

Young Age Faith in Light of Developmental Psychology

G. JONKER VENTER AND H. G. (HENK) STOKER

Abstract

This article focusses on the faith formation and ability of preschool children to defend their faith from as early as the early childhood phase (two to six years). The research investigates prominent psychological theories that cover preschool children's cognitive development to determine if children within this age group can constructively partake in faith formation, as well as the role that parents have in encouraging and shaping this faith formation and apologetic ability. The article provides apologetic guidelines from the Reformed tradition to parents to assist them in this task.

Keywords

Christian education, faith formation, apologetics in preschool children, spirituality, developmental psychology, early childhood, Jean Piaget, James Fowler, Lev Vygotsky, Erik Erikson

Small children think about deep theological questions. This statement may sound strange to some, but parents will agree about the surprisingly tricky type of questions even toddlers can ask. Together with ordinary questions about the course of life, they also ask existential questions.

When my (Jonker Venter) son was three years old, while we were on our way to vacation, he asked us, “If God is in our heart, and there is only one God, how can he simultaneously be in the heart of every child of God?” This is a highly intelligent question coming from a three-year-old! We were stunned that a child as young as this uses such sound logic¹ to make sense of the faith that we had taught him (thus far). The realization that we will have to provide him with a proper answer (among other things) gave rise to this article. If we had not answered his question correctly, our child would probably have wrestled with this question until eventually he was provided with a wrong answer from someone else, or perhaps he might have concluded that there is no answer. If this were to happen, not only might our child doubt us as his parents, but also, more importantly, he might start doubting the majesty and power of God himself, which in turn would bring about questioning and uncertainty in matters of faith. He might perhaps even come to a conclusion with a wrong worldview, such as a deistic worldview, believing that God is far away and beyond reach, either unable or not wanting to be personally involved in his life. We realized that we could not give him an answer such as, “Once you grow up, you will understand,” or “Do not ask questions to which the Bible does not give answers!” To his satisfaction, I responded as follows: “That is a very good question! God is so magnificently great that he can be in all his children’s hearts at the same time! This, my son, is exactly the reason why we can worship God with confidence: because he is everywhere and always with us.”

This answer made enough sense for this three-year-old boy’s logic that it answered his question at that moment. It helped him find peace on this matter but also contributed to the development of a deeper awareness of God’s greatness and omnipresence. This event also contributed to the formation of his faith as the Holy Spirit worked in his heart and mind. This

¹ Concerning the human capability to reason solely on the grounds of logic, see Sarel van der Walt and Nico Vorster, eds., *Reformed Theology Today: Practical-Theological, Missiological and Ethical Perspectives* (Durbanville: AOSIS, 2017), 41–60. Human logic is so darkened by sin that human reason alone cannot lead to knowledge of God. Only when the Holy Spirit works faith into the human heart through the means of scriptural revelation is it possible for human reason to accept submissive servanthood to the Scriptures. This relationship between Scripture and human reason has been maintained throughout the centuries by the Reformers and other Christians. God remains the standard norm of all logic. However, he also created human beings with logical minds so that they can rightfully know him through faith and can know his will as he has revealed himself in Scripture. See also Norman Geisler and Ronald Brooks, *Come, Let Us Reason: An Introduction to Logical Thinking* (Grand Rapids: Baker House, 1990), 17; John Frame, *Perspectives on the Word of God: An Introduction to Christian Ethics* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1999), 6–7, 51–52; John Frame, *The Doctrine of the Christian Life* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2008), 181.

event enabled him to grow in his relationship with God; he was already aware that God is always with him and all his other children, and he trusted God while confidently continuing to live according to his faith. The answer he received made it possible for him to convincingly give an answer about his faith in God to anyone, young or old, who might have similar questions.

From a young age, children learn what it means to trust because all people enter the world as helpless and vulnerable infants. This confidence can provide certainty and insight into the trustworthiness of God and his assured love. God's attribute of truth and truthfulness is a vital part of the faith guidance of Christian children. Is faith not defined in the Heidelberg Catechism with the verbs "know" and "trust"?

