



# In the Beginning was Pre-Evangelism: An Examination of Francis Schaeffer's Doctrine of Creation as an Apologetic

Christopher Talbot

Instructor of Ministry/Program Coordinator for Youth and Family Ministry at Welch College  
[ctalbot@welch.edu](mailto:ctalbot@welch.edu)

**Abstract:** Much of modern apologetic discussion regarding the Genesis account emphasizes the debate on the age of the Earth. Because of this shift in focus, a bifurcation is seen between the doctrine of Creation (a theological concern) and views of creationism (an apologetic concern). While these areas certainly have distinct foci, one wonders whether the division has been unnecessarily amplified, specifically with two so closely related fields of research. Considering current divisions, one wonders how Creation and creationism can be best understood in relation to one another, particularly as it relates to apologetics. To explore this query, Francis Schaeffer offers a unique perspective of the connection between Creation and creationism. Therefore, this paper will argue that for Francis Schaeffer, his doctrine of Creation (instead of creationism) offered a foundational framework for his apologetic and evangelistic method.

**Keywords:** Francis Schaeffer, Creation, Creationism, Apologetics, Evangelism

Much of modern apologetic discussion regarding the Genesis account emphasizes the debate on the age of the Earth. Because of this shift in focus, a bifurcation is seen between the doctrine of Creation (a theological concern) and views of creationism (an apologetic concern). While these areas certainly have distinct foci, one wonders whether the division has been unnecessarily amplified, specifically with two so closely related fields of research. Considering current divisions, one wonders how Creation and creationism can be best understood in relation to one another, particularly as it relates to apologetics. To explore this query, Francis Schaeffer offers a unique perspective of the connection between Creation and creationism. Therefore, this paper will

argue that for Francis Schaeffer, his doctrine of Creation (instead of creationism) offered a foundational framework for his apologetic and evangelistic method.

Francis Schaeffer's apologetic and evangelistic approach has intrigued generations of those interested in defending the faith.<sup>1</sup> Yet, little attention has been given to how his method is related to his doctrine of Creation. Most appraisals, instead, evaluate Schaeffer's apologetic epistemology. On the topics of Creation and creationism, these two ideas demonstrate their thematic intersection in the thought of Francis Schaeffer. First, for Schaeffer, the age of the Earth was not an essential question when seeking to practice apologetics or evangelism. Instead, he understood the Christian to have interpretive freedom in how to conceptualize

the dating of the Earth and the use of “day” in the Genesis account. Second, and conversely, Schaeffer placed a fundamental emphasis toward the doctrine of Creation in apologetic and evangelistic encounters. He understood the Christian to have some freedom in the creationist debate, but utilized and underscored the doctrine of Creation as vital for developing a Christian worldview.

The doctrine of Creation, with its various theological implications, lays at the forefront of Schaeffer’s apologetic paradigm. For these reasons, Schaeffer offers readers a helpful balance between Creation and creationism as it relates to his own ministerial practice. To argue this position, I will begin by exploring Schaeffer’s views on creationism, noting his exegetical convictions and liberties, followed by assessing his perception of the relationship between science and Christianity. After establishing these categories, I will then offer a constructive framework for how Schaeffer utilized his doctrine of Creation for his apologetic approach, followed by how his framework correlates pre-evangelism (apologetics) and evangelism.

### Schaeffer’s Views of Creationism

Ken Keathley and Mark Rooker offer a helpful distinction between creation and creationism: “One is a doctrine while the other is an apologetic approach. On the one hand, creation is a foundational doctrine to the Christian faith... On the other hand, creationism is an apologetic approach which attempts to integrate the doctrine of creation with the current understandings of the natural sciences.”<sup>2</sup> Throughout this paper, “creationist” will be used broadly to refer to any apologetic approach that seeks to reconcile the doctrine of creation with the natural

sciences. This can include, but is not limited to: young-earth creationism, old-earth creationism, and evolutionary creationism. To be sure, Schaeffer was indisputably a creationist.<sup>3</sup> Yet, Schaeffer’s entire apologetic project is grounded in understanding God’s intimate involvement within creation, not only in the design of human beings, but the entire universe. The biblical worldview, according to Schaeffer, is predicated on the Trinitarian, personal God’s creation of all things.<sup>4</sup> Consistently, Schaeffer challenged naturalistic views that not only rejected divine action, but that also depended entirely on natural processes to explain the cosmos. Without a personal creative act, “we are the natural products of the impersonal, plus time and chance...”<sup>5</sup> Even Schaeffer’s belief in hermeneutical freedom toward creationism seemed to have an apologetic, pre-evangelistic bend.

Schaeffer sought to remove barriers keeping skeptics from embracing the truth of the Gospel, while at the same time, sought to maintain a robust, intellectually viable Christian faith in relation to science.<sup>6</sup> As C. John Collins writes, “For these reasons Schaeffer articulated an approach to origins that he called ‘freedoms and limitations’: there is a range of reasonable scenarios by which we may address the apparent conflicts between the Bible and the sciences, and yet there are limits to this range, limits set both by basic Biblical concepts and by good human judgment.”<sup>7</sup> Collins clarifies these freedoms should be understood as “enumerative and suggestive, rather than exhaustive.”<sup>8</sup> Schaeffer had no problem standing resolutely on issues he felt were fundamental to the Christian faith – he did so in a variety of cultural spheres. Yet, he was also concerned to avoid unnecessary conflict that may be disparaging to

the Church's witness.<sup>9</sup>

Many creationist apologetic ministries have divided on the age of the earth, including, but not limited to young-earth, old-earth, and evolutionary creationism.<sup>10</sup> Even though Schaeffer grew up and began his education during the liberal-fundamentalist debate, he did not take a hard position on the age of the earth.<sup>11</sup> Instead, he writes,

What does *day* mean in the "days" of creation? The answer must be held with some openness... The simple fact is that *day* in Hebrew (just as in English) is used in three separate senses to mean: (1) twenty-four hours, (2) the period of light during the twenty-four hours, and (3) an indeterminate amount of time. Therefore, we must leave open the exact length of time indicated by *day* in Genesis.... In the light of the word as used in the bible and the lack of finality of science concerning the problem of dating, in a sense there is no debate, because there are no clearly defined terms upon which to debate.<sup>12</sup>

While advocating for some interpretive freedoms, Schaeffer stood against modern science. He was unsure about the ability of carbon-dating to give a reasonable date over billions of years. He doubted scientists ability to consider evidence that may be in conflict with their prevailing theories and presuppositions.<sup>13</sup> The statement from L'Abri on creation/evolution is clarifying: "he allows freedom of opinion on the lengths of the days, on animal death before the Fall, on the extent of the flood – all of which shows him to be remarkably free of his own fundamentalist heritage. And yet he is crystal clear that there was an historical Adam and Eve, an historical Fall, and multiple moments of creative intervention by

God."<sup>14</sup> Schaeffer held this balance well, maintaining an orthodox view of Creation.

