

Keith Edmondson

PRINCIPLES OF LEADERSHIP

What We Can

Learn From

the **Life** and

Ministry of

Bill Bright

Compiled and Edited by

TED MARTIN & MICHAEL COZZENS



15. *Regeln des löblichen Ordens vom Senffkorn*, Erich Beyreuther, Gerhard Meyer, and Amedeo Molnar, eds. (Büdingen: Johann Christoph Stöhr, 1740; reprint in *Zweiter Sammelband über Zinzendorf*, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1975), 125–40.
16. *Ibid.*, 37.
17. See Michael Richardson, *Amazing Faith* (Colorado Springs, CO: WaterBrook Press, 2000), 53–60.
18. Of the English literature available on the Moravians and their history, I recommend John R. Weinlick and Albert H. Frank, *The Moravian Church Through the Ages* (Bethlehem, PA: The Moravian Church in America, 1989); John R. Weinlick, *Count Zinzendorf* (Bethlehem, PA: Moravian Church, 1989); and Fredrick E. Stoeffler, *German Pietism during the Eighteenth Century* (Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1973).
19. A complete history of the Renewed Moravian Brethren and their mission activity can be found in J. Taylor Hamilton and Kenneth G. Hamilton, *History of the Moravian Church* (Bethlehem, PA: The Moravian Church in America, 1967).
20. William Carey, who is often given that title, once said, “Look at what the Moravians have done!” And they had done it almost a century before he began his missionary work.
21. Arthur J. Freeman, *An Ecumenical Theology of the Heart* (Bethlehem, PA: The Moravian Church in America, 1998), 67,68.

CHAPTER 24

Doctrinal Convictions and Persuasions

ALAN SCHOLLES

On Staff since 1969

Associate Professor of Theology, International School of Theology

I sat in a large open-air amphitheater at Arrowhead Springs, then the headquarters of Campus Crusade for Christ, surrounded by more than a thousand of my fellow staff members. It was a balmy summer evening in the early 1970s.

Bill Bright rose to introduce the main speaker of the evening. The president of Campus Crusade spoke enthusiastically about the man's years as a prominent pastor and his contribution as the president of a major evangelical seminary. He talked of the many books the man had written and his other contributions to the progress of evangelical Christianity. By the time the guest speaker took the podium, I was excited with anticipation. What was this important man of God going to say to us?

The speaker spent the next 45 minutes telling of his own experience with the ministry of the Holy Spirit and explaining several passages of Scripture that he felt supported his view. The longer he spoke, the more agitated I became.

His view of the ministry of the Holy Spirit is quite different than Bill Bright's, I thought to myself. Some of these points are in serious tension with what Bill himself taught us just last week!

I had recently joined the staff myself, and I was not sure what Bill would do. Would he interrupt the man before he could do any more damage? Would he let him finish, but then take over the podium and correct the speaker's errors?

After the speaker closed in prayer, Bill did return to the podium. To my

surprise, Bill renewed his praise of the speaker, thanked him for his wonderful message, and urged each of us on staff to take the things we'd heard and apply them to our own walk with God. Bill even repeated some of the language about the Holy Spirit that had been new to me and had seemed in conflict with Bill's own previous teachings.

Bill Bright's response that evening was my first experience of what I believe has been his consistent approach to the theological distinctives of Campus Crusade. That approach might be summarized by the following statement: "Hold strongly to a small number of the historic doctrines of Christianity, but be gracious and supportive of all true believers, even when they disagree in non-essentials." Both strength and grace have characterized Bill's and the movement's stance toward theology.

INCLUDING CONVICTIONS AND PERSUASIONS WITHIN BOUNDARY STATEMENTS

My observation of this approach in Dr. Bright's ministry and in the movement of Campus Crusade was the inspiration behind my own development of a series of technical terms for dealing with different levels of belief. Although I have written more extensively concerning these terms elsewhere, I will briefly review them for the purposes of this chapter.¹

Convictions. As I have defined them, convictions are central beliefs, crucial to salvation, over which we should be willing to denounce someone in serious disagreement and (if there is no repentance) eventually divide fellowship. These are the historic doctrines of Christianity that separate it from non-Christian world religions and from pseudo-Christian cults. Some examples of convictions would be the Trinity, the deity of Christ, and salvation by grace through faith.

