

The Evangelical Accommodation: Reassessing Francis Schaeffer's Critique of the Church

Justin McClendon

Dr. McClendon is a professor at Grand Canyon University in Phoenix, Arizona.

American evangelicals face unique challenges for ministry and cultural engagement. Old theological, ecclesiastical, and practical battles remain unsolved while new challenges emerge on many fronts. Across the evangelical spectrum, the religious scene provides ample evidence that much work remains. It cannot be achieved without an analysis of what plagues modern evangelical witness by scholars like Francis Schaeffer (1912-1984). More than thirty years after his death, there is widespread agreement regarding Schaeffer's contributions.

When asked why one should study Schaeffer, theologian Stephen Wellum responds: "There is probably no single figure that has affected and impacted evangelicalism in the latter half of the twentieth century more than Francis Schaeffer."¹ How should evangelicals react to Schaeffer's legacy? One does not have to search far to find Schaeffer's imprint on evangelicalism. Schaeffer contributed immensely to the furtherance of the gospel. Schaeffer used his keen intellect and his pen to critique and influence evangelicalism. One major contribution centers upon his critique of the church.

Schaeffer alerted evangelicals that society's ills are a reflection of the church's accommodation, resulting in the church's widespread ineffectiveness. Schaeffer's solution to what he described as "the evangelical accommodation of the age" centered in biblical inerrancy, a true apologetic, and social activism. These correctives do not stand independently; each solution is logically and practically united. These three antidotes are still theologically and practically relevant for churches seeking to accomplish effective contextualized ministry.

A Critical Evaluation

Post World War II America saw an increasing evangelical presence. The offspring of Fundamentalism in the 1920s and 1930s revealed a fresh zeal among evangelicals to seek spiritual revival throughout America.² This new breed of evangelical leaders believed a cultural ultimatum existed: experience revival through Christianity or succumb to "the Dark Ages of heathendom."³ However, any optimism that existed among evangelical leaders diminished quickly. As James Patterson remarked, by the late 1960's, "revivalism seemed to have run its course without conspicuously transforming the culture. Some evangelical leaders sensed an alarming and growing distance between their values and what was happening in America."⁴ Patterson attributed this growing concern to Vietnam, increasing racial tensions, and trends in sexual immorality.

Nearly all facets of American culture were succumbing to secular humanism.⁵ Secular humanism did not go unnoticed by Schaeffer and other evangelicals. Schaeffer's proposed solution was a strong evangelical church. George Marsden noted, "Francis Schaeffer was the key person in articulating this new comprehensive yet simple paradigm."⁶ One can hardly overlook Schaeffer's belief in the cultural influence of a well-armed church.

The decline of American culture provided Schaeffer an opportunity to evaluate what defenses the evangelical church could offer in combating these trends. In doing so, he realized

evangelicalism's growing weaknesses for impacting society. Schaeffer believed the first major battle centered on the Bible's authority. Schaeffer urged evangelicals to recommit to the absolute inerrancy of Scripture. The church could not engage culture without recovering its view of Scripture.

Biblical Inerrancy

Truth and True Truth

Schaeffer believed the greatest cultural battle concerned truth. Evidenced by art, literature, music, newspapers, and magazines, Schaeffer believed people were abandoning the way they approached truth. He believed the consequences of this change were disastrous. He argued, "The tragedy of our situation today is that men and women are being fundamentally affected by the new way of looking at truth, and yet they have never analyzed the drift which has taken place."⁷ In other words, people were using a new paradigm for determining truth without realizing it.

While never using the phrase, Schaeffer was indicating the emergence of postmodernity.⁸ The hallmark of postmodernism rests in the denial of absolute truth. Schaeffer noted this tendency:

Modern men no longer believe in truth. They no longer believe in antithesis. Modern man believes only in dialectical synthesis. There is a thesis; it has an antithesis. Neither is true or false. "Truth" for today lies only in a synthesis. And even that synthesis is not true forever, for tomorrow there will arise another thesis different from today's and out of the combination of these will come "truth" for tomorrow. But in no case will any of these "truths" be absolute.⁹

This shift in truth not only affected society, but also posed new challenges for evangelicals. The cultural abandoning of truth was the residue of the church's shift in its embrace of truth. This change was too important to neglect, and its consequences were too detrimental to ignore. Schaeffer believed, "This change in the concept of the way we come to knowledge and truth is the most crucial problem, as I understand it, facing Christianity today."¹⁰

Schaeffer saw the new methodologies of determining truth to be a direct attack on the inerrancy of Scripture. Summarizing Schaeffer's position, Udo Middelman stated, "The Bible with its message, in contrast to other ways of viewing the world, is the only true truth."¹¹ Thus, society's definition of truth was no truth at all. In his quest to solve this shift, Schaeffer differentiated between society's "truth" versus "true truth" found in God's Word.