Some have charged Schaeffer with encouraging the larger evangelical culture to be suspicious of science, but this seems to be unwarranted given his equal critique of both sides of the debate.<sup>15</sup> Schaeffer argued modern natural science was impossible without the presuppositions laid out clearly in the Genesis account.<sup>16</sup> Schaeffer's resilient concern with creation seemed to be on Scriptural inerrancy – not with different viable and faithful interpretations. He sought to defend a high view of Scripture, but understood Scripture to have a particular focus and purpose. Schaeffer was distinctly not arguing for a dichotomy between Christianity and science. Instead, he believed Scripture to speak authoritatively about science and the cosmos, but only inasmuch as it related to the singular purpose of the Bible to proclaim what man needs to know about himself and God.<sup>17</sup>

Schaeffer seemed to rule out the possibility of evolution from a theistic perspective.<sup>18</sup> He argues those Christians who are excited about the big bang theory and its possible support of Christianity ultimately miss the key point.<sup>19</sup> He writes, "The simple fact is that what is given in Genesis 1:1 has no relationship to the big bang theory – because from the scriptural viewpoint, the primal creation goes back beyond the basic material or energy."<sup>20</sup> The difference here is that the Christian believes God spoke primal matter out of nothing, making a distinction between matter and who created that matter.<sup>21</sup> Schaeffer consistently oriented his audience to look back to creation and behind the natural order to answer the question regarding who had been there "before the beginning."

### Schaeffer's View of the Relationship Between Science and Christianity

Much of modern debates about creationism include reference to the relation and role of science in understanding the world. On one side of the spectrum, proponents have argued for a "god of the gaps" approach, on the other side, cognitive dualism.<sup>22</sup> By "god of the gaps" I am referring to utilizing God as an explanation when science currently does not offer a solution. Therefore, God offers an explanation to a supposed "gap" in scientific thought. Cognitive dualism, on the other hand, means holding two (often competing) ideas/traditions simultaneously while not seeking to reconcile their tensions.<sup>23</sup> Schaeffer, interestingly enough, seems to avoid either extreme. He does not argue for Scripture to simply fill in where science is silent, but also does not believe in the need to divide one's thinking on the issue. He was clear that when both Christianity and science are properly understood in relation to one another there is "no final conflict." Because both science and Christianity operate in revelational capacities, both speak to the truth of reality.<sup>24</sup> Instead, Schaeffer believed science and Scripture to operate with different methodologies.<sup>25</sup> He argued that there was no automatic need to accommodate the Bible to science. Instead, because Scripture deals in propositional truth and brute facts, then it can be trusted on the things it proports.<sup>26</sup> While one might argue this approach to be an oversimplification, Schaeffer merely sought to promote the authority of Scripture without diminishing the truth found in scientific discovery.

One of Schaeffer's major themes found throughout his work was to bring all areas of life under submission to the

Lordship of Jesus Christ. Science, as an area of authority for the natural world, was certainly no exception. He was concerned with the bifurcation of science and Christianity that would lead to an epistemological divide. He understood this separation to leave one with "the Bible as an authority only in religious matters."<sup>27</sup> Put another way, he believed the issue at stake to be whether "the Bible [is true] and without error wherever it speaks, including where it touches history and the cosmos, or is it only in some sense revelational where it touches religious subject?"<sup>28</sup> Schaeffer's trepidation, again, was on the issue of inerrancy and authority. Specifically, he hoped to keep evangelicalism from reducing inerrancy to a modern sacred-secular divide, in which the Bible becomes housed-off from non-spiritual areas. He admits that the Bible is not a scientific textbook, at least not in the technical sense.<sup>29</sup> Yet, he is clear that the Bible is not without authority and truth on cosmology and scientific subjects, inasmuch as it relates to Scripture's central theme/purpose.<sup>30</sup>

While Schaeffer was clearly concerned with maintaining the reliability of Scripture, he also noted the Bible itself does not give exhaustive truth about the cosmos. Scripture offers authoritative truth, but not comprehensive truth. Instead he encouraged Christians, saying, "we should take time as educated people to reconsider both the special and general revelations..."<sup>31</sup> Even though Schaeffer held to a strong view of inerrancy, he did not mean for one to read the Bible in a "wooden, uneducated way."<sup>32</sup> He argues, instead, that while there are limits to our interpretations, there are also significant freedoms within those limitations.<sup>33</sup> Interestingly, in his short book *No Final*

*Conflict*, Schaeffer commends seven freedoms that Scripture offers regarding cosmogony, along with only two limitations. These freedoms are as follows: (1) it is possible that God created a “grown up universe,” (2) it is possible that there is a break between verses 1 and 2, or verses 2 and 3, of Genesis 1 and that from that point on the Bible speaks of a reforming a partially disordered creation rather than the original creation, (3) it is possible Genesis 1 refers to a “long day,” (4) it is possible the flood affected geological data, (5) it is possible “kinds” in Genesis 1 does not necessarily denote individual species, (6) there is a possibility of animal death before the Fall, and (7) only the word *bara* must mean an absolute new beginning.<sup>34</sup>

As indicated, Schaeffer did argue for two limitations to which evangelicals should subscribe. First, “is that the use of the word *bara* insists that at the original creation, at the creation of conscious life, and at the creation of man there was specific discontinuity with what preceded.”<sup>35</sup> Second, “is that Adam was historic and was the first man, and that Eve was made from Adam.”<sup>36</sup> These two limitations logged certain non-negotiables for interpreting the Genesis account. Schaeffer held, at the very least, the *ex niblio* creation of the world, and the historical *de novo* creation of Adam and Eve to be fixed truths for the Christian.<sup>37</sup>

One might be tempted to think that with hermeneutical freedom comes a diminished view of Scripture. For Schaeffer, on the topic of Creation, nothing could be further from the truth. He writes in *Genesis in Space and Time*, “Wherever [the Bible] touches upon anything, it does so with true truth, but not with exhaustive truth. That is, where it speaks of the

cosmos, science, what it says is true ... it speaks with what I call true truth – that is, propositional, objective truth.”<sup>38</sup> Schaeffer resolutely held to a strong view of scriptural authority and sufficiency. He strongly believed Scripture to be the inspired, inerrant word of God, which speaks to the whole of life. He simply wanted to avoid moving beyond what Scripture itself proports.