Persuasions. I use the term "persuasions" for beliefs about which we are personally certain, but which are not crucial to salvation. We should accept those with differing persuasions as members in good standing of God's family, even when we are certain they are wrong. These may include some doctrines based in biblical teaching, but concerning which true believers have differed through the centuries. Some examples of persuasion-level beliefs might be millennial views, the proper mode and meaning of baptism, and the place of tongues in the Christian life.

Opinions. Opinions are beliefs, desires, or even wishes which may not be clearly taught in Scripture or which may legitimately differ for various believers. Opinions may concern subjects on which we either have a prefer-

ence but acknowledge that others may also be right in holding a different view, or we do not have any confidence that we yet know the truth of the matter. Some opinion-level subjects might be: How long will it be until Jesus' return? What kind of music should we use for worship? Which is the best Bible translation?

Boundary Statements. These are creeds, statements of faith, or doctrinal statements that may legitimately incorporate a combination of convictions, persuasions, and even opinions. I believe that denominations, institutions, and movements are entitled to limit their leadership, or even their entire membership, to a set of beliefs that may be more restrictive than those common to all true Christians.

In the rest of this chapter, I will use these concepts to analyze how the Campus Crusade Statement of Faith (which all staff sign yearly) functions within the movement.²

AFFIRMING HISTORIC CHRISTIAN BELIEFS

One of the functions of boundary statements in general, and Crusade's Statement in particular, is to define who may be included and who must be excluded based on their doctrinal beliefs. In the case of Campus Crusade for Christ, the statement helps articulate who may, and who may not, be members of the full-time staff.

The Statement of Faith (reproduced later in the chapter) is short enough to be printed on a single side of one sheet of paper. Following two introductory paragraphs, the statement is divided into seventeen numbered paragraphs, each consisting of one to three sentences. The second of the introductory paragraphs reflects Bill Bright's "hold strongly but be gracious" approach to doctrinal beliefs. It states, in part:

We accept those areas of doctrinal teaching on which, historically, there has been general agreement among all true Christians... We desire to allow for freedom of conviction on other doctrinal matters...

I understand the reference to areas of "general agreement" to be similar to what I have called "convictions." The "other doctrinal matters" would include what I have termed "persuasions." A number of the points articulate classic doctrines of Christianity and are intended to distinguish between historic, evangelical belief and those positions which are heterodox. I would like to comment on several of these distinguishing articles.

Article 1: Trinity. This statement identifies Crusade with the historic creeds and church councils but would exclude the God concepts of non-

Christian world religions (Islam, Judaism, Hinduism) and most of the cults (Jehovah's Witnesses and all other non-Trinitarian groups such as Witness Lee's "Local Church" movement).

Articles 2–5: Christ's virgin birth, deity, resurrection, and ascension. These clauses separate Campus Crusade from Protestant (and some Catholic) theological liberalism that denies (or greatly redefines) the full deity of Christ. It also helps eliminate cultic beliefs that deny or redefine Christ's deity.

Article 8: Imputed righteousness by faith through grace alone. This statement is worded to exclude the traditional (Council of Trent) Roman Catholic view that grace is infused into believers as they cooperate through their own good works.³

Article 9: Assurance of salvation. This article was explicitly worded to include the beliefs of both Reformed and Methodist evangelical believers. Although the statement is often misread as an affirmation of eternal security (the fifth point of Calvinism—Perseverance of the Saints), it actually merely states that all who are born again can immediately be assured of their salvation by the internal witness of the Holy Spirit. It stops short of saying whether that assurance (and salvation itself) can ever be lost. The wording of this statement is a clear indication that, while salvation by grace is a conviction-level belief, the issue of whether that salvation can be lost is a matter of persuasion best left to the conscience of each believer.