1. Faith Formation and Apologetics in Preschool Children

In order to determine young children's cognitive abilities to comprehend God and their relationship with other people on a more abstract level, the findings of developmental psychologists and other authoritative research specialists about this early age will be taken into account. The focus will first be on the cognitive-developmental phases that children undergo, according to psychological research. After that, the article will shift towards the relationship between religion and spirituality in these young children.

1. Cognitive Development in Children under Seven Years

Although humans are complex beings that develop through various factors at various paces at different stages in life, it remains useful to divide children according to the appropriate developmental stages. Psychologists generally classify children between the age of two and six years in a cognitive-developmental phase called *early childhood*.² Since cognitive development has important points of contact concerning one's faith formation and apologetic ability, we need to focus on cognitive development during the early childhood phase.

Cognitive development theories concentrate on how children think and how their thinking develops and changes over time.³ Well-known theories concerning cognitive development during the early childhood phase are those of psychologists such as Jean Piaget and his contemporary Lev Vygotsky.⁴ Other theories follow, such as Lawrence Kohlberg's theory of

² Dap A. Louw and Anet E. Louw, *Child and Adolescent Development*, 2nd ed. (Bloemfontein: Psychology, 2014), 8.

³ *Ibid.*, 25.

⁴ David R. Shaffer and Katherine Kipp, *Developmental Psychology: Childhood and Adolescence*, 8th ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2008), 281.

moral development,⁵ thought process theory, and modern techniques of information processing.⁶ While all standard theories have their unique strengths, none of them provide an all-inclusive and comprehensive view of a child's total cognitive development.⁷ Therefore, an investigation into some of the prominent psychological theories will enable a more holistic view of children's cognitive and moral development as well as identify the factors that influence this development.⁸

Jean Piaget's Four Stages

According to Piaget, children go through four stages of cognitive development, each containing a more complex reasoning ability in their understanding of reality. The first stage is the *sensorimotor* stage, during which children from birth through the first two years develop their cognition through their senses and motor skills.

The second stage, called the *preoperational* phase, includes children between ages two and six years. At this stage, children use language and symbols to refer to and represent ideas and objects. The next phase, between ages seven and eleven years, he calls the *concrete operational* phase, which is the phase in which children develop logical thinking, with little to no abstract ability. The last stage is the *formal operational* stage, where twelve-year-old children develop the ability to think in terms of abstract concepts.⁹

The faith formation of children under the age of seven falls into Piaget's preoperational phase, where children are not yet able to think abstractly and are therefore not yet ready to think logically. However, this theory is

⁵ Wayne Weiten, *Psychology: Themes and Variations* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning), 443–46.

⁶ See Louw and Louw, *Child and Adolescent Development*, 157–73.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 16.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 10–15. The debate still exists among psychologists about the relationship between nature and nurture; in other words, whether children's inherited characteristics are responsible for their development or whether the influence of parents and environment plays the decisive role in children's development. Further uncertainty in this regard is about whether children play an active or passive role in their development and what contribution the cultural context makes in children's development. Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that religion and spirituality can play a big role in this regard.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 25–26. These phases of the child's cognitive thinking are mainly based on the following interdependent principles of processes. *Organization* occurs when the child makes sense of reality so that everything can be systematized in categories (which Piaget called *schemes*). *Adaptation* occurs when the child must amend his or her theory in order to adapt to new information concerning reality. The latter takes place in one of two ways: either by way of *assimilation* or by way of *accommodation*. Piaget believes that *assimilation* and *accommodation* are used to bring the child's theory into harmony with reality, which Piaget called *equilibrium*. See also Shaffer and Kipp, *Developmental Psychology*, 250–52; Louw and Louw, *Child and Adolescent Development*, 27.

self-destructive because it simultaneously claims that these children already use language on a cognitive level to refer to objects; this therefore proves that they do have the ability to argue conceptually and disproves that they are incapable of abstract thinking. Even by Piaget's own theory about the animistic worldview that children in this phase have, whereby they associate emotions to nonliving objects such as their dolls or animal toys, it is evident that children can think abstractly. However, Piaget based his conclusion that children are unable to comprehend abstract thoughts on certain obstacles which he observed during the fluid comparison experiments he conducted with children.¹⁰

Although Piaget's theory is to some extent one-sided, he has contributed significantly to the understanding of children's cognitive development. Particularly relevant is the fact that children play an active role in understanding their world,¹¹ which should be taken into account, especially concerning the understanding of children's faith formation and their ability to defend their faith.