Schaeffer asserted that the new method for acquiring truth was, in effect, a declaration of war against the inerrancy of Scripture. He argued,

We as Bible-believing evangelical Christians are locked in a battle. This is not a friendly gentleman's discussion. It is a life and death conflict between the spiritual hosts of wickedness and those who claim the name of Christ. It is a conflict on the level of ideas between two fundamentally opposed views of truth and reality. It is a conflict on the level of actions between a complete moral perversion and chaos and God's absolutes.¹²

On one hand, Schaeffer acknowledged the battle between "Bible believing evangelical Christians" and the growing trend to accept other means of truth. As Schaeffer noted, the battle was between perversions of truth and God's absolutes. In addition, Schaeffer believed some evangelicals were slack in their adherence to inerrancy.

The battle Schaeffer envisioned was supposed to be a conflict between Christians and pagans, yet Schaeffer noticed a tendency of some evangelicals to adhere to inerrancy only partially. Commenting on this trend, Schaeffer argued,

The Bible is the weapon which enables us to join with our Lord on the offensive...But it must be the Bible as the Word of God in *everything it teaches*—in matters of salvation, but just as much where it speaks of history and science and morality. If it is compromised in any of these areas, as is unhappily happening today among many who call themselves evangelicals, we destroy the power of the Word and put ourselves in the hands of our enemy.¹³

Clearly, if one restricted the Bible's inerrancy to matters of salvation but denied it in other areas, then one denied inerrancy completely.

In addition, Schaeffer believed "the central core" of evangelicalism was disappearing in less obvious places.¹⁴ The collapse of inerrancy was pervasive. Schaeffer lamented, "We must say with sadness that in some places, seminaries, institutions and individuals who are known as evangelical no longer hold to a full view of Scripture."¹⁵ When culture redefines truth without regard to Scripture and evangelicals follow suit, the church loses its foundation and source.

Schaeffer's commitment to the inerrancy of Scripture was consistent.¹⁶ He often wrote in defense of the Bible and formed allegiances with other evangelicals who were equally committed to this cause. He was instrumental in establishing the International Council for Biblical Inerrancy.¹⁷ In his defense of Scripture, Schaeffer realized what consequences would result if inerrancy believing evangelicals refused to act.

What Was at Stake?

The following remark indicates Schaeffer's most concise summary of what was at stake in this battle:

When the Scriptures are being destroyed by theological infiltration and compromise, and equally by cultural infiltration and compromise, will we have the courage as Bible-believing Christians to mark the watershed? Will we have the courage to draw a line, and to do it publicly, between those who take a full view of Scripture and those who have been infiltrated theologically and culturally? If we do not have the courage, we will cut the ground out from under the feet of our children, and we will destroy any hope of being the redeeming salt and light of our dying culture.¹⁸

According to Schaeffer, theological and cultural compromise was directly opposed to inerrancy. Schaeffer wanted evangelicals who believed in inerrancy to make a public stand. The goal was to reveal a noticeable difference between the two opposing views. Moreover, if the distinction was not made, tragic consequences loomed on the evangelical horizon.

Of the many consequences Schaeffer only noted two. If a public declaration and defense of Scripture did not occur, then future generations would have no solid foundation. Schaeffer believed that this evangelical battle would set the precedent for future evangelicals. Without a foundation, they were left without any defense.

In addition, refusing to defend Scripture would void any counter argument to culture. If inerrancy was not defended, Scripture could be twisted to fit any mold. As Schaeffer warned, "The Bible is bent to the culture instead of the Bible judging our society and culture."¹⁹ Without this crucial doctrine, the church could not launch an authoritative response. Because Schaeffer believed in this cause, he called for an aggressive apologetic method.