### Doctrine of Creation as Foundation for Pre-Evangelism

Schaeffer conceptualized apologetics as pre-evangelism. According to Schaeffer, pre-evangelism is preparatory work that brings the non-Christian to an awareness of their need of the Gospel.<sup>39</sup> Pre-evangelism is “the communication of the gospel to the present generation in terms that they can understand.”<sup>40</sup> While Schaeffer never explicitly stated that it was his doctrine of Creation which operated as the foundation for his pre-evangelism, virtually all the main tenets are present. As William Edgar writes, “His strength was to see everything as interrelated, and this really does go back to his strong view of the creation. However inconsistently he applied it, he certainly started with a robust view of the original order of things.”<sup>41</sup> For Schaeffer, the story of salvation begins in Genesis, not in the New Testament.<sup>42</sup> Further, it is the truth which begins in Genesis that moves the story of salvation through the New Testament and into the life of the contemporary believer.

Schaeffer’s believed apologetics to serve two purposes: (1) defense, and (2) communication. The first purpose is to defend historic Christianity from any outward attacks. The second is to responsibly communicate the gospel.<sup>43</sup> As

Schaeffer clearly says, “No one can become a Christian unless he understands what Christianity is saying.”<sup>44</sup> Schaeffer considered truth to come before conversion, and therefore, pre-evangelism (apologetics) must inherently come before evangelism.<sup>45</sup> The framework for Schaeffer’s own “pre-evangelism” finds much of its substance in his doctrine of creation.

Udo Middeldmann records Schaeffer beginning his Bible reading each year in Genesis, “in the creation of a material world.”<sup>46</sup> Middeldmann notes this practice to be an outgrowth of understanding salvation not to be a promise for heaven, but a salvation and healing for the whole person. Schaeffer took the truth of Genesis seriously. While he was open to interpretations of the Genesis record, he resolutely believed and argued that the Genesis narrative consisted of real events that happened in space-time.<sup>47</sup> For Schaeffer, “[i]nterpreting Genesis as allegory, myth, or parable was to undercut the whole moral argument for the existence of the triune God.”<sup>48</sup> As Barry Hankins argues, Schaeffer’s *Genesis in Space and Time* was “written to gird Christians for apologetics, not a book directed to unbelievers to draw them into the faith.”<sup>49</sup> In part, his argument seemed relatively simple: since the biblical authors treated Adam and Eve as historical figures, Christians should do likewise.<sup>50</sup>

Schaeffer’s comments on the opening chapters of Genesis are not limited to just one book. He writes in *The Finished Work of Christ*,

There is a tendency in our day to view the first three chapters of Genesis as merely myth or parable, an idea or allegory. But considering that both Paul and Christ accepted those chapters as real history, if we reject them we are rejecting the

authority not only of Paul but even of Christ Himself. Seeing, however, that both Christ and Paul *did* believe in the historicity of Adam and Eve, we can be confident and unapologetic in presenting Genesis 3 as the sufficient explanation of sin’s entrance into the world...There was a historical Fall, bringing death to all people, even those who lived before the giving of the law. But then there was also the equally historical coming of the Redeemer.<sup>51</sup>

Therefore, Genesis 1-3 spoke truthfully and historically about not only the creation and reality of Adam and Eve, but also a historical fall that brought about disastrous consequences to all of mankind and creation.

According to Schaeffer, the basis for much (if not all) of the answers to the inescapable questions of life are found “in the beginning,” clearly laid out in the opening chapters of Genesis. According to one author’s account, Schaeffer himself asserted that if he could spend an hour discussing Christianity with someone, that he would spend the first fifty-five minutes talking about the doctrine of Creation, and the last five minutes on the presentation of the gospel.<sup>52</sup> Among other ideas, themes of human personhood and the distinctiveness of the universe are laid out foundationally in Genesis 1-3. Schaeffer understood Christianity as a system that begins with a few basic truths, which include, “the existence of the infinite-personal God, man’s creation in His image and a space-time Fall.”<sup>53</sup> Without a real Adam and a real fall, Schaeffer believed the biblical worldview to collapse.<sup>54</sup> Stephen Wellum records that Schaeffer “was very concerned that Adam was viewed as a historic figure and the Fall as a space-time event, and that the early chapters of



Genesis were not de-historicized.”<sup>55</sup> Schaeffer understood these beliefs to be main tenets of the historic Christian worldview.

Schaeffer’s doctrine of creation includes the following tenets that were key to his pre-evangelism/apologetic approach: (1) a personal God, (2) the flow of history, (3) a personal universe, and (4) a wholistic understanding of man. These components are neither exhaustive of Schaeffer’s doctrine of creation, nor the entirety of his theological foundation for apologetics. Instead, these four areas are representative of the way in which Schaeffer’s doctrine of creation provides the basis for much of his apologetic structure. Placed together, they offer a strong base for Schaeffer’s formulation of the Christian worldview.

### *A Personal God*

First, Schaeffer understood the biblical worldview (and his apologetic) to begin with God, specifically God as the preexistent Trinity. As noted, there was something “before the beginning” that is crucial to one’s understanding of reality.<sup>56</sup> Here, “before the beginning” the Triune God existed, receiving glory and expressing love to Himself. Further, it was here, before the creative acts where God chose His redemptive plan for humanity.<sup>57</sup> Schaeffer argues that the Christian God is more than a theoretical concept. The truth of a personal God challenges both the “philosophical other or impersonal everything which is frequently the twentieth-century theologian’s concept of God.”<sup>58</sup> Schaeffer wanted to make resolutely clear that what existed before everything was neither a philosophical abstraction or a subjective experience, nor was that thing static – instead, it was the per-

sonal, active, triune God. In that triune God, “the Father loved the Son; there was a plan; there was communication; and promises were made prior to the creation of the heavens and the earth.”<sup>59</sup> Even before the creative act in Genesis, God’s existence and intent was clear.