Article 10: The Holy Spirit's indwelling and filling. This article states both that the Spirit indwells every believer from the moment of spiritual birth and that the filling of the Spirit is appropriated by faith. This wording would exclude the traditional Pentecostal teaching that the "Baptism of the Holy Spirit" is a second event, marked by speaking in tongues, which is a prerequisite to being filled and empowered by the Holy Spirit. The statement does leave room, however, for the less dogmatic views that often characterize those in movements such as Calvary Chapel and the Vineyard. Teachers in these groups, although often retaining the language of the "Baptism of the Spirit" referring to a second event, usually affirm that all believers are indwelt by the Holy Spirit and that any Christian can be Spirit-filled and empowered by faith.⁴

Articles 14–15: Death is immediately followed by conscious fellowship with the Lord or separation from Him. These articles exclude two of the traditional Seventh-Day Adventist teachings: soul sleep and annihilationism. Article 15, by affirming everlasting judgment and condemnation for unbelievers, also excludes the annihilationist and universalist tendencies of some contemporary evangelical thinkers.

TAKING SIDES ON INERRANCY

One doctrinal stance in the Statement of Faith might be viewed as an exception to the general "hold strongly but be gracious" approach of Bill Bright and the Campus Crusade for Christ Statement. In the second sentence of the first paragraph of the introduction, we find a clear statement that the Bible is inerrant. The question of whether it is appropriate to describe the Bible as "inerrant" or merely "infallible" was one of the major debates among evangelical Christians during the latter half of the twentieth century (particularly the seventies and eighties). Why take a stand on this controversial, persuasion-level belief?⁵

First, I would like to make a couple of points of historical clarification. The current Campus Crusade Statement of Faith was drafted in the late 1960s. In 1972, Dr. Bright's alma mater, Fuller Theological Seminary, changed its statement of faith, eliminating the idea of inerrancy from the clause about the Bible.⁶ Subsequent to Fuller's decision to change its statement, Dr. Bright and the leadership of Campus Crusade inserted the word "inerrant" (in parentheses) into the second sentence of the first paragraph of Crusade's Statement of Faith. This was not a change of position, but rather a clarification of the position that was always intended. Even without the parenthetical addition, the language of the statement clearly affirmed inerrancy. It said that the Bible "was written without error in the original manuscripts." The word "inerrant" was added so there could be no doubt about the original meaning intended by the phrase.

Why was it important to Bill Bright and the other Campus Crusade leaders to take so clear a stand on an issue where prominent and respected evangelical leaders disagreed? Several years ago, I had a brief conversation with Dr. Bright which may shed some light on why he and Crusade have chosen so strong a position in this controversy.

In September 1998, I received a call from the President's Office of Campus Crusade saying that Bill would like to talk with me later in the week. My first reaction was a tensing in my stomach. *What have I done wrong that Bill needs to call me personally?* I wondered. Phone calls from our president have been rare in my thirty years on staff.

When the appointed hour came and I answered the phone, Bill's voice had a warm, grandfatherly tone, and I heard the words that I understand long-time staff members often hear from Bill. "My dear Alan, it's so good to speak with you again."

But it turned out my fears were not entirely unwarranted.

"NavPress has sent me the manuscript of your new book, asking me to

endorse it," Bill continued, "and I intend to do so. But I have a concern with one statement you've made in chapter five."

I was immediately impressed and, frankly, amazed that Bill had taken the time to familiarize himself enough with my book to be concerned about a single statement buried a third of the way into the manuscript. As I scrambled to find my copy on the computer, I tried to imagine what I might have said that concerned him. After all, I had written the book primarily for our staff and was already using the manuscript as a basic text to train the new Campus staff!

"Alan, on page 79, you say that because of manuscript evidence 'we can have a high level of confidence in the integrity and reliability of our modern biblical texts.'"

"Yes," I said, still unable to fathom why that statement could be problematic for him.

"My concern," he said, "is with the phrase 'high level of confidence.' I'm afraid some people might read that to mean that you had something less than *complete* confidence in the Bible."