True Apologetics

The Purposes

Evangelicals must seek to change society. The inerrant Bible provides the answers to all of life's questions. Evangelicals, however, must not remain silent about what they claim to be the only "true truth." Truth must be expressed, not hidden. Schaeffer admitted, "First, I am not an apologete if that means building a safe house to live in, so that we Christians can sit inside with safety and quiescence. Christians should be out in the midst of the world as both witnesses and salt, not sitting in a fortress surrounded by a moat."²⁰ Schaeffer believed apologetics served an all important function for the church to impact society.²¹

For Schaeffer, apologetics served two purposes: to defend historic Christianity and to articulate Christianity's claims in a manner that anyone, in "any given generation can understand."²² Christian apologists must defend biblical claims because each generation brings with it new challenges and questions. The first purpose of Christian apologetics, to defend the faith, benefits individual believers as much as it could a non-believer seeking answers.

Schaeffer believed defending the faith benefits Christians by strengthening believers personally, devotionally, and intellectually.²³ Secondly, apologetic defense provides a clear blessing to persons who have questions. Yet few believers realize their apologetic responsibility.

As he traveled throughout the world, Schaeffer saw greater numbers of Christian young people falling away from historic Christianity. A growing neglect in teaching young people how to defend their faith resulted in this trend.

When young adults are exposed to criticisms of their faith, they have no answer. Schaeffer blamed parents, churches, Christian colleges, and Christian missions.²⁴ He added, "We have left the next generation naked in the face of the twentieth century thought by which they are surrounded."²⁵ The first purpose of apologetics was to defend Christianity's claims, but the second purpose centered on evangelism. For Schaeffer, evangelism comprised of much more than a simple Gospel presentation.

Pre-Evangelism

Schaeffer became friends with Billy Graham, who saw countless people make professions of faith as a result of his simple Gospel presentation. While Schaeffer never publicly criticized Graham's evangelistic approach, Schaeffer had issues with what he considered an oversimplification of the Gospel.²⁶ Schaeffer worried that Graham's listeners may be responding without knowing fully what they were accepting. He did not lay the blame so much on Graham's theological conviction, but at the assumptions he and other evangelicals made in evangelism.

The second function of apologetics centers in pre-evangelism, which highlights the importance of knowledge. Schaeffer believed it impossible to separate true Christianity from knowledge because he thought genuine conversion cannot occur without it. As Schaeffer acknowledged, one cannot have a personal relationship with someone they do not know.²⁷

In Schaeffer's view, pre-evangelism does not undermine the Holy Spirit's special work in conversion. The Holy Spirit's work remains a divine initiative and must not be confused with Schaeffer's emphasis. Moreover, pre-evangelism does not contend one must go through rigorous

studies of apologetic textbooks. Pre-evangelism strives to express a biblical worldview by which unbelievers can see their need of salvation. In Schaeffer's view, pre-evangelism establishes salvation's designer and plan for the unbeliever.

The pre-evangelistic method may last for days or weeks. This purpose does not center on how quickly one can present the Gospel and ask for a response. Pre-evangelism dispels false beliefs and establishes a basis for one to see the full spectrum of salvation. Schaeffer's pre-evangelism does not begin with Jesus' life, death, and resurrection. Rather, pre-evangelism begins with the doctrine of God.²⁸ Schaeffer maintained an uncompromising maxim: "Knowledge precedes faith."²⁹

Schaeffer believed society had drifted too far from biblical truth. There was a time when an unbeliever's presuppositions would have accepted a simple Gospel invitation. As Schaeffer claimed, "If a man got up to preach and said, 'Believe this, it is true,' those who heard would have said, 'Well, if that is so then its opposite is false.'"³⁰ With the influx of liberalism, secular humanism, and the new method of defining truth without absolutes, unbelievers no longer possessed previously held presuppositions. Schaeffer believed evangelistic methods not observing these changes neglected to address the issue of knowledge.

Evangelicals must not begin an evangelistic witness based on the assumption that people know doctrine. Schaeffer argued, "No one can become a Christian unless he understands what Christianity is saying."³¹ In order to demonstrate what Christianity affirms, evangelicals must establish what it denies (atheism, pluralism, works salvation, etc.). As a result of the loss of truth, evangelicals must communicate the Gospel in a manner understandable to each generation.

Schaeffer believed apologetics possessed two related purposes: a defense of the faith from criticism and a witness of the faith for evangelism. His methodology was rooted in his adherence to inerrancy. The Bible is true and must be defended and proclaimed. When Schaeffer critiqued evangelicalism, however, he argued that these two emphases lead evangelicals to social activism.

