FRANCIS SCHAEFFER: HOW FAR FROM LUTHERANISM?

Black Canyon Delegate Conference
Good Shepherd Ev. Lutheran Church
Phoenix, Arizona

February 6 - 7, 1979

John W. Zarling

#49

Dr. Francis August Schaeffer journeyed to Switzerland as a missionary in 1948. There he and his wife, Edith, founded L'Abri fellowship in Huemoz, Switzerland in 1955. From this gathering place for students and disillusioned humanists (one who believes that man is the source of all things), has flowed a stream of lectures, books and very recently a ten episode movie series combating much of modern thought and culture. Dr. Schaeffer has quickly emerged as a leading spokesman for conservative Christians. With obvious scholarship and intelligence, he has spoken out against the general trends in thinking and the unconscious principles on which people in this modern day have structured their lives. He upholds the truth of the Holy Scriptures and the truth of historic Christian teaching. So international and influential has his work become in the last years, that Eternity magazine could say:

> Dr. Francis Schaeffer is something of an evangelical phenomenon. Judging by the popularity of his books, he has more influence with today's youth--from members of the dropout world to the disillusioned heirs of evangelicalism--more than any other man. [1]

His rigorous defense of the Christian faith and his obvious love of the Scripture and his Savior has prompted this paper to be assigned. He comes of conservative Presbyterian background and he himself went through a period of agnosticism (not believing in anything). But, do his writings really reflect the Presbyterian teaching of his background, or is he in reality Lutheran or very close to Lutheranism? This is no idle question, for Dr. Schaeffer is a refreshing voice in many areas of Christian teaching. Thus to fully answer the question, this paper will concentrate in two areas. The first, those statements and views of Dr. Schaeffer which are very Lutheran in content and secondly those areas in which Dr. Schaeffer leans away or deviates from sound Scriptural teaching. In fact, if one would want to sub-title this first part, it might be called "The Lutheran Glow of Francis Schaeffer." We will proceed in a logical order dealing first withhis concept of God and creation, then the Word of God, the Christian's coming to faith and Santification, and finally his view of the Church and Christian fellowship. Much of what he says here is very Lutheran.

In an era of fizzy platitudes concerning God, and a blending of Eastern and Western concepts of God, Dr. Schaeffer speaks out very clearly that God is Triune as Christians and the Scriptures have always taught. Speaking of the Baptism of Jesus in Everybody can Know (written with his wife) he says:

> Everyone there had proved to them that there is one God but in three separate Persons. Jesus, the Second Person of the Trinity, stood there on the shore of the river; the Holy Spirit who is the Third Person of the Trinity, came down in shape like a dove, so that people could see him come to be with Jesus; and the Fatherwho is the First Person of the Trinity, spoke with a voice that everyone could hear, with words they could understand, telling people in their own language that this man is his very much loved Son in whom He is well pleased. [2]

This is a comment that surely could take place in one of our confirmation classes. Dr. Schaeffer is not content to merely mouth words like "God" and "Father" that Christians understand and yet at the same time are used by unbelievers to hide false teaching; so he reaffirms that this Triune God is the only one, the only God that exists.

> The Judaistic-Christian God is completely different from all other gods in the world. The Judaistic-Christian God is a personal, infinite God. The gods of the East are infinite by definition, in that they contain everything, including the male-female equally, the cruel and the non-cruel equally, and so on. But they are never personal. In contrast, the gods of the West, the Greek and the Roman gods, the great god Thor and the Anglo-Saxon gods, were personal but were always limited and finite.
>
> So the Judaistic-Christian God is unique: He is infinite, and He is, at the same time, personal.[3]

Thus there is no compromise with any other "Way to God." There is only one unique personal yet infinite God, a God who acted historically and created the world. The world did not evolve, nor is the world merely an extension of God. The world is beautiful and wonderful; but it is creation and should be valued because it, like us, is a creation of God. It is marvelous and to be valued, not mistreated and abused. Thus creation is something real existing of itself. This seems self evident to Luther Christians but to peoples of the East, what you see is God. God is everything. To Western man the universe is a machine and we are trapped in it. The only way to bring God into the picture is to leap from the reasonable world we live in to nice thoughts about God who has no place in reality. Reality to modern man is that things evolved and exist of themselves. To this, Schaeffer gives a resounding "No":