"Ooh," I said slowly. "I guess I can see how someone might read it that way. That's not what I meant, and I certainly don't want to communicate that I have doubts about the Bible."

"I was sure you didn't," Bill said. "Perhaps we could work out a wording that would communicate more clearly."

We spent the next couple of minutes hashing through the phraseology until both of us were satisfied. In the published version of the book, the sentence now affirms that "the science of manuscript evidence has progressed to the point where we can trust the integrity and reliability of our modern biblical texts." At the end of the next paragraph, I also added a sentence to conclude the discussion. "The fact that there are a few minor differences in ancient manuscripts does not undermine my confidence in the inerrancy of the original autographs or my trust in the Bible I hold in my hands."

I think Bill's conversation with me illustrates two crucial aspects of his approach to this issue. First, I think it shows how important this issue has been in the heart and ministry of Bill Bright. Although the rest of my book covered all the major doctrines of Christianity (including some other controversial ones), Bill had no concerns about the remainder of what I'd written.⁷ I realize now that Bill was doing with my book something corollary to what was done with the inerrancy clause in the Campus Crusade Statement. In both cases, he wanted to make certain no one could misunderstand where Campus Crusade stands as a movement. He wanted it to be entirely clear

that we harbor no doubts or hesitations of any kind concerning the truthfulness and accuracy of God's holy Word.

The second clue to Bill's approach to the inerrancy issue came a few minutes later in the conversation. We happened to mention Fuller Seminary, and he expressed his warm regard and respect for a number of longtime friends there, including Dan Fuller.⁸ Clearly, Bill did not believe that these faculty members had ceased to be Christians or should be condemned as heretics. Bill was treating inerrancy as a persuasion-level issue. He recognized that sincere, godly Christians disagreed, but he nevertheless held inerrancy as a persuasion that was crucial for the ministry of Campus Crusade.

EVALUATING EFFECTIVENESS

How has this approach of "holding strongly but being gracious" served the ministry of Campus Crusade over the years? Have the boundaries been drawn too broadly or too tightly? Bill Bright and Crusade have received considerable criticism over the years (most frequently from Calvinists) for being too broad and inclusive. Often the charge has been that we've been too friendly with Wesleyans and with Charismatics. I was raised Presbyterian and would not consider myself to be either a Wesleyan or a Charismatic. Rather, I often identify myself as a moderate Calvinist. Yet my own judgment is that the theological boundary has been drawn in something very close to the right place.

Despite his own Presbyterian roots, Bill Bright founded Campus Crusade to be an interdenominational parachurch movement, not a Reformed missionary society. In my view, there would have been nothing wrong with his choosing to start a distinctively Presbyterian home mission society if he had felt God leading him to do so. But that was not what Bill felt God leading him to do. Rather, he was to start an evangelistic movement that would reach as many as possible with the simple gospel of Christ's love and forgiveness. To do so, Bill decided to attract as many genuine, dedicated Christians to the Crusade staff as possible. He wanted staff membership to be open to evangelical Wesleyans, Baptists, Lutherans, and Episcopalians, as well as Presbyterians, as long as all could wholeheartedly agree with Campus Crusade's doctrine and ministry distinctives. I believe this choice and the way it shaped the Statement of Faith have served the movement well.

But what about the opposite charge? Perhaps Bill has drawn the boundary too tightly, especially on the issue of inerrancy. After all, many sincere godly believers who love Christ and hold to the historic Christian doctrines do not feel they can honestly say that the Bible is without error. Wouldn't it

be better for the movement if we welcomed them on staff as well? Certainly, there are other wonderful evangelistic movements (such as Young Life) which have chosen differently. Admittedly, this is a judgment call. However, it is my view that Dr. Bright and the other Crusade leaders have made the wiser choice. Perhaps a personal story will help illustrate why I'm glad our doctrinal statement clearly affirms inerrancy.