However, contemporary research differs, in many respects, from Piaget's. One difference, for example, is with his view that children's contexts do not play any role in their cognitive formation.¹² Another claims that children are not wholly animistic and do not truly believe objects to be alive. Further studies of children's emotional development have also indicated that children are not as egocentric as Piaget's experiment suggests and that they are even able to show empathy. Other tests point out that some children in this phase also have an understanding of numerical orientation, something that Piaget sharply questioned.¹³

James Fowler and Children's Faith Formation

James Fowler's theory is still authoritative when it comes to children's faith formation, even though it has received extensive critique in the past.¹⁴

¹⁰ Louw and Louw, *Child and Adolescent Development*, 158–61. See also Shaffer and Kipp, *Developmental Psychology*, 265. These experiments are known as Piaget's conservation studies. He filled, for example, two identical glasses with the same amount of liquid. After the child agrees that both glasses contain the same amount of liquid, one of the glasses' fluid is poured into a third glass that is both taller and thinner. The general observation is that children in the preoperational phase usually say that the third glass now contains more liquid than the first glass. As a result, Piaget concluded that these children's thoughts centered on the object that attracts most, and therefore children in this phase are to be classified as intuitive thinkers.

¹¹ Shaffer and Kipp, *Developmental Psychology*, 278.

¹² Weiten, *Psychology*, 441.

¹³ See especially Shaffer and Kipp, *Developmental Psychology*, 266–69; Louw and Louw, *Child and Adolescent Development*, 161–62.

¹⁴ Joyce Eady Myers, "Children's Spiritual Development: Analysis of Program Practices

Fowler bases his theory on Piaget's developmental stages and applies it to children's faith formation.¹⁵ Although Fowler views faith formation within the framework of developmental stages, he still believes that children's faith does not unfold by itself, claiming rather that children are born with some readiness for faith, which develops mainly through the parents' interaction and nurturing.¹⁶

Fowler's theory regards the first two years of a child's life as the *prestige* of faith, where they develop feelings of confidence and support based on parental interaction.¹⁷ This period creates the foundation for healthy faith development. During the next phase, known as the *early phase* or *Intuitive-Projective phase* (two to six years of age), children begin to have a basic moral judgment of right and wrong.¹⁸ Although children in this phase are very imaginative and still have a very concrete representation of God and the devil, they have already begun to form their concepts about who God is and who the devil is (e.g., that God is love and loves his children, whereas the devil is a liar who wants to hurt God's people). According to Fowler, it is only once children reach the next phase that they can differentiate between fantasy and fact, differentiating between a human's perspective and God's perspective. It is interesting, however, that preschool children describe God in terms of his being, whereas children in the next phase use more concrete anthropomorphic terms to describe God.¹⁹

By the time children enter the middle childhood phase, they are already influenced by several adults. Although children at this stage start to think more logically, according to Fowler, they still interpret religious stories in a very literal way. The last religious stage is reached when children enter adulthood. A personal search for love and acceptance, as well as a personal relationship with God, characterize this phase.²⁰

Criticisms of Fowler's theory include, among other things, that he underestimates modern children, as they can reflect on established standards and even rebel against them. Further criticism includes claims that Fowler's definition of faith is so broad that it exceeds religious faith.²¹ For this reason,

and Recommendations for Early Childhood Professionals" (D.Ed. diss., University of North Texas, 2009), 39. See also Louw and Louw, *Child and Adolescent Development*, 297.

¹⁵ Myers, *Children's Spiritual Development*, 11, 13, 39.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 12, 29, 56.

¹⁷ James Fowler, *Stages of Faith: The Psychology of Human Development and the Quest for Meaning* (New York: HarperCollins, 1981), 53–55, also 119–21.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 130, 133.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 135–50.

²⁰ Louw and Louw, *Child and Adolescent Development*, 296–97.

²¹ Cf. Myers, *Children's Spiritual Development*, 40.

various interpretations exist based on the conclusions of his research.²² Fowler's theory does, however, emphasize the vital role that family and society play in children's faith formation.