> The value of things is not in themselves autonomouslybut that God made them, and thus they deserve to be treated with high respect. The tree in the field is to be treated with respect. It is not to be romanticized, as the old lady romanticizes her cat (that is, she reads human reactions into it.) This is wrong because it is not true. When you drive the axe into the tree when you need firewood, you are not cutting down a person; you are cutting down a tree. But while we should not romanticize the tree, we must realize that God made it and it deserves respect becasue He has made it AS A TREE. Christians who do not believe in the total evolutionary scale have reason to respect nature as the evolutionist never can, because we believe God made these things specifically in their own areas.[4]

The Truine God and His beautiful creation are prevalent themes in much of Schaeffer's writings, especially since he concentrates also in upgrading our appreciation of art and beauty as Christian people. He correctly points out that only from this high view of the world could science ever begin because there is something worth studying, and you can learn something from it.[5]

But there is something wrong in this Creation, and for Dr. Schaeffer, what is wrong is that man fell historically from fellowship with God into sin and death. Things have never been right since. Here he stresses the completeness of the fall against the Roman Catholic idea that man's intellect was unharmed and thus he could come to God. No man is completely fallen; only God is autonomous (moves freely).

The reformation accepted the picture of the total fall. The whole man had been made by God, but now the whole man is fallen, including his intellect and will. In contrast to Aquinas, only God was autonomous.[6]

It was a real historical event which to Schaeffer properly brought death and condemnation on all men: separation from God here, temporal death at the end of that, and eternal death following.[7] Yes, and causing guilt feelings both proper and improper in man even thousands of years later.[8] Where can fallen man turn? Where can he go for help? There is no problem for Schaeffer, for the God who created man also spoke clearly to Him in His Word.

Here he speaks in no uncertain terms about the authority, reliability and factualness of Scripture. As we have already seen, he believes firmly in creation and in the fall of Adam and Eve; and he is quick to defend the historical portions of Scripture as really having happened: the angels that appeared to Jacob at Jabbok, the resurrection and ascension of Jesus, His death on the cross--not just any death, but that of the Mighty Maker.[9] All are reliable, for all are contained in the Scripture divinely inspired of God:

> We affirmthe divine inspiration, truthfulness and authority of both the Old and New Testament Scriptures in their entirety as the only written word of God, without error in all that it affirms, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice.[10]

Yet, we have heard many such sounding words before from those who really do not hold to them but use them to lull people into error. To be clear as possible, Dr. Schaeffer often uses different terminology to express his confidence and trust in the Bible: "propositional revelation in verbalized form."[11] He uses these words specifically against those who talk about finding the Word of God <u>in</u> the Bible or uses phrases such as "The Word of God for You." These words mean very simply that all of Scripture is the Word of God in human language and sentence structure. It is not exhaustive revelation[12] and it dare not be added to or subtracted from.[13]

Yet, it still is the living powerful Word of God for our day:

> What does God say to our generation? Exactly the same thing that he said to Isreal two thousand five hundred years ago through Ezekial: "I am broken with their whorish heart, which departed from me and their eyes which go awhoring after their idols"....Will he not judge our culture? Will he not call it adulterous? I tell you in the name of God he will judge our culture and he is judging our culture.[14]

The Bible is God's living eternal Word and Dr. Schaeffer isn't afraid to speak it in judgement upon a heathen people. He has a clear grasp of inspiration and the fact that all of what Scripture says has happened. Thus the God of history has spoken. What then happens to sinful man? How does he come to trust the Word and this God who acted? How does he come to faith?

Here I simply would like to give you several major quotes in a row to show how plainly Dr. Schaeffer speaks on the salvation of sinful man and why he is given heaven. All would agree that this is a major division between The Lutheran, Catholic and Reformed churches. How does Dr. Schaeffer stand?

> Let me stress it again: salvation is all one piece. All salvation past, present and future, has one base. That base is not our faith. If we are confused here, we are confused completely. Man can never be justified on the basis of his own faith. Through all of salvation, the only base is the finished work of Christ on the cross in history.