Social Activism

Ideas Have Consequences

According to Schaeffer, evangelicals who believe in inerrancy and practice Schaeffer's two-fold apologetic method should become more socially active. Schaeffer's logic for this methodology rested in the Lordship of Christ. He argued:

We must acknowledge and then act upon the fact that if Christ is our Savior, he is also our Lord in *all* of life. He is our Lord not just in religious things and not just in cultural things such as the arts and music, but in our intellectual lives, and in business, and in our relation to society, and in our attitude toward the moral breakdown of our culture.³² In Schaeffer's logic, not "thinking and acting" to culture was an indication of one's commitment, or lack thereof, to inerrancy.

Schaeffer did not believe evangelicalism understood this element. He lamented the lack of social activism among evangelicals, "Rather than trumpet our accomplishments and revel in our growing numbers, it would be closer to the truth to admit that our response has been a disaster."³³ This disaster was the result of evangelical neglect. What appeared to be an obvious understanding for Schaeffer became an absent response on behalf of evangelicalism. Schaeffer, however, did not allow this neglect to hinder his involvement and influence in social activism.

Roe vs. Wade

The battle over abortion won Schaeffer many of his most devoted followers.³⁴ Michael Hamilton noted, “Schaeffer had always opposed abortion, but the matter only became prominent in his work after February 1973 when the U.S. Supreme Court declared abortion a constitutional right.”³⁵

Prior to the legalization of abortion, Schaeffer warned of America’s drift toward de-humanization. When legalization occurred, Schaeffer believed an evangelical response was necessary. As a result, Schaeffer launched two film series: “How Should We Then Live?” and “Whatever Happened to the Human Race?”³⁶ Along with the films, Schaeffer embarked on a nationwide speaking tour to rally evangelicals to oppose abortion. For Schaeffer, opposing abortion could not be separated from inerrancy. Truth demanded action, and Schaeffer called evangelicals to respond.

Wellum noted, “It is not an exaggeration to say that the rise of Crisis Pregnancy Centers, The Christian Action Council, and even the Moral Majority, were directly linked to the influence of Schaeffer.”³⁷ Schaeffer was not only a critical voice for the church, but he provided avenues for activism. It was not good enough merely to oppose a position contrary to Scripture. Schaeffer believed Christians must provide an avenue of escape. More importantly, Christians must work as a united front to have any influence at all.

Schaeffer’s Activism

Schaeffer encouraged evangelicals to write letters to members of Congress, demonstrate outside of abortion clinics, and intellectually challenge the presuppositions of the pro-choice movement. Through these efforts Schaeffer helped ignite evangelicals to join the cultural fight. Schaeffer’s influence also brought powerful evangelicals into the debate.

When *Roe v. Wade* was decided, Jerry Falwell admitted he was horrified at the depths of ungodliness in America. He realized Christians must respond in a decisive manner. However, Falwell confessed, “I was hoping that other Christian pastors and lay leaders would volunteer to do it.”³⁸ Falwell went on to admit,

I refused to carry a sign and march for or against any issue, because I sincerely believed that the Christian’s best contribution to social change was his or her faithfulness to our primary goals: studying the Word, preaching the Gospel, winning souls, building churches and Christian schools, and praying for the eventual healing of the nation.³⁹

According to Schaeffer, Falwell’s methodology restrains Scripture inside the church. In fact, Schaeffer approved of every aspect of Falwell’s plan. Schaeffer believed praying for society was necessary, but prayer does not eliminate the need for action. Falwell realized his error through Schaeffer’s influence. Falwell admitted he would never have opposed abortion publically without Schaeffer’s influence.⁴⁰

Arguing from Scripture and church history, Schaeffer encouraged believers to adopt civil disobedience.⁴¹ Christians must know the limitations of obedience to the State. Schaeffer argued that civil disobedience was not to be confused with anarchy. Rather, Schaeffer’s understanding of civil disobedience was composed of two elements: protest and force.

With regard to abortion, evangelicals must protest through calling, writing, and speaking

out to their elected leaders. Schaeffer urged protest to be the first and most common form of resistance. Schaeffer argued, "Protest is our most viable alternative."⁴² Schaeffer believed evangelicals could protest abortion by refusing to pay part of their taxes if it were determined that those tax dollars would be distributed to hospitals or doctors that practiced abortion.⁴³

Schaeffer believed certain circumstances might lead one to use force, "When all avenues to flight and protest have closed, force in the defensive posture is appropriate."⁴⁴ Schaeffer argued that German Christians should have defied Hitler's demands and hidden their Jewish neighbors. Schaeffer believed such an act was a use of force. Schaeffer's view of force must not be confused with violence. Rather, Schaeffer wanted the use of force to produce four objectives.