A number of years ago, I spent considerable time discussing this issue with a staff member whom I will call Ron (not his real name). When I met him, Ron had already spent many years as a faithful full-time, faith-supported Crusade staff member. It soon became clear to me that Ron loved the Lord deeply and sincerely desired to continue a ministry of evangelism, discipleship, and teaching for the rest of his life. To help prepare further, Ron was pursuing an advanced degree at a major seminary. At this school, he was attracted to a prominent professor who was part of a new movement called "Anglo-American Postmodernism." By the time I met him, Ron had become a strong disciple of this new approach to evangelical belief. In fact, he had the vision to return to full-time staff duties and spread his new understanding of Christianity throughout the Crusade ministry, believing that it would help us to better evangelize the current generation in Western culture.

When I raised the issue of inerrancy, Ron said, "From a postmodern perspective, I can't make any sense of the term."

"How then," I asked, "can you continue in good conscience to sign the statement of faith which clearly teaches inerrancy?"

His answer was a fascinating one. "Well, I understand the modern framework out of which that statement was drafted. And I also understand the heart and intent behind the words. And I can honor the intent even though, as a postmodernist, I can no longer find meaning for myself in the words themselves."

"Ron," I said, "that's simply not enough. You know the meaning that was intended by those words. You can't simply say that you honor and respect those who wrote them. You must, in good conscience, still believe them yourself, as you know they were intended to be understood. Or else you must leave staff."

Others on staff gave Ron similar counsel. Eventually, he chose to leave. Since that time, I have made a substantial study of postmodernism in general and of its conservative, evangelical branch in particular. My own eventual judgment was that it is a dangerous, though well-intentioned, distortion of Christianity.⁹ In this instance, I believe the inerrancy clause in the Crusade statement saved the ministry from much greater future problems.

GUARANTEEING PROTECTION?

Is the Campus Crusade Statement of Faith an ironclad guarantee against doctrinal drift within the movement? Sometimes, as in the case of Ron, it can play a crucial role. But overall, my judgment would be "no." I do not believe that any statement, no matter how carefully worded, could ever be, by itself, a complete protection against doctrinal defection.

This point was powerfully expressed to me nearly twenty years ago during an evening I had the privilege of spending with theologian Charles Ryrie. Dr. Ryrie had graciously agreed to come to San Bernardino for several days to advise those of us in the newly established International School of Theology. One evening, I volunteered to take him to dinner where I enjoyed a fascinating conversation with him over salad and pasta.

At one point in the evening, I told him that I was the current chair of the faculty selection committee. Then I posed this question: "If you were in our position, just beginning a new evangelical school, what measures would you take to avoid the kind of doctrinal drift toward liberalism that has plagued so many formerly conservative seminaries?"

His answer surprised me. I expected that he might propose certain points for inclusion in the seminary's doctrinal statement. Or I thought he might suggest theological questions we should pose to prospective faculty. After all, he was a widely published and very influential American theologian. But his answer had little to do directly with theology. "The most important thing you can do to protect your seminary is to hire faculty who share their faith in Christ with others."

I am convinced that Dr. Ryrie was right. Nearly twenty years later, I'm convinced the practice of hiring faculty members who are active in practical ministries, including evangelism, is one of the most important distinctives, and greatest protections, for our various schools of theology around the world.

I would like to conclude with an expansion of the point Charles Ryrie made to me nearly two decades ago. I believe there are two emphases of the ministry of Bill Bright that have been vitally important in protecting the various ministries of Campus Crusade (including its educational arms) for the last fifty years. Significantly, both of these emphases are reflected in the statement of faith. Both are notable because neither are common subjects found in the historic creeds of Christendom nor in most contemporary doctrinal statements. I mentioned one of these distinctives earlier in this chapter. Article 10 speaks of various ministries of the Holy Spirit. The last sentence of the article says, "His fullness, power, and control are appropri-

ated in the believer's life by faith." I believe that Bill Bright's emphasis on the importance of every staff member (and every Christian) living day by day filled and empowered by the Holy Spirit has been a significant boon and protection for the ministry.