Because God is a personal God, He then is able to reveal objective truth to those whom He has made in His image. Schaeffer maintained that the only reason the Bible, creeds, or even orthodoxy had any importance is because they found their reality and truthfulness in the God who is there.<sup>60</sup> He sought to avoid worldview constructions that swung the pendulum too far one way or another on God’s interaction with His creation. He was quick to challenge deistic formulations that may reject a present, active God on one hand, as well as rejecting more pantheistic or mystical formulations that make God too immanent on the other. Schaeffer wanted to draw a distinction between other understandings of Creation. He wrote, on the concept of creation, “that God was there before the beginning of the space-time continuum and God created everything out of nothing. From this, we must understand that creation is not an extension of the essence of God. Created things have an objective existence themselves.”<sup>61</sup> Schaeffer constantly emphasized the profound balance of the Christian God that is illustrated in the opening chapters of Scripture – one who is not only omnipotent and holy, but also intimately acquainted with His creation.

While he only mentions two persons (Father and Son) of the Trinity earlier in *Genesis in Space and Time*, he is clear that the whole basis of reality is rooted in the reality of the three-person Godhead.

Schaeffer believed the doctrine of the Trinity, as expressed in the first few chapters of Genesis, to hold the answers to modern man's needs.<sup>62</sup> Within the Trinity, a personal beginning exists in which love, thought, and communication are not products of creation, but exist prior to creation in God.<sup>63</sup> From this triune God flows those things that move creation beyond just a material existence to something more transcendent, purposeful, and personal.

### *The Flow of History*

Second, Schaeffer's doctrine of creation focuses on the beginning and purpose of history. As he notes, "The infinite God has ... created a significant History. He can tell us of future events as well as past events. History is going someplace; it is not a series of endless cycles. History as we now know it had an *absolute starting place at the creation*, and it flows on."<sup>64</sup> According to Schaeffer, God created time itself, rather than suggesting God to simply participate within a preexistent time.<sup>65</sup> Even more, he considered time to have a particular direction. He believed creation history to begin in peace, move in a particular and purposeful direction, and return to peace again at the end of time.<sup>66</sup> As Edgar summarizes Schaeffer's views, "God's creation ordinances herald a rich fabric of human history, where forces and counterforces are at work."<sup>67</sup> All of history speaks to God's initial and continual work with humanity.

This understanding of history has implications to Schaeffer's epistemology as well. Schaeffer referenced the Kantian epistemic distinction between what he called "upper story" and "lower story" knowledge. He was not only concerned with the upper story/transcendent truths

the Genesis narrative conveys of love and purpose, but also the lower story/real historical event it records. William Varner inquires of this central question, "Did the events that are related in Genesis 3 really take place in space-time history (Schaeffer's lower sphere) or can we Christians be satisfied with affirming faith in the message that these stories convey (his upper sphere) without any concern that they actually took place?"<sup>68</sup> Varner argues, by way of Schaeffer, on the necessity of a historic space-time fall for the viability of the Christian faith. Salvation history, then, involves both the upper and lower story of human knowledge.<sup>69</sup> History, which begins in creation, is intended to reach across the divided plain of knowledge to unify and record both the absolutes and the particulars, the transcendent and the tangible.

Schaeffer reiterates this theme elsewhere, speaking on the objective truth that connects all areas of life, including both science and history, "But once God created, that which he created had objective reality. And as God created history with space-time significance, that which happens in history also has objective reality."<sup>70</sup> Therefore, history (rightly understood) is a record not of subjective experience, but of objective truth as it relates to reality. Moreover, because history was created to relay objective reality, it has significance for every person. History, which is important for Schaeffer's apologetic framework, begins and finds its grounding in Creation.

### *A Personal Universe*

Third, Schaeffer's doctrine of Creation maintains a personal universe. He often enlists worldview/apologetic analysis by contrasting the perspective of two world-



views: those who held to an impersonal universe, and those who held to a personal one. He understood all of creation's existence to show "the God who is."<sup>71</sup> Thomas Morris, analyzing Schaeffer's approach and discussing the materialistic worldview, writes, "The problem is how an impersonal environment could have generated and maintained a form of life whose distinctive nature is both unnecessary for functioning in that environment and finally unfulfillable by that environment."<sup>72</sup> According to Schaeffer the answer to man's "mannishness" and personality are found in a personal beginning of the universe.<sup>73</sup>

He claimed that without a personal universe, man was left with nothing in their origin but time and chance. Things like personality and morality, among a variety of other elements, were unexplainable to the human experience.<sup>74</sup> He explored in his writings the myriad implications for man's place in the universe if all was framed only in terms of matter and time.<sup>75</sup> A purely material universe reduced man to nothing more than a cosmic coincidence, left with no connection to the transcendent truths found in God. Christianity, on the other hand, argues for a strong cosmic and anthropological *telos*, giving humanity worth and purpose found in its creation.

Much of Schaeffer's worldview/apologetic project is contrasting Christianity with the constant foil of naturalism/humanism. Schaeffer was especially uneasy toward naturalism, "whose view of reality reflects a materialist understanding of man in which he is merely the chance product of matter in motion. In short, man lives in an impersonal universe, according to the materialist, and hence personality is not intrinsic to existence. But then how does

one explain man's personality from the impersonal beginning, plus time, plus chance?"<sup>76</sup> He considered naturalism to lack the explanatory power to give meaning and purpose to human life. Schaeffer believed an impersonal origin of the cosmos to result in at least two devastating problems. First, with no personal beginning, "there is no real explanation for the fact that the external world not only exists, but has a specific form."<sup>77</sup> Second, and even more significant to Schaeffer, is "if we begin with an impersonal universe, there is no explanation of personality."<sup>78</sup>

Therefore, a personal Creator, who created time and history, also created a personal universe and mankind with personality. Schaeffer's doctrine of Creation, then, gives a basis for answering man's inescapable questions, while an impersonal beginning "gives no basis for understanding human relationships, building just societies, or engaging in any kind of cultural effort."<sup>79</sup> His doctrine of Creation begins infinitely large, beginning with God Himself, then narrows from history and the universe down to how his conception of Creation has implications even for the individual person.