First, Schaeffer believed Christians should seek a constitutional amendment to end abortion. Second, evangelicals must seek a reversal in the Supreme Court abortion law. Third, Christians should insist on legal and political action against any entity that practices abortion. Fourth, "the State must be made to feel the presence of the Christian community."⁴⁵ These forceful efforts would demonstrate a commitment to the lives of the unborn.

Schaeffer believed it was the Christian's duty to not only believe and defend the Bible but to live the Bible. Social activism flows logically from a belief in inerrancy. Schaeffer rallied many evangelicals to recognize their accommodation of the age and respond with renewed convictions.

Current Applications

If recent publications are any indication, evangelical scholars are committed to speaking about integrating faith into culture.⁴⁶ With the lingering residue of recent culture wars and the expansive onset of secular humanism within the American context, there is fertile soil for scholarly and popular treatments of Christ and culture. The battle for the Bible remains alive as it is commonplace to challenge its authority and relevance in social controversies.

When inerrancy is detached from a robust view of the Bible, one can find an array of opposing positions. For example, in their treatment of same-sex marriage, Miroslav Volf and Ryan McAnnally-Linz distinguish three approaches Christians should take when considering the legitimacy of these unions.⁴⁷ First, Christians must consider the ecclesial question concerning whether or not churches should bless any kind of same-sex union. Second, Christians must consider the legal question which focuses upon the sharing of societal benefits among all lawfully united couples. Third, Christians must consider the moral question focusing on which kind of sex is prohibited. According to these authors, rather than rooting a theology of marriage in Scripture, they suggest that marriage is an evolving institution which requires subtlety for application.

Volf and McAnnally-Linz suggest that Christians should embrace legal benefits for same-sex couples (the legal question), while allowing for individual congregations to solve the ecclesial question in a way that does the least damage to the ecclesial body. While many Christians differ on the legal question, there can be no wavering from the biblical answer to the ecclesial question. All of this assumes the bifurcation is warranted. In other words, should the Bible be reduced to an authoritative source only when ecclesial questions emerge? Schaeffer's analysis proves crucial on this point. If the church relinquishes biblical authority, its apologetic is weakened and its cultural voice is unheard.

Conclusion

Stephen Wellum believed Francis Schaeffer was the most influential evangelical in the last half of the twentieth century. Perhaps Schaeffer's greatest gift was his overall critique of evangelicalism.

Schaeffer witnessed an evangelicalism lacking productivity and authority. He believed if evangelicalism was going to affect culture with the Gospel, the ultimate authority must be maintained without reservation. Biblical inerrancy provided the church with a divine answer. The Bible was "true truth" in an age where "truth" lacked conviction and authority. In addition, the Bible could stand on its own. Thus, for evangelicals to have any influence in a declining culture, an inerrant Bible was and still is its best weapon.

The Bible not only was the source of absolute truth, but it was also the foundation for a two-fold apologetic. Christians must know how to defend their faith amidst criticism. They were also to teach and share its unchangeable truths. Perhaps more attention needs to be given to how modern evangelicals perform evangelism. Schaeffer's pre-evangelism strategy, while subject to abuse, could provide a great benefit to the church.

As a result of standing strong on the Bible and spreading its message, evangelicals must press forward to cause cultural change. Schaeffer believed God requires both a defense of His Word and an aggressive demonstration to the world. While many in evangelicalism may not agree with Schaeffer's threefold paradigm, his methodology warrants consideration.

First, there can be no compromise or confusion regarding inerrancy. Like Schaeffer, contemporary evangelicals must realize that one's view of inerrancy determines one's authority and outlines one's actions. Second, because the Bible is God's Word, it remains relevant to any culture and provides answers offering hope and reform. Third, many modern evangelicals unashamedly concur with Schaeffer's first two positions, yet few practice the final solution of cultural activism. Evangelicals must realize their responsibility in affecting the culture through holy living and activism. Admittedly, evangelicals may not accept Schaeffer's complete argument on this issue. Nevertheless, ignoring social activism altogether only further strengthens the evangelical accommodation of the age.