Lev Vygotsky and Environmental Factors

Piaget's contemporary Vygotsky agreed with Fowler by recognizing the critically important role that environmental factors, such as the influence of the home environment and kindergarten, play in children's cognitive development.

Piaget places the focus on children's current intellectual abilities, while Vygotsky is more interested in children's intellectual potential.²³ He agrees with Piaget's argument that children undergo intrinsic development. However, unlike Piaget, Vygotsky believes that without the assistance of society, these inner forces cannot cause children to fully develop on their own.²⁴ Only through the direct participation of the surrounding society and culture, by way of role modeling, will the child's cognitive ability fully develop. These influences include skills such as language acquisition, memorization, and mastery of numbering systems and scientific concepts.²⁵ In this endeavor, every society aims to enable children to learn the skills and culture of their particular social group. For this reason, Vygotsky instead focuses on ways in which adults can cooperate in children's development.²⁶

Vygotsky's emphasis that children's cognition primarily develops through interactions with parents, teachers, and the rest of society²⁷ offers sufficient grounds for parents to encourage and guide their children in their process of faith formation and spiritual growth toward spiritual maturity (cf. 1 Cor 3:2; Heb 5:12–13; 1 Pet 2:2). Children's play and scaffolding are especially relevant here. When it comes to guidance and participation during the act

²² Louw and Louw, *Child and Adolescent Development*, 297.

²³ Ibid., 168.

²⁴ Michael Cole, Vera John-Steiner, Sylvia Scribner, and Ellen Souberman, eds., *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978), 30.

²⁵ Shaffer and Kipp, *Developmental Psychology*, 282–83; Louw and Louw, *Child and Adolescent Development*, 167.

²⁶ Louw and Louw, *Child and Adolescent Development*, 28–29, see also 168–69. Vygotsky calls this influence of adults in children's lives the area of close development, or the zone of proximal development. This refers to the difference in development between a child without guidance and one with guidance, the latter displaying higher performance and competence. His theory is based on, among other things, his view that cognitive development follows a dialectical process of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. In this process, the thesis represents the child's initial idea, which is challenged by an older person's antithesis, so that the child can eventually come to a synthesis that stimulates the child to higher cognitive levels.

²⁷ Shaffer and Kipp, *Developmental Psychology*, 281.

of play, parents have the most influence on their children. Indeed, parents usually know their children better and will, therefore, know what type of exposure will challenge each child to a new level for further growth and development.²⁸

Vygotsky also differs from Piaget in terms of children's development of language and thought. Piaget believes that cognitive development precedes language, whereas Vygotsky believes that language regulates every aspect of children's minds, keeping in mind that language should not be confused with speech (spoken language). That is why Piaget characterizes children as egocentric when engaged in self-talk while playing. In contrast, Vygotsky identifies this phenomenon instead as *private speech*, which children use while developing their cognition.²⁹

This private speech serves as an imitation of previous assignments given by adults. As an imitation of what children have learned from adults, they speak out loud in an attempt to exhort themselves to correct behavior. As soon as these children become competent enough in their development to control their behavior and thoughts without parental supervision (which happens typically at the age of six or seven), this private speech changes to *inner speech*. This is the age when children develop the ability to internalize and integrate the conversations that they have with adults guiding them.³⁰ By participating in their children's cognitive development, parents assist their children in developing their logical thinking.

Erik Erikson and Adaptation

Erik Erikson, one of Freud's students, places the emphasis on the active role that children themselves play in an attempt to adapt to their environment. Therefore, Erikson developed the psychosocial theory that divides the development process of human beings into eight stages. Within this theory, Erikson identified certain milestones that humans need to pass before they can enter the next stage (see Table 1).³¹ If an individual moves to the next stage without mastering the previous challenge, this person will not be competent in meeting the subsequent challenges, as this jump brings potential negative effects on that person.³²

²⁸ Ibid., 287–88.

²⁹ See, e.g., Michael Cole et al., *Mind in Society*, 27.

³⁰ Shaffer and Kipp, *Developmental Psychology*, 289–90; see also Louw and Louw, *Child and Adolescent Development*, 168–69; Weiten, *Psychology*, 442.

³¹ The table is taken from Shaffer and Kipp, *Developmental Psychology*, 44–46.

³² Ibid., 44–46; see also Louw and Louw, *Child and Adolescent Development*, 22–23.