### *A Wholistic Understanding of Man*

Lastly, Schaeffer connected his theological anthropology to his doctrine of Creation.<sup>80</sup> He sought to tie the creation of Adam and Eve to the unity of the whole human race.<sup>81</sup> This approach is not unique with Schaeffer. Throughout church history the Church has largely understood Adam and Eve to be representative for the rest of the human race. Schaeffer's anthropology, substantiated in his doctrine of Creation, was a seedbed for much of his thinking and practice. Not only is Adam's own creation depicted in Genesis,

but so is Adam's call to the creation/cultural mandate – another important theme in Schaeffer's works. Part of man's purpose, then, is to fulfill his call and command to rule over the created order and creative work throughout life.<sup>82</sup>

Humanity's creation in the image of God is the basis for what God intends and desires for human beings.<sup>83</sup> This image-bearing quality makes man distinct from the rest of creation and more like God.<sup>84</sup> Schaeffer distinguishes this Christian vision of the *imago Dei* from a naturalistic conception of humanity. Contrary to a mechanistic origin and purely biological process, he argues that the Christian has a right understanding of his identity precisely because he has a right understanding of his origin.<sup>85</sup> He writes "because I am made in the image of God and because God is personal, both a personal relationship with God and the concept of fellowship as fellowship has validity."<sup>86</sup> He contends that the importance of this creaturely distinction enables God to disclose propositional truth to His image-bearers.<sup>87</sup> Udo Middelmann affirms this sentient, stating that Schaeffer recognized "God made man in his image within an originally good creation. Our categories of understanding are accurate, because they are derived from the attributes of God."<sup>88</sup> Clearly, much of the Christian worldview and Schaeffer's apologetic approach is included in Schaeffer's understanding of the *imago Dei*, which is thus directly tied to his doctrine of Creation.

Related to his theological anthropology is an orthodox understanding of sin. Duriez states that "[w]ithout the actual sin of a real first man and woman in history... there is no ultimate explanation of the problem of evil."<sup>89</sup> Schaeffer's hamartiology is not to be conflated with his

understanding of Creation. However, Schaeffer uses the Creation ideal to demonstrate sin's effects on the created order, specifically on humanity. In contrast to other theological views, he argues that humanity still retains something of the image of God after Adam's sin.<sup>90</sup> He maintains that humanity keeps his "mannishness of man" after the Fall. Mankind still retains something of the image of God, although it is "twisted, broken, abnormal."<sup>91</sup> Further, he believes the Fall not to effect man's unique distinction in the created order.<sup>92</sup> Schaeffer did not believe sin to be a psychological guilt or abstracted philosophical category. Instead of an existential anxiety or erudite hopelessness, Schaeffer defines sin as rebellion against one's Creator, with real, true moral guilt which requires one to bear responsibility for their actions.<sup>93</sup> He understood sin to affect not only God's good creation in real, tangible ways, but also mankind, both internally and externally.

Ultimately, Schaeffer believed mankind's place in creation to reveal our purpose as human beings. Laid out in the Christian Scriptures is the beginning and essence of the universe, the inauguration of history, the image-bearing creation of man, and the ever-present and revealing triune God. These components, brought together and connected by a strong doctrine of Creation, offer a framework to move towards the Gospel message.<sup>94</sup> He writes, "This is what we were made to be; and on the basis of the finished work of Christ and with the indwelling of the Holy Spirit we are called to the fulfilment of our purpose of a person-to-person relationship with the God who is there, and then to our fellow men."<sup>95</sup> Schaeffer's doctrine of creation not only defends

Christianity against alternative worldviews, but also communicates central truths that are necessary for one to fully understand the Gospel. As the trustees of L'Abri note, "What is defended is not so much a detailed pseudoscientific Creationism but rather the critical importance of divine supernatural activity, of design and purpose, of the image of God in Man, of human death (including physical death) as a result of God's judgment, and a real historical flow in Genesis."<sup>96</sup> Therefore, Schaffer wonderfully utilizes his doctrine of Creation to accomplish both tasks he sets forth for apologetics.

### Schaeffer's Doctrine of Creation and Evangelism

Both Schaeffer's hermeneutical freedom in creationism and strong doctrine of Creation in apologetics provide a robust framework to move toward sharing the Gospel. Stephen Wellum notes, "That is why he championed... without equivocation the full authority and inerrancy of Scripture as well as such crucial issues as: the historicity of Genesis 1-11, *the doctrine of creation*, the centrality of the doctrine of God, and the exclusivity of Jesus Christ as the way, the truth, and the life."<sup>97</sup> Schaeffer was resolute to hold to and proclaim these fundamental Christian beliefs. Wellum continues later, stating explicitly where Schaeffer began in his apologetic formulation,

in his evangelism and presentation of Christianity he would not begin with "accept Christ as Savior"; instead, he would begin where Scripture begins, starting with the doctrine of God, *establishing the worldview structures of Christianity grounded in the doctrine of creation*, revelation, and the historic fall, and then and only then move to redemption, pointing people to

the Lord Jesus Christ, who alone is their only hope.<sup>98</sup>

Clearly for Schaeffer, the beginning of the Christian worldview is found at the beginning of the universe. Wellum rightly clarifies that Schaeffer begins with the doctrine of creation in establishing the Christian worldview, but that Schaeffer does not stop there in his approach. Instead, he moves from his doctrine of creation toward the message of redemption.

It is not an anomaly that in *Genesis in Space and Time* Schaeffer leads with an apologetic tone. Even in this Bible commentary, he is very much seeking to develop a biblical worldview.<sup>99</sup> Unfailingly, he ties his doctrine of creation to man's need for truth and love found in God alone. He writes in *Genesis*,

Modern man is deeply plagued by the question, "Where do love and communication come from?" Many artists who pour themselves out in their paintings, who paint bleak messages on canvas, many singers, many poets and dramatists are expressing the blackness of the fact that while everything hangs upon love and communication, they don't know where these come from and they don't know what they mean. The biblical answer is quite otherwise: something was there before creation. God was there, love and communication were there, prior even to Genesis 1:1, love and communication are intrinsic to what always has been.<sup>100</sup>

He is not as concerned with the theological student, as much as he is the modern individual who is wrestling with life's inevitable questions. Schaeffer, then, seeks to point his readers to Genesis 1 as a starting point to begin to find the answers.