> Faith is the empty hand, the instrument by which we accept God's free gift... Now let me repeat to be absolutely clear about it: the basis is not your faith; it is the finished work of Christ. Faith is the Instrument to receive this thing from God that Christ has purchased for us.[15]

> We must never forget that the first part of the Gospel is not "Accept Christ" as Savior, but "God is there"... THE TRUE BASIS FOR FAITH IS NOT THE FAITH ITSELF BUT THE WORK WHICH CHRIST FINISHED ON THE CROSS. My believing is not the basis for being saved--the basis is the work of Christ. Christian faith is turned outward to an objective person: "Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved.[15]

> Paul is saying something more than that one is saved by faith. As a matter of fact, one must be careful to understand that phrase in itself, for often it is presented so that it is no longer Biblical. The BASIS of our salvation is not our faith. Faith is the instrument, the empty hand with which we accept the gift. We are not saved by faith in faith.[17]

Added to these quotes is the fact that Schaeffer will also speak of the "Forensic act"--God declaring us righteous as the basis of our faith, which is certainly impressive.[18]

The light and warmth from the "Lutheran Glow" are almost astounding. Not only is there a rejection of the Catholic teaching of earning your way to heaven, but he clearly rejects the "Accept Christ" as the basis for salvation and points people not inwards towards their faith but outwards to Christ on the cross. This is even more startling and refreshing because when he moves in to the area of Christian living and sanctification, he continues to speak of God being the doer.

How do we live as Christians? How do we bring forth fruit for our Lord? Dr. Schaeffer simply says:

> The "how" is that the glorified Christ will do it through us. There is an active ingredient; he will be the doer. Second, there is the agency of the Holy Spirit...IT IS NOT TO BE IN OUR OWN STRENGTH. There is a Holy Spirit who has been given to us to make this "Service" possible.[19]

Yet he does not say that this will lead to perfection or that we will finally be so sanctified we will not sin.[20] He speaks out forcefully against legalism[21] and the neopentecostalism where, as long as you have the gifts of the Spirit, the content of your faith doesn't matter.[22] He also rebukes those Christians who make the signs of the last things (eschatology) the heart and core of their faith.[23] He points out that a Christian always lives as a Christian no matter what he is doing[24] and points to four basic things: Bible study, prayer, witnessing and church attendance at a Bible believing church as aids to sanctification.[25] He realizes also that part of the wonder of our Christian lives is that our own conscience should no longer place us in bondage as if Jesus had not paid for our sins:

> Martin Luther in his commentary on Galations, shows a great understanding of the fact that our salvation includes salvation from the bondage of our conscience.[26]

Not that we are to take sin lightly,but our conscience shouln't be weighed down year after year grieving over sins that are past. Then too in this area of our living, Dr. Schaeffer sees clearly the difference between chastisement and punishment for sin. God chastises us to bring us back. He punished Christ completely for our sins on the cross:

> God's chastening is not a punishment. The punishment is altogether dealt with on Calvary's cross. It is a correction to bring us back to fellowship with Himself, and we do not need to be chastened before fellowship can be restored. The chastening of God does not have a penal aspect. That was finished on the cross. There is no double jeopardy when the holy God is the judge. Our guilt is gone, once and forever. [27]

There is true insight into the Christian life and the Christian's relationship with his God. However, Dr. Schaeffer also has much to say about Christians as a group -(as the church,) that in this day and age is nothing short of surprising.

To begin, he sees completely through the false notions of the eucumenical movement and its idea of one church. That is not Christian unity:

> First the oneness that Jesus is talking about is not just organizational oneness. In our generation we have a tremendous push for ecclesiastical oneness. It's in the air--like German measles in a time of epidemic and it is all around us. Human beings can have all sorts of organizational unity but exhibit to the world no unity at all.[28]

The ecumenical movement is built, I believe, in organizational oneness on the basis of lack of content.[29]

For that sort of thing, he has no time. There must be content to faith and there should not be false teaching in the church. Chapter Two in the Church Before the Watching World is very strong on this. No, a church has the right to discipline and even expell those who deviate from the truth. There can be heresy trails within the Christian church:

> Please note this with tremendous care. The church is to judge whether a man is a Christian on the basis of his doctrine, the propositional content of his faith, and then his credible profession of faith. When a man comes before a local church that is doing its job, he will be quizzed on the content of what he believes. If, for example, a church is conducting a heresty trial (the New Testament indicates there are to be heresy trials in the church of Christ), the question of heresy will turn on the content of man's doctrine. The church has a right to judge; in fact, it is commanded to judge a man on the content of what he believes and teaches.[30]

False doctrine is to be fought and corrected, and you don't do it by simply electing a conservative leader either. Unity in the church is to be based on doctrine[32] and there should be no hedging on it. Not only is there to be correct doctrine, there is to be correct practice also:

> There must be orthodox doctrine, true. But there also must be PRACTICE of those doctrines, including orthodoxy in human relationships.
>
> I hesitate to add, but I will, that this is fun.[33]

Thus he will not join in fellowship with false doctrine or participate with those who espouse it.[34] Finally if the false doctrine cannot be corrected, the outward church turned around then must come division:

> If the battle for doctrinal purity is lost, we must understand that there is a second step to take in regard to the practice of the principle of the purity of the visible church. It may be necessary for true Christians to leave the visible organization with which they have been associated. But note well: if we must leave our church, it should be with tears--not with drums playing and flags flying. This is no place for naturally bombastic men to bombast.[35]

And all the way through these sections Dr. Schaeffer stresses at the same time the love and concern that we are to have for those who err, and how lovingly we are to be in our actions.[36] Discipline and love are to be displayed within the church. Unity is to be based on doctrine and practice, not on organization. These are surprising statements to find in modern Christian writing but reassuring nonetheless.

Does Francis Schaeffer have a "Lutheran Glow"? He proclaims the mighty Triune God who acted in history and revealed Himself through His inspired Word who gives men heaven on the basis alone of Christ's work. This God leads them in Christian living and expects of his church, even the outward church, purity in doctrine and practice. Yes, there is definitely a "Lutheran Glow".

But just as the glowing of the moon is only an outer reflection with no real source within it, so Dr. Schaeffer's "Lutheran Glow" is only that-- a "Glow" and nothing more. What is the real heart of his teaching? What does the man himself really believe and teach? If you want to subtitle this second part, you might call it, "The Real Francis Schaeffer Stands Up."

What does he really teach? Dr. Schaeffer is very fond of a term he uses in many of his books. It is "The integration point"; that is, that point of view that holds all of one's beliefs and teachings together. Thus he does not want "eschatogogy" (the teachings about the last things) to be the integration point of one's Christian belief.[37] What is Dr. Schaeffer's integration point? What is central and basic to all that he says? What really is the source from which he flows? It is not the unexplainable love of God toward man! It is rather the intrinsic value in man himself! Dr. Schaeffer is completely and totally in error in his integration point, for he teaches that man stills retains the image of God.

> As far back as the covenant with Noah, God said, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man"(Gen. 9:6). The Bible says that though man is fallen he is still the image-bearer of God. Human worth does not rest on the fact that man can breed with others of the same biological species. Rather, it rests on the fact that man is unique; he is made in the image of God.[38]

Notice several things. First, the Bible passage quoted does not say man has the image of God; it says he <u>had</u> it. Secondly, man's worth is thus made intrinsic. Man has worth as man. It is from this point really that Dr. Schaeffer's writings flow, for all men have the image of God, even non-Christians:

> The fact that man has fallen does not mean that he has ceased to bear God's image. He has not ceased to be man because he has fallen. He can love though he is fallen. It would be a mistake to say that only a Christian can love.[39]

Remember how seemingly clear Dr. Schaeffer had been that the total man had fallen? Yet still, there is something in man. It may be contorted but the image of God is still there. The "mannishness of man" is at the heart of his system.[40] It is at the heart, for it "Answers many questions intellectuall and explains "who we are." He has returned completely to the fact that man is worth something even though a sinner. Though he has said that the whole man, will and intellect, has fallen, what is important is that he has said that man can reason; man can will. Those beautiful quotes on justification page 3 are misleading. Notice, where does that empty hand come from? Even the term "Accept Christ" is used there. Schaeffer is totally clear. In the area of man's sanctification and conversion, man has an active part. Listen to this written for families in Everyone Can Know; after talking of the gift of righteousness and everlasting life Schaeffer uses this example:

> But when you get a gift for Christmas, or a birthday, or some other day, there is something that you have to do about it before it is really any good to you. You have to accept it, to TAKE it in your hands and make it your own.[42]

This acceptance that man can give is based very simply on the fact that he has "the image of God." There is something good that responds:

> The Bible insists, "Don't forget who you are. You are not a puppet or a machine... you are made in the image of God and as such you must choose and choose rightly at every point" ...For those of us today, the situation is the same. Whether Christian or non-Christian, we are called upon to make choices which will have significant results.
>
> If you are not a Christian, remember you are faced with a choice which will make a total difference to you.[43]

So what is the most important moment in history for you? Not just when Jesus died, but also when you accepted. There must be an act of will in becoming a Christian. [45]

Here is a quote in which Schaeffer discusses the danger of falling off "cliffs," that is, falling off one side or the other of Christian teachings. To Dr. Schaeffer, Lutherans, in the area of justification, have fallen off a cliff; Lutherans do believe that man is totally depraved and can do nothing to come to God, that man is a "zero."

> What this means since the Fall is that when man accepts Christ as Savior, there has been a work of the Holy Spirit, yet man is not simply a zero; there is a conscious side to justification.
>
> If we fail to see that there is a conscious side to justification, we soon come to the place where we must say that either the gospel is not universally offered or that man is a zero. But neither is the case.. we can fall off the cliff on the other side by denying the conscious side of justification and making man a zero. [40]

If you would like, you could at this moment refer to the end notes and look at the number of references(and these are few) where Schaeffer talks of "accepting Christ."[47] In fact in this area, though he speaks clearly of universal justification or seems to, the man can still write when he speaks of the Baptism of Jesus:

> But it is at this time, when Jesus stood in the Jordan River to be baptized by John, he begins a special period of living his perfect life for all who will accept him as Savior.[48]

"Living his perfect life for all who will accept him as Savior"? Who is falling off a cliff and limiting the work of Christ only to whose "who Accept"? In fact, this carries through even to the forgiveness of God. Before you can be forgiven by God, "We have to really be sorry, and coming ask forgiveness and then, because Jesus died for us, we are forgiven." Do you see where his view of the image of God has taken him? Far, far from the free and glorious gifts that God offers to totally worthless man. By ignoring the clear words of Genesis five.

> When God created man, he made him in the likeness of God... When Adam had lived 130 years, he had a son in his own likeness, in his own image (NIV)

He has ended up where he didn't want to be and made man an agent in his own salvation, no matter how much he would strike to deny this. In fact, the "image of God" problem carries over into his view of Scripture and the Word of God.

The Word of God, verbally inspired, with all the events recorded true and factual and yet does Dr. Schaeffer accept this? It is simply because God has spoken? One could pray so, yet listen:

> However, in the area of personality, man's relationship is upward to God and therefore the incarnation and death of the Son of God for the sake of man's salvation is sensible.

The reasonableness of the incarnation and the reasonableness of communication between God and man, turn on this point, that man as man, is created in the image of God.[50]

What a totally foreign way of speaking and looking at the acts of our God. The Bible's inspiration (communication between God and man) is reasonable. The incarnation and death of the Son of God is sensible. Where is he now? He is point blank gunned down by his own reason. Reason is the key. He has not moved at all in five hundred years from Zwingli and Calvin. Surely, the Bible is to be read devotionally, but it is also "God's book of Rules." Reason and understanding are the key to faith. Schaeffer has no need of Sacraments.

In all 14 books which were read for this paper, you can count the number of times the Sacraments are mentioned on one hand and that is all. Baptism has nothing to do with being born again.[52] How do little children come to faith? They "understand":

> The birth of a baby into God's family is through understanding that Jesus, God's Son, has taken our place, has taken our punishment and

> with some amount of understanding of this, accepting what he had done, bowing, as the publican bowed without pride. Yes, Jesus, said, a little child can come in the right way.[53]

Baptism isn't the "right way," "understanding" is. So when a little child grows older, he can accept Christ and thus enter into the family of God.[54]

The precious Lord's Supper fairs no better and is only "an external sign."[55] It can only mean anything if "there is a choice to be in the proper relationship with God." There is no room for these precious "Means of Grace" that God has given to us. They form no part of Schaeffer's system. It would be impossible to imagine him ever writing something like Luther's "Confession Concerning the Lord's Supper." Let me give you a rather unique example of how completely the Holy Sacraments have been removed from Dr. Schaeffer's system and totally ignored.