The second emphasis that has served as an important protection for the ministry is the one highlighted by Dr. Ryrie, the stress that Bill has placed on evangelism and the Great Commission. The final article of Crusade's statement reads:

The Lord Jesus Christ commanded all believers to proclaim the Gospel throughout the world and to disciple men of every nation. The fulfillment of that Great Commission requires that all worldly and personal ambitions be subordinated to a total commitment to "Him who loved us and gave Himself for us."

It is my belief that these two distinctives, the Spirit-filled life and fulfillment of the Great Commission, are perhaps the greatest lasting legacy of Bill Bright to the movement of Campus Crusade for Christ and to the Body of Christ throughout the world.

THE CAMPUS CRUSADE FOR CHRIST STATEMENT OF FAITH

The sole basis of our beliefs is the Bible, God's infallible written Word, the 66 books of the Old and New Testaments. We believe that it was uniquely, verbally and fully inspired by the Holy Spirit and that it was written without error (inerrant) in the original manuscripts. It is the supreme and final authority in all matters on which it speaks.

We accept those areas of doctrinal teaching on which, historically, there has been general agreement among all true Christians. Because of the specialized calling of our movement, we desire to allow for freedom of conviction on other doctrinal matters, provided that any interpretation is based upon the Bible alone, and that no such interpretation shall become an issue which hinders the ministry to which God has called us.

1. There is one true God, eternally existing in three persons—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—each of whom possesses equally all the attributes of Deity and the characteristics of personality.
2. Jesus Christ is God, the living Word, who became flesh through His miraculous conception by the Holy Spirit and His virgin birth. Hence, He is perfect Deity and true humanity united in one person forever.

3. He lived a sinless life and voluntarily atoned for the sins of men by dying on the cross as their substitute, thus satisfying divine justice and accomplishing salvation for all who trust in Him alone.
4. He rose from the dead in the same body, though glorified, in which He lived and died.
5. He ascended bodily into heaven and sat down at the right hand of God the Father, where He, the only mediator between God and man, continually makes intercession for His own.
6. Man was originally created in the image of God. He sinned by disobeying God; thus, he was alienated from his Creator. That historic fall brought all mankind under divine condemnation.
7. Man's nature is corrupted, and he is thus totally unable to please God. Every man is in need of regeneration and renewal by the Holy Spirit.
8. The salvation of man is wholly a work of God's free grace and is not the work, in whole or in part, of human works or goodness or religious ceremony. God imputes His righteousness to those who put their faith in Christ alone for their salvation, and thereby justifies them in His sight.
9. It is the privilege of all who are born again of the Spirit to be assured of their salvation from the very moment in which they trust Christ as their Savior. This assurance is not based upon any kind of human merit, but is produced by the witness of the Holy Spirit, who confirms in the believer the testimony of God in His written Word.
10. The Holy Spirit has come into the world to reveal and glorify Christ and to apply the saving work of Christ to men. He convicts and draws sinners to Christ, imparts new life to them, continually indwells them from the moment of spiritual birth and seals them until the day of redemption. His fullness, power and control are appropriated in the believer's life by faith.
11. Every believer is called to live so in the power of the indwelling Spirit that he will not fulfill the lust of the flesh but will bear fruit to the glory of God.
12. Jesus Christ is the Head of the Church, His Body, which is composed of all men, living and dead, who have been joined to Him through saving faith.
13. God admonishes His people to assemble together regularly for worship, for participation in ordinances, for edification through the Scriptures

and for mutual encouragement.

14. At physical death, the believer enters immediately into eternal, conscious fellowship with the Lord and awaits the resurrection of his body to everlasting glory and blessing.
15. At physical death, the unbeliever enters immediately into eternal, conscious separation from the Lord and awaits the resurrection of his body to everlasting judgment and condemnation.
16. Jesus Christ will come again to the earth—personally, visibly and bodily—to consummate history and the eternal plan of God.
17. The Lord Jesus Christ commanded all believers to proclaim the Gospel throughout the world and to disciple men of every nation. The fulfillment of that Great Commission requires that all worldly and personal ambitions be subordinated to a total commitment to “Him who loved us and gave Himself for us.”