While much of Schaeffer's pre-evange-

listic approach has its beginnings in his doctrine of creation, the most central component and purpose of Schaeffer's approach is found in the person of Jesus Christ and His space-time act within history – a truth alluded to in the opening chapters of Genesis, but not explicitly revealed. Thus, Schaeffer's pre-evangelism, his *apologia*, makes way for the *euangelion*, the gospel. Schaeffer's two purposes, the defense and communication of the faith, were but a way in which to bring listeners to the center – which is a personal relationship with a personal God.<sup>101</sup> Schaeffer is explicit on this point. He writes, "According to the teaching of the Scriptures, the finished work of the Lord Jesus Christ is meant eventually to bring healing... When the individual accepts Christ as his Savior, on the basis of the finished work of Christ, God has [sic] Judge declares that his guilt is gone immediately and forever."<sup>102</sup> The goal, then, is for the individual to receive true and real forgiveness before God as his Judge.

As stated earlier, Schaeffer often quipped that if given an hour, he would spend the majority of time on pre-evangelism, helping those with whom he was talking to understand their need of the Gospel. He understood the Gospel to be referenced in Genesis. He writes, "The gospel goes back literally as far as we can go. As soon as mankind sinned in the Garden, before twenty-four hours had passed, God promised the Messiah."<sup>103</sup> If Schaeffer's doctrine of creation offered central tenets to his apologetic methodology, it also contained hints of his evangelistic approach as well. He writes, concerning Genesis 3:15, that "The one who is promised here is a person. A person will

bruise Satan's head, and in doing so will be wounded."<sup>104</sup> He continues, "we find that Christ is *the seed* of the woman in Genesis 3:15... Christ finished the work needed for us in His substitutionary death, and in doing so He became the second Adam – the second founder of the human race."<sup>105</sup> Schaeffer's doctrine of Creation not only contained his apologetic thought, but also the beginning of the Gospel promise. After Creation, with Adam's sin, the Fall challenges and corrupts the Creation ideal. Yet, hope is offered amid this Creation-Fall paradigm.

### Conclusion

Francis Schaeffer operated with a distinction between creationism and the doctrine of Creation. Unique for an apologist of his historical context, he advocated for some freedom in how one understands the age of the earth. Even more, he sought resolution and unity between the Scriptures and science, rather than driving a wedge further between these two revelatory bodies. Ultimately, it is Schaeffer's doctrine of Creation which provides the key factors to his framework of apologetics/pre-evangelism. A personal God, the beginning of history, a personal universe, and a rich understanding of mankind all speak to the difficult questions Schaeffer sought to answer.

For Francis Schaeffer, it seems that the answers really were in Genesis. Schaeffer located the foundation of the Christian worldview both in and before the beginning of the cosmos. His wife records him saying later in his life, "What rang the bell for me was the answers in Genesis, and that with these you had answers – real answers – and without these there were no answers either in philosophy or in the religion I had heard preached."<sup>106</sup>

He then sought to formulate and pro- he came in contact.  
claim these compelling answers to those