The picture, the "Adoration of the Mystic Lamb" was painted by the Van Eyck brothers in the fifteeth century and is part of an altarpiece in the cathedral in Ghent Belgium. The central part of this picture--from the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove down around the lamb and to the kneeling men at either side of the fountain--is the picture on the jacket for Francis Schaeffer's "How Should We Then Live." He analyzes this painting in some detail in the following manner:

> Van Eyck who was doing landscapes as early as 1415-1420 was the first great master on this subject, the first gread landscape artist. A number of paintings show this early interest but let us examine just one: his ADORATION OF THE MYSTIC LAMB (1432) in the Cathedral of St. Bavon in Ghent Belgium ....most impressive is the central theme--the rich, the poor--people of all classes and backgrounds--coming to Christ. And who is this Christ? Van Eyck comprehended the Biblical understanding of Christ as the Lamb of God who died on the cross to take away the moral guilt of those who accept him as Savior. But this Christ is not now dead. He stands upright and alive on the altar symbolizing that he died as the substitute, sacrificed, but now he lives...
>
> The background of this painting is marvelous--a real landscape.[57]

Well, if you ignore the phrases "Who died on the cross to take away the moral guilt of those who accept him as Savior," is it not really a bad description. But it is a classic case of saying what you want to be there and ignoring what is really portrayed. Schaeffer said it showed people coming to Christ, but he didn't say anything about how they came. In fact, if you look closely at the picture you note three things in the central portion of the picture: the dove with the rays descending from it on to the people, the chalice on the altar under the lamb with his blood flowing into it, and the large fountain with water in it. What is the central theme? Schaeffer was right; it is about people coming to Christ but it is also how they come. They come to him through the working of the Holy Spirit among men (the rays coming down on people) and he works among men through the Lord's Supper (the chalice of blood) and baptism(the fountain in front). What is what Elizabeth Dhanens says when discussing the influence of Rupert on the Van Eycks and their painting of this altarpiece:

> Rupert also devoted many pages to the Works and Gifts of the Holy Spirit from whose aureole, in the altarpiece rays descend to the various groups of figures. These Works and Gifts are confirmed

> through Baptism and the Eucharist. The shape of the Fountain of Life in the Adoration Panel, reminiscent of the octagonal form in traditional founts, was probably chosen to symbolize Baptism.

In this painting although great stress is placed on the sacrifice of the mass, there is still a very clear portrayal of the sacraments as the means whereby the Holy Spirit works among men, and this is one hundred years before Luther's light hammered in Wittenburg. Francis Schaeffer side-stepped the main point of the painting because there was no room for it in his concept, of God andman, thus a "strong sacerdotal system" is always wrong."[59] One wonders if the Lutheran Church to Schaeffer really isn't included in a "Strong sacerdotal system."

Thus to a man who accepts the supernatural because it is reasonable, one should not be surprised to read that he isn't sure whether the "day" in Genesis One is really a 24 hour day [60] or that one shouldn't make the belief in a world-wide flood at the time of Noah--a test of Orthodoxy. [61] He also admits as "possiblities" three or four strange ideas in Genesis One. An example of one of these strange ideas is Satan's ruling of this world for a period before Adam and Eve were created.[62] Perhaps one could say that the Bible is the source of Schaeffer's system and thus the source of his faith, instead of the Bible being the source of Schaeffer's faith and thus of his outlook. The "Means of Grace" are gone and in their place has come prayer as the means the Holy Spirit uses to bring faith. He is discussing the Lord's Prayer and says:

> But to begin to pray "Our Father," a person needs to be his child by accepting Christ. Otherwise, a person ought to say, "O God please help me to find you...or to know if you exist.[63]

His views of the Bible, the Sacraments and prayer are really foreign to Scriptural Christianity although in many areas, especially his view of the Bible, they have seemed very close.