NOTES

1. I first explored these technical terms for my Master of Divinity thesis at the International School of Theology in 1983 under the direction of Steven M. Clinton, my thesis chair. Dr. Clinton and I eventually published a revised and edited version of the thesis under the title, “Levels of Belief in the Pauline Epistles: A Paradigm of Evangelical Unity,” *Bulletin of the Evangelical Philosophical Society* 1991, Vol. 14, No. 2, 70–84. A more popular version of the same concepts was elaborated in the first chapter of my book, *What Christianity Is All About: How You Can Know and Enjoy God* (Colorado Springs: NavPress, 1999). The book has been used as a basic text for the past five years in the Doctrine Survey course as a part of winter and summer Campus Crusade for Christ new-staff training in the United States.
2. In my view, the Campus Crusade for Christ Statement articulates several conviction- and persuasion-level beliefs. I do not think it speaks to any issues I have defined as “opinions.”
3. What is not entirely clear to me is whether this statement also excludes all post-Vatican II Catholic thinkers. Bill Bright came under considerable criticism for endorsing the two Evangelicals & Catholics Together study documents. While this controversy is much too complex to address properly in this chapter, it should be noted that both documents clearly stated the remaining differences between the evangelical and Catholic signers. Specifically, the first statement acknowledged, “Evangelicals hold that the Catholic Church has gone beyond Scripture, adding teachings and practices that detract from or compromise the Gospel of God’s saving grace in Christ.” The second statement admitted that unresolved questions between the two groups included the issue of “the historic uses of the language of justification as it relates to imputed and transformative righteousness.” The text of both statements (including a list of signers) can be found at www.onebody.org.

4. See, for example, Chuck Smith’s discussion of these issues in “Empowered by the Spirit,” chapter three of *Calvary Chapel Distinctives* (Costa Mesa, CA: The Word for Today Publishers, 2000), 29–35.
5. In *What Christianity*, I argue that the authority of the Bible, not inerrancy, is the cardinal conviction that separates believers from nonbelievers. I class inerrancy as a persuasion-level belief, one that I am certain is true but would not use as a basis of dividing fellowship with other believers. However, I also state that I “am glad that my own institutions (Campus Crusade for Christ and the International School of Theology) include inerrancy in their statements of faith and I, for one, would fight to retain that clause.”
6. From the founding of the seminary in 1947, the relevant clause in the Fuller statement read: “The books which form the canon of the Old and New Testaments as originally given are plenary inspired and free from all error in the whole and in the part. These books constitute the written Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice.” In the new statement adopted in 1972, the same clause now reads: “Scripture is an essential part and trustworthy record of this divine self-disclosure. All the books of the Old and New Testaments, given by divine inspiration, are the written word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice.” Although the new statement retained the idea that the Bible is the “only infallible rule of faith and practice” (the reliable guide in matters of doctrine and morals), it eliminated the assertion that it was also free from all error (inerrant). One of the motivations for this change was to appeal to the seminary’s large Presbyterian constituency, which Fuller has done with great success, seeing more than a thousand of its graduates ordained in the PCUSA denomination.
7. Bill’s endorsement, which appears on the back cover of the book, reads “With great skill and insight, Dr. Scholes captures the very essence of God’s loving message to the human race, and he does so in an easily understood way. I highly recommend this book for any and all who are seeking a more personal, intimate relationship with God.”
8. Daniel Fuller, the son of the seminary’s founder, was in the initial group of five staff who joined Bill and Vonette in the nascent ministry of Campus Crusade at UCLA in 1952.
9. Space will not allow a full analysis of the teachings of evangelical postmodernism. Briefly, all postmodernists have been influenced by Wittgenstein’s concept that truth is established by (not merely learned through) the language game of a particular community. If this premise is accepted, it seems to me that the conclusion is inescapable that all Christian doctrines are produced by and relative to the Christian community (or even specific subgroups within Christianity). It does not seem possible for a postmodernist to consistently maintain that Jesus is *The Truth* for all people, no matter what their community and language game. This teaching, in my view, would eventually lead to Christians abandoning the urgency of the Great Commission.