## Notes

1. For studies and assessments on Francis Schaeffer's apologetics, see Kenneth Dale Boa, "A Comparative Study of Four Christian Apologetic Systems" (Ph.D., New York University, 1985); Kenneth Boa and Robert M. Bowman, *Faith Has Its Reasons: Integrative Approaches to Defending the Christian Faith* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2005); Lane T. Dennis, *Francis A. Schaeffer: Portraits of the Man and His Work*, (Wheaton: Crossway, 1986,); William Edgar, "Two Christian Warriors: Cornelius Van Til and Francis A. Schaeffer Compared," *Westminster Theological Journal* 57.1 (1995): 57-80; Bryan A. Follis, *Truth with Love: The Apologetics of Francis Schaeffer* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2006); William Edgar, "Francis A. Schaeffer," in Joshua D. Chatraw, Benjamin K. Forrest, and Alister E. McGrath, eds., *The History of Apologetics: A Biographical and Methodological Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2020); E. R. Geehan, "The Presuppositional Apologetics of Francis Schaeffer," *Themelios* 8.1 (1972): 10-18; Brian K. Morley, *Mapping Apologetics: Comparing Contemporary Approaches* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2015); Thomas V. Morris, *Francis Schaeffer's Apologetics: A Critique* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1976); Bill Nyman, "Francis Schaeffer's Relevance to Contemporary Apologetics," *KOERS: Bulletin for Christian Scholarship*, 85.1 (2020): 1-18; David Outlaw, "An Overview of Francis Schaeffer's Worldview," *Integrity: A Journal of Christian Thought* 3 (2006): 141-57; Jack Rogers, "Francis Schaeffer: The Promise and the Problem," *Reformed Journal* 27.5 (1977): 12-15; Ronald W. Ruegsegger, ed., *Reflections on Francis Schaeffer* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986); John E. Voss, "The Apologetics of Francis A. Schaeffer" (Th.D., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1984); James Emery White, *What Is Truth?: A Comparative Study of the Positions of Cornelius Van Til, Francis Schaeffer, Carl F. H. Henry, Donald Bloesch, Millard Erickson* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2006).
2. Kenneth Keathley and Mark Rooker, *40 Questions About Creation and Evolution*, (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2014), 17.
3. Colin Duriez, *Francis Schaeffer: An Authentic Life* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2015), 201.
4. William Edgar, *Schaeffer on the Christian Life: Countercultural Spirituality* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2013), 88.
5. Francis A. Schaeffer, *Escape from Reason in The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer: A Christian Worldview*, 2nd ed. 5 vols. (Wheaton: Crossway, 1985), 1:266.
6. C. John Collins, "Freedoms and Limitations: C. S. Lewis and Francis Schaeffer as a Tag Team," *Theofilos* 12.1 (2020): 166-167.
7. Collins, "Freedoms and Limitations," 167.
8. Collins, "Freedoms and Limitations," 167.
9. Collins, "Freedoms and Limitations," 167.
10. For a few examples, see Gerald Rau, *Mapping the Origins Debate: Six Models of the Beginning of Everything* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2012); Kenneth Keathley, J. B. Stump, and Joe Aguirre, eds., *Old-Earth or Evolutionary Creation?: Discussing Origins with Reasons to Believe and BioLogos* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2017); J.B. Stump, ed., *Four Views on Creation, Evolution, and Intelligent Design*, Counterpoints: Bible and Theology (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2017).
11. To be sure, B. B. Warfield, R. A. Torrey, and others who would otherwise be considered conservative or even fundamentalists held to an array of views. For an interesting historical survey of the creationist movement, see Ronald L. Numbers, *The Creationists: From Scientific Creationism to Intelligent Design*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006).
12. Francis A. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time* in *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, 2:39.
13. Barry Hankins, *Francis Schaeffer and the Shaping of Evangelical America* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 150.
14. www.labri.org/statements/The-LAbri-Statements.pdf as quoted in Lars Dahle and Bjørn Hinderaker, "Exploring Genesis 1-3 as a True Worldview Story: Reading Alongside C. S. Lewis, Francis A. Schaeffer, and C. John Collins," *Theofilos* 12.1 (2020): 190.
15. There is the more political dynamic regarding legislation of allowing Creation Science to be taught in public schools. Schaeffer was involved in commentary, as well as correspondence regarding the *McLean v. Arkansas Board of Education* case. There was a fair amount of discussion and tension between George Marsden, who participated in the case, and Schaeffer. Barry Hankins writes, "The earliest available letter from a Christian scholar to Schaeffer after the appearance of *Manifesto* was from Marsden, and it was written to correct a factual error related to the Arkansas Creation Science court case of 1982. Marsden had participated in the case as an expert witness for the ACLU, testifying that Creation Science was essentially the view of only a small segment of fundamentalist Christianity, not one widely held among Christians. The implication of Marsden's testimony, and the eventual ruling of the district judge in Arkansas, was that the Arkansas law mandating the teaching of Creation Science was an unconstitutional establishment of religion because Creation Science was actually a sectarian religious view masquerading as science. Marsden wrote to Schaeffer primarily to correct an error in *Manifesto* where Schaeffer had said the Arkansas law allowed the teaching of Creation Science... Schaeffer wrote back to Marsden, saying, 'I must say, I think you were mistaken in taking an active part on the side of those who are tyrannically shutting out the possible freedom of Christians to speak in our public school system.' Barry Hankins, "'I'm Just Making a Point': Francis Schaeffer and the Irony of Faithful Christian Scholarship," *Fides et Historia* 39.1 (2007): 20.

16. Duriez ties this to the creationist perspective of B. B. Warfield and “old” Princeton. Colin Duriez, *Francis Schaeffer*, 201.
17. Schaeffer, *No Final Conflict* in *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, 2:129.
18. This statement stands in some tension with Duriez’s speculation above. While Schaeffer does not challenge the view of theistic evolution outright, he does critique an evolutionary view of nature. He writes “Christians who do not believe in the complete evolutionary scale have reason to respect nature as the total evolutionist never can, because we believe that God made these things specifically in their own areas. So if we are going to argue against evolutionists intellectually, we should show the results of our beliefs in our attitudes. The Christian is a man who has a reason for dealing with each created thing on a high level of respect.” Francis Schaeffer, *Pollution and the Death of Man* in *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, 5:33.
19. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 2:17.
20. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 2:17.
21. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 2:17.
22. Kenneth Keathley, J. B. Stump, and Joe Aguirre, eds., *Old-Earth or Evolutionary Creation?: Discussing Origins with Reasons to Believe and BioLogos* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2017), 91, 98, 116. To be sure, many avoid these extremes and offer some form of concordism or nuanced way of integrating science and Scripture.
23. J. B. Stump, in defending this position, argues “This does not suggest that there are two different kinds of reality, nor that there are two different magisterial or domains—one for science and one for theology. But it suggests that we have developed two different traditions or ways of thinking about reality—the scientific and the personal.” Keathley, Stump, and Aguirre, eds., *Old-Earth or Evolutionary Creation?*, 91.
24. Francis A. Schaeffer, *No Final Conflict* in *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, 2:119.
25. Schaeffer, *No Final Conflict*, 2:139.
26. Schaeffer, *No Final Conflict*, 2:140-141.
27. Schaeffer, *No Final Conflict*, 2:119.
28. Schaeffer, *No Final Conflict*, 2:121. He repeats this sentiment later in the book, “the infinite-personal God who exists has not been silent, but has spoken propositional truth in *all* that the Bible teaches – including what it teaches concerning history, concerning the cosmos and in moral absolutes as well as what it teaches concerning religious subjects.” 2:147.
29. Schaeffer, *No Final Conflict*, 2:129.
30. Schaeffer, *No Final Conflict*, 2:129.
31. Schaeffer, *No Final Conflict*, 2:130.
32. Duriez, *Francis Schaeffer*, 201.
33. Duriez, *Francis Schaeffer*, 201.
34. Schaeffer, *No Final Conflict*, 2:131-136.
35. Schaeffer, *No Final Conflict*, 2:136.
36. Schaeffer, *No Final Conflict*, 2:136.
37. For more on this, see Hans Madueme and Michael Reeves, eds., *Adam, the Fall, and Original Sin: Theological, Biblical, and Scientific Perspectives* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014).
38. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 2:52.
39. Thomas Morris, *Francis Schaeffer’s Apologetics: A Critique* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1976), 17.
40. Francis A. Schaeffer, *The God Who Is There* in *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, 1:153.
41. William Edgar, “Francis Schaeffer and the Public Square” in J. Budziszewski, *Evangelicals in the Public Square: Four Formative Voices on Political Thought and Action* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 172.
42. Worth noting how little attention Schaeffer’s commentary *Genesis in Space and Time* receives in recent biographies and appraisals of his work. Duriez mentions the book once, see Colin Duriez, *Francis Schaeffer*, 201, and Edgar references the work once in a footnote, see Edgar, *Schaeffer on the Christian Life*, 105n30.
43. Schaeffer, *The God Who Is There*, 1:151-152.
44. Schaeffer, *The God Who Is There*, 1:153.
45. Schaeffer, *The God Who Is There*, 1:155.
46. Udo Middelman, “Francis A. Schaeffer: The Man,” in Bruce Little, ed., *Francis Schaeffer: A Mind and Heart for God* (Phillipsburg, N.J: P & R, 2010), 8.
47. Hankins, *Francis Schaeffer and the Shaping of Evangelical America*, 94.
48. Hankins, *Francis Schaeffer and the Shaping of Evangelical America*, 94.
49. Hankins, *Francis Schaeffer and the Shaping of Evangelical America*, 137.
50. Hankins, *Francis Schaeffer and the Shaping of Evangelical America*, 138.
51. Francis A. Schaeffer, *The Finished Work of Christ: The Truth of Romans 1-8* (Wheaton: Crossway, 1998), 141.
52. This phrase is repeated by a few different authors with slight variations. See Follis, *Truth with Love*, 48; Barrs, “Francis Schaeffer: The Man and His Message”; Douglas F. Kelly, *Creation And Change: Genesis 1:1-2:4 in the Light of Changing Scientific Paradigms* (Fern, Ross-shire: Mentor, 2017), 17; Will Metzger, *Tell the Truth: The Whole Gospel to the Whole Person by Whole People* (InterVarsity, 2002), 71. Schaeffer himself writes “As I’ve said over and over, I would spend forty-five or fifty minutes on the negative to really



