spouses can narrate a situation to highlight their innocence, their partner’s guilt, and, thereby, justify the conflict.

In the last two chapters, Kim moves beyond the just war framework for marital conflict. In chapter 8, he explores chastity. He argues that violations of chastity are, at their core, pride (94). One spouse puts their own interests above the other, and this lack of mutuality inevitably causes conflict. Kim concludes the book with an epilogue arguing that “just conflict in marriage may be thought of as a practical application of the beatitudes” (97).

In *Just Marriage*, Kim has taken a creative approach in applying just war criteria to marital conflict. It has two key benefits. First, it draws attention to conflict in marriage, a reality that is too often neglected by theologians. Second, it provides principles for addressing conflict and working toward reconciliation. These are important achievements. However, the approach comes with a key weakness. In utilizing a just war framework, marriage appears fundamentally conflictual. When Kim makes claims such as “falling in love is a kind of conflict” (18) and “marriage is not a place for pacifism” (47), one must ask, Why would one want to get married in the first place? And why would Christians understand marriage as an image of God’s love for humanity? Thus, the value of *Just Marriage* is as a resource for theologians who can take up its insights on marital conflict and integrate them into a broader theology of marriage and family.

JASON KING  
 St. Mary’s University, USA  
[jking25@stmarytx.edu](mailto:jking25@stmarytx.edu)