Although he down-plays the role of eschatology, he is definitely a millennialist[64] and believes in a universal conversion of the Jews and a return to their physical homeland.[65]

Even in his view of the church and fellowship, he falls short of the mark. True doctrine isn't as important as being able to find fellowship--finding a Bible-believing church, whatever that may mean:

> Find a Bible-believing church and go there. This is not to say that one is going to agree with every detail that is taught, nor is it to say that there is no time or place to discuss our Christian distinctiveness. ... But if a church is a Bible-believing Church, if it falls within the circle, then you are not falling off the cliff.[66]
>
> Remember his use of "not falling off a cliff," you're still on firm ground.

Then too his concept of the role of the church is that of a typically Reformed preacher. The church should be the conscience of the government. Thus Luther made a terrible blunder in the Peasant War [67] and the church should have been more forceful over the issue of slavery.[68]

Thus when viewed and read carefully, Francis Schaeffer is far from sound Scriptural teaching in many areas and for this we must sorrow. Sorrow for a man who has insight, who has struggled himself, who has much good and yet falls short of the full comfort of the Gospel. This paper is not given in the spirit of haughty pride nor should it be received as such. What thanks we should give to our God that we have the full assurances, the clear proclamation, the full warmth and the light of the Gospel and not the cold gloomy assurances of our reason and our own merit no matter how carefully expressed.

In closing then, just a brief word about the method and approach underlying this paper. I have not read everything that Francis Schaeffer has written nor do I feel that I necessarily understood and grasped exactly what he was striving to say. The extensive footnoting is to show that these teachings are in his writings and he is not simply being quoted out of context. The footnotes are also meant to serve as a resource for you, if questions should ever arise concerning Francis Schaeffer. Yes, he has a"Lutheran Glow" and we see that with joy; but he has no real substance and that we note with sorrow. Reason, not trust is the heart of his teachings.

++++++++++++++++++++

ENDNOTES

Due to the extensiveness of these notes, please consult the bibliography for publishers information on the individual books. All books unless otherwise noted are authored by Dr. Francis Schaeffer:

1. "Why and How I Write My Books," Eternity, March 1973, p. 65
2. Everyone can Know, p. 61
   see also: Genesis in Space and Time, pp. 16-17
   The God Who is There, p. 97
3. Pollution and The Death of Man, p. 49
   see also: Escape from Reason, p. 25
   The God Who Is There, p. 94
4. Pollution and the Death of Man, p. 54
5. How Then Should We Live? p. 140
6. Escape From Reason, p. 19
   see also How Then Should We Live?, p. 52
7. Genesis in Space and Time p. 97
8. The God Who Is There, p. 102
9. Refer:
   How then Shall We Live, p. 255
   Joshua and The Flow of Biblical History, pp. 202-203
   Pollution and The Death of Man, pp. 55-56
   True Spirituality p. 22, 34-35, 66-67
   The Church Before the Watching World, p. 99
10. No Final Conflict, Preface
    see also Everybody Can Know, p.87, pp 222-224
    True Spirituality, p 116
11. He Is There and He Is Not Silent, pp 33 and 78
12. The God Who Is There, p. 93
13. Everybody Can Know, p. 244