Table 1. Erik Erikson’s stages by age.

Psychosocial Stage	Age	Basic Challenge to be met
Trust vs. distrust	0–1 years	Realize the world around is safe and good
Autonomy vs. mistrust	1–3 years	Recognize independence and the ability to make decisions
Initiative vs. shame	3–6 years	Try new things and deal with failure
Industry vs. inferiority	6 years–adolescent	Learn basic skills and cooperation with others
Identity vs. confusion	Adolescent	Develop a preserving integrated sense of self
Intimacy vs. isolation	Young adult	Commit oneself to a love relationship
Generation vs. stagnation	Middle-aged adult	Contribute to younger people’s lives and other community work
Integrity vs. despair	Late adult	Look with satisfaction back on one’s own life

The most serious criticisms of Erikson’s theory are that it is only descriptive, that it is vague, and that it lacks a fundamental empirical research and so is subjective and inaccurate. His theory does, however, provide an overview of a human’s personality development, of which parents can use the core elements in their contribution toward their children’s development.

Furthermore, Erikson’s theory also addresses children’s faith development in the sense that a healthy psychosocial development will prepare the way for a healthy relationship with God. It is much easier for children to develop a healthy concept of God when they have already developed trust, autonomy, initiative, and a sense of self-worth. In such a way, Erikson’s psychosocial stages support the Christian concepts of hope, human will, and purpose in children under the age of seven, as shown in the table.

Newborn child (up to one year old) who have not yet learned to *trust* cannot place their *hope* in God, and later in life, they cannot place their hope on salvation in Jesus. Consequently, children between one and three years who have not yet *discovered their own will* cannot place their *will* under God’s will. Following the same pattern, if children between three and six years have not experienced some sort of *purpose* through their own initiative, they will not be able to realize that God has a *purpose* for their life.³³

³³ Myers, *Children’s Spiritual Development*, 40–41.

The Early Childhood Phase and Abstract Thinking

Of all the psychologists discussed, only Piaget states that children in their early childhood phase cannot think abstractly. The other three (Fowler, Vygotsky, and Erikson) disagree with Piaget's theory on this matter: Fowler claims that children are born with a readiness for faith, Vygotsky believes that the abstractness of language is present in children from birth, and Erikson states that children from birth already strive towards autonomy while wrestling with complex challenges and decisions. It is even evident from Piaget's theory that children have a certain sense of abstract thoughts since children in the preoperational phase can use words to refer to objects, as well as assigning imaginary emotions to objects such as dolls or toys. Therefore, if Piaget's theory is considered apart from the totality of child development theory, it is easy to wrongly conclude that preschool children are unable to think abstractly and are therefore not yet ready for concepts of faith and faith formation.³⁴

2. The Relationship between Religion and Spirituality

Although the majority of psychological textbooks fail to discuss the influence of religion and spirituality,³⁵ some psychologists believe that religion and spirituality can have a considerable impact on a child's development. However, within psychology, there is no uniform answer as to what the relationship between religion and spirituality should be.³⁶ The only certainty is that spirituality and religion are somehow interconnected to each other, although spirituality in a man does not necessarily imply that he is religious.³⁷ For this reason, Anna Giesenberg suggests that these theories should be combined to acquire a holistic view of man, where the spiritual represents the core of human existence. As things stand, faith or religion are taken to represent only a segment of human existence.³⁸ This spirituality is synonymous with one's worldview and is expressed by small children in everything they do

³⁴ Louw and Louw, *Child and Adolescent Development*, 16. Theories of child development are useful and helpful as they point out various aspects of development (see also p. 7). They serve as indicators whether the child is developing according to the general norms and determines whether the child is ready for new phases, for example, to go to school. The advantage of psychological theories is that they can describe the child's development. However, as far as faith formation is concerned, psychology cannot take the Bible's place and prescribe how the child's faith formation and spiritual growth should proceed. On this matter, see Myers, *Children's Spiritual Development*, 13.

³⁵ Louw and Louw, *Child and Adolescent Development*, 10.

³⁶ Anna Giesenberg, "The Phenomenon of Preschool Children's Spirituality" (PhD diss., Queensland University of Technology, 2007), 10–25.

³⁷ Ibid., 10–11.