¹ Stephen J. Wellum, "Francis A. Schaeffer (1912-1984): Lessons from His Thought and Life," *Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 6, no. 2 (Summer 2002): 4.

² James A. Patterson, "Cultural Pessimism in Modern Evangelical Thought: Francis Schaeffer, Carl Henry, and Charles Colson," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 49, no. 4 (December 2006): 808.

³ *Ibid.*, 809.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 245.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, vol. 1, *A Christian View of Philosophy and Culture* (Wheaton: Crossway, 1982), 5.

⁸ Many contemporary scholars believe Schaeffer warned of post-modernism long before it arrived. For example, D. A. Carson, et al. "The *SBJT* Forum: Dimensions of Schaeffer's Life and Thought," *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 6, no. 2 (Summer 2002): 68-9.

⁹ *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, vol. 4, *A Christian View of the Church* (Wheaton: Crossway, 1982), 72.

¹⁰ *Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, vol. 1, 6.

¹¹ Udo Middelman, "The Unusual Francis A. Schaeffer," *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 6, no. 2 (Summer 2002): 44.

¹² *Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, vol. 4, 316.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 312. Emphasis Schaeffer's

¹⁴ *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, vol. 2, *A Christian View of the Bible as Truth* (Wheaton: Crossway, 1982), 121.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ R. Greg Grooms argued, "Promoting and defending the doctrine of inerrancy is one of the earliest and most consistent factors in Schaeffer's work." R. Greg Grooms, "Remembering Francis Schaeffer," *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 6, no. 2 (Summer 2002): 53.

¹⁷ Wellum, "Francis A. Schaeffer (1912-1984): Lessons from His Thought and Life," 10.

¹⁸ *Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, vol. 4, 67.

¹⁹ *Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, vol. 2, 147.

²⁰ *Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, vol. 1, 175.

²¹ Scott Burson and Jerry Walls believed that "the question of apologetic methodology is probably the most disputed and controversial subject surrounding the life and ministry of Francis Schaeffer." Scott Burson and Jerry Walls, *C.S. Lewis & Francis Schaeffer: Lessons for a New Century from the Most Influential Apologists of Our Time* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1998), 143.

²² *Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, vol. 1, 151.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 152.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ Wellum, "Francis A. Schaeffer (1912-1984): Lessons from His Thought and Life," 23.

²⁷ *Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, vol.1, 156.

²⁸ Parkhurst has an excellent summary of pre-evangelism. Parkhurst, *Francis Schaeffer*, 151-8.

²⁹ *Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, vol. 1, 154.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 8.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 153.

³² *Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, vol. 4, 322.

³³ *Ibid.*, 32.

³⁴ R. Greg Grooms argued that Schaeffer's activism against abortion "was the inescapable result of his doctrinal commitments." Grooms, "Remembering Francis Schaeffer," 58.

³⁵ Michael S. Hamilton, "The Dissatisfaction of Francis Schaeffer: Thirteen Years After His Death, Schaeffer's Vision and Frustrations Continue to Haunt Evangelicalism," *Christianity Today* 41 (March 03, 1997): 28.

³⁶ C. Everett Koop later became U.S. surgeon general under Ronald Reagan.

³⁷ Wellum, "Francis A. Schaeffer (1912-1984): Lessons from His Thought and Life," 6.

³⁸ Jerry Falwell, *Strength for the Journey: An Autobiography* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987), 336.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 337-8.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.* 361-2.

⁴¹ *Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, vol. 5, *A Christian View of the West* (Wheaton: Crossway,

1982), 467-474. From Scripture Schaeffer argued that God delegated authority to the State, but God did not make it autonomous. Rather, the State's function rests on administering justice and restraining evil. When God's laws are ignored by the State, believers are not obligated to obey.

⁴² *Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, vol. 5, 478.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 483.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 485.

⁴⁶ See, for example, Richard J. Mouw, *Uncommon Decency: Christian Civility in an Uncivil World*. 2nd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Books, 2010), Mark Dever, *God and Politics: Jesus' Vision for Society, State and Government* (Youngstown, OH: 10 Publishing, 2016), Jonathan Leeman, *Political Church: The Local Assembly as Embassy of Christ's Rule* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2016), and David VanDrunen, *Living in God's Two Kingdoms: A Biblical Vision for Christianity and Culture* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010).

⁴⁷ Miroslav Volf and Ryan McAnnally-Linz, *Public Faith in Action: How to Think Carefully, Engage Wisely, and Vote with Integrity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2016), 88.