- show him his dilemma... Then I would take ten or fifteen minutes to preach the gospel.” Francis A. Schaeffer, *Death in the City* in *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, 5:251.
53. Schaeffer, *The God Who Is There*, 1:122.
  54. Stephen J. Wellum, “Francis A. Schaeffer (1912-1984): Lessons from His Thought and Life,” *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 6.2 (2002), 18.
  55. Wellum, “Francis A. Schaeffer (1912-1984),” 18.
  56. Edgar, *Schaeffer on the Christian Life*, 88.
  57. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 2:8.
  58. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 2:9.
  59. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 2:10.
  60. White, *What Is Truth?*, 76.
  61. Francis A. Schaeffer, *Pollution and the Death of Man*, 5:27.
  62. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 2:10.
  63. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 2:12.
  64. Francis Schaeffer, *No Little People*, in *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer*, 3:159. Emphasis added.
  65. Roger D. Duke, “The Biblical Worldview of History: Developing the Biblical Story,” *The Journal of Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary* 7 (2020): 48.
  66. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 2:43.
  67. Edgar, “Francis Schaeffer and the Public Square,” 173.
  68. William Varner, “The Seed and Schaeffer,” in Abner Chou, ed., *What Happened in the Garden: The Reality and Ramifications of the Creation and Fall of Man* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2016), 154.
  69. Varner, “The Seed and Schaeffer,” 154.
  70. Schaeffer, *No Final Conflict*, 2:140.
  71. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 2:46.
  72. Morris, *Francis Schaeffer’s Apologetics*, 28.
  73. Follis, *Truth with Love*, 42.
  74. Follis, *Truth with Love*, 42-43.
  75. Wellum, “Francis A. Schaeffer (1912-1984),” 15.
  76. Eduardo J. Echeverria, “The Christian Faith as a Way of Life: In Appreciation of Francis Schaeffer (on the Fiftieth Anniversary of L’Abri Fellowship),” *Evangelical Quarterly* 79.3 (2007): 250.
  77. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 2:11.
  78. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 2:11.
  79. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 2:11.
  80. See Christopher Talbot, “The Mannishness of Man and the Imago Dei: An Analysis of Francis Schaeffer’s Anthropology and Apologetic Methodology” *Eikon: A Journal of Biblical Anthropology*, 3.1 (2021): 72-95.
  81. Hankins, *Francis Schaeffer and the Shaping of Evangelical America*, 139.
  82. Francis Schaeffer, “The Purpose of Our Creation Fulfilled,” PDF, *L’Abri.Org*, n.d., [http://www.labri.org/england/resources/05052008/FS01\\_Purpose\\_Creation.pdf](http://www.labri.org/england/resources/05052008/FS01_Purpose_Creation.pdf).
  83. Barrs, “Francis Schaeffer: The Man and His Message.”
  84. Francis Schaeffer, “The Purpose of Our Creation Fulfilled,” *L’Abri.Org*, [http://www.labri.org/england/resources/05052008/FS01\\_Purpose\\_Creation.pdf](http://www.labri.org/england/resources/05052008/FS01_Purpose_Creation.pdf), 5.
  85. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 32.
  86. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 32.
  87. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 32.
  88. Middelman, “Francis A. Schaeffer: The Man,” 8.
  89. Duriez, *Francis Schaeffer*, 201.
  90. See John F. Kilner, *Dignity and Destiny: Humanity in the Image of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015).
  91. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 70-71.
  92. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 34.
  93. Schaeffer, *The Finished Work of Christ*, 67-71.
  94. Schaeffer, “The Purpose of Our Creation Fulfilled,” 5.
  95. Schaeffer, “The Purpose of Our Creation Fulfilled,” 5.
  96. [www.labri.org/statements/The-LAbri-Statements.pdf](http://www.labri.org/statements/The-LAbri-Statements.pdf) as quoted in Dahle and Hinderaker, “Exploring Genesis 1-3 as a True Worldview Story,” 190.
  97. Wellum, “Francis A. Schaeffer (1912-1984),” 6. Emphasis added.
  98. Wellum, “Francis A. Schaeffer (1912-1984),” 17. Emphasis added.
  99. Dahle and Hinderaker, “Exploring Genesis 1-3 as a True Worldview Story,” 188.
  100. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 2:12.
  101. Follis, *Truth with Love*, 92-93.
  102. Schaeffer, *The God Who Is There*, 1:164.
  103. Schaeffer, *The Finished Work of Christ*, 15.

---

104. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 2:73.

105. Schaeffer, *Genesis in Space and Time*, 2:74-75.

106. Edith Schaeffer, *The Tapestry: The Life and Times of Francis and Edith Schaeffer* (Waco, Tex: Word Publishing, 1985), 52.