³⁸ Ibid., 25–28; see also Myers, *Children's Spiritual Development*, 130.

and say, whether it be play or a work of art.³⁹ In essence, children live according to their spirituality as if their whole being is their spirituality. Thus, Giesenberg defines spirituality in children as follows: “Spirituality is an innate part of a person. It is an awareness or consciousness of the surrounding world, a sense of compassion and love towards this world and anything in it shown through wonder and through activities and relationship with peers and significant adults in the child’s life.”⁴⁰

3. The Necessity of Faith Formation and Apologetics for Children under Seven

In Christianity, spiritual development overlaps with faith formation because, for Christians, spirituality includes and should include all aspects of their lives, even to such a degree that spirituality be considered as a religious character trait.⁴¹

Giesenberg notes that preschool children have a strong concept of God, but that children naturally have an interest about God while not necessarily having a living relationship with him.⁴² Thus, Christian children’s spiritual development should include a conscious relationship with God in Jesus Christ, through the Holy Spirit, within the community of believers who cherish this relationship, as well as an understanding and response towards this relationship. Of all age groups, children in the age group of three to five years ask the most questions about God. It seems that children even have an innate sense of God’s existence but do not quite know how to express themselves during prime childhood.

II. Apologetic Guidelines to Promote Faith in Preschool Children

With children under the age of seven showing the most spontaneous interest in existential questions and matters concerning God, it seems only logical to provide some apologetic guidelines for Christian parents. This is especially crucial since these children are proven to have the ability to actively partake in their understanding of God and their relationship with God. Therefore, these guidelines should therefore be from an apologetic angle,⁴³ within a

³⁹ Giesenberg, “Preschool Children’s Spirituality,” 32.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 256.

⁴¹ Ibid., 29, 32, 133–34; see also Myers, *Children’s Spiritual Development*, 44.

⁴² Giesenberg, “Preschool Children’s Spirituality,” 134, 259.

⁴³ Our conviction is that Reformed apologetics should follow the presuppositional apologetics viewpoint as developed by Cornelius Van Til and others. The basic point of presuppositional apologetics is that Scripture alone can convince someone of the Christian faith through the guidance of the Holy Spirit. It is the only way anyone can become a believer. There is,

biblical and Christian worldview, as it will specifically focus on promoting faith formation and apologetic ability in preschool children. Even though there might be many guidelines, we will only discuss two.

1. Teach the Christian Worldview and Preach the Gospel to Children

In the Great Commission in Matthew 28, Jesus commanded believers to make disciples of all people, which includes the idea that the follower's entire outlook and lifestyle should change accordingly. The process of disciple-making includes⁴⁴ new believers continually being taught about everything that Christ commanded and taught his followers. Parents should consider their children as “new believers” and also continually teach them to be disciples of the Lord and to have insight in the Christian doctrine⁴⁵ with the worldview that flows from it. Even though children below the age of seven cannot understand all the doctrines of the Christian faith in all its details, parents should still lay the foundation for the principles of the Christian doctrine. Indeed, it is precisely at this age range that the core aspects of the development of a Christian worldview take place.⁴⁶ All worldviews, and therefore also Christianity, reflect and provide answers to the most fundamental questions about God, humanity, and the world. These essential questions can be laid out in the following statements:

- 1) Who God is and what he does (including questions about the Trinity)
- 2) Who man is and what he does (including questions about the fall)
- 3) What nature is and what it entails (including questions about science)
- 4) Questions about life in the future, after death (eschatology)

however, within this viewpoint still place to make use of various methods from other apologetic convictions. Methods from evidential apologetics, for instance, can be used without neglecting the viewpoint of presuppositional apologetics. Henk Stoker calls this approach *reasonable reformational apologetics*. For more information on this, see H. G. Stoker, “Convinced by Scripture and Plain Reason: Reasonable Reformational Apologetics,” in *Reformed Theology Today: Practical-Theological Missiological and Ethical Perspectives*, ed. Sarel P. van der Walt and Nico Forster (Durbanville: AOSIS, 2017), 58.

⁴⁴ Note that the only main verb in the Great Commission in the Greek original is *matheusate* (you should make disciples). The other two verbs (baptizing them and teaching them) are participles that function as adverbs as an extension