14. The Church Before the Watching World, pp. 56-57
15. True Spirituality, pp. 77-78 see also p. 1
16. The God Who Is There, p. 133
17. Death in the City, pp. 87-88
    see also Escape From Reason, p. 20
    He is There and He is Not Silent, p. 100
18. Refer
    Death in the City, p. 85
    Pollution and the Death of Man, p. 66
19. True Spirituality, pp. 56-57
20 Refer
    Pollution and the Death of Man, p. 66
    True Spirituality, p. 70 and p. 94
21. The New Super Spirituality, pp. 12-12 and p. 17
22. The New Super Spirituality, p. 15
23. The New Super Spirituality, p. 23
24. Pollution and the Death of Man, p. 59
25. The God Who Is There, p. 136
26. True Spirituality, p. 104
27. True Spirituality, p. 105
28. The Mark of a Christian, pp 18 and 19
29. The Church Before the Watching World, p. 68
30. Mark of a Christian, p. 16
31. The Church Before the Watching World, p. 66
32. Death in the City, p. 73
33. True Spirituality, p. 164
    see also The Church Before the Watching World, p. 66
34. The God Who Is There, pp 102 and 169
35. The Church Before the Watching World, p. 74
36 Refer
    The God Who Is There, p. 36
    The Church Before the Watching World, p. 60
37. The New Super Spirituality, p. 23
38. Joshua and The Flow of Biblical History, p. 194
39. Escape From Reason, p. 88
    see also Genesis in Space and Time, pp. 100-101
40. Refer
    How Then Should We Live? p. 97 and p. 133
    The God Who Is There, p. 29
41. Refer
    Pollution and The Death of Man, p. 51
    How then Should We Live? p. 84
    Genesis In Space and Time, p. 47
42. Everybody Can Know, p. 37
43. Joshua and the Flow of Biblical History, p. 213
44 True Spirituality, p. 39 see also p. 87
45. Joshua and the Flow of Biblical History, p 26 see also p. 76
46. The Church Before the Watching World, p 92
47. True Spirituality, pp. 1, 15, 28
    Everybody Can Know, pp. 37, 51, 116, 122, 241, 256
48. Everybody Can Know, p. 60 see also p. 82
49. Everybody Can Know, p. 164
50. The God Who Is There, p. 95 see also "proffing theory" p. 109
51. Everybody Can Know, pp. 52-53
52. Everybody Can Know, p. 52-53
53. Everybody Can Know, p. 284

54. True Spirituality, p. 163
55. Death in The City, p. 7
56. Joshua and the Flow of Biblical History, p. 212
57. How Then Should We Live? p. 66
58. Dhanens, Elizabeth, Van Eyck, The Ghent Altarpiece, p. 98
59. True Spirituality, p. 149
    see also, Genesis in Space and Time, p. 89
60. Genesis in Space and Time, p. 57
    see also No Final Conflict, pp. 28-29
61. Genesis in Space and Time, p. 133
62. No Final Conflict, pp. 28-31
63. Everybody Can Know, p. 188
64. Refer
    Genesis in Space and Time, p. 64
    Escape From Reason, p. 79
    True Spirituality, pp. 36-37 and p. 76
65. Refer
    Joshua and the Flow of Biblical History, pp. 56-65 and p. 113
66. The Church Before the Watching World, p. 105
    see also The New Super Spirituality, p. 25
67. How Then Should We Live? p. 84
68. How Then Should We Live? pp. 113-114

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dhanens, Elizabeth, Van Eyck: The Ghent Altarpiece, London: Penquin Books 1973

Schaeffer, Francis, Back To Freedom and Dignity, Downers Grove: Inter-varsity Press, 1972

Schaeffer, Francis, The Church Before the Watching World, Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1971

Schaeffer, Francis, Death in The City, Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1969

Schaeffer, Francis, Escape From Reason, Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press,1968

Schaeffer, Francis, Everybody Can Know, Wheaton: Tyndal House, 1973

Schaeffer, Francis, Genesis in Space and Time, Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1972

Schaeffer, Francis, The God Who Is There, Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1968

Schaeffer, Francis, He is There and He is Not Silent, Wheaton: Tyndale House, 1972

Schaeffer, Francis, How Should We Then Live?, Old Tappan: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1976

Schaeffer, Francis, Joshua and The Flow of Biblical History, Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1975

Schaeffer, Francis, The Mark of the Christian, Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970

Schaeffer, Francis, The New Super Spirituality, Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1972

Schaeffer, Francis, No Final Conflict, Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1975

Schaeffer, Francis, Pollution and the Death of Man, Wheaton: Tyndal House, 1970

Schaeffer, Francis, True Spirituality, Wheaton: Tyndale House, 197]

Schaeffer, Francis, "How Should We Then Live," Christianity Today, Oct 8, 1976, p. 2.

Schaeffer, Francis, "How Should We Then Live." Moody, Jan. 1978, p. 38

Schaeffer, Francis, "Why and How I Write My Books, Eternity, March 1973, p. 65

Stedelijke, Dienstvoor Toerisme, Ghent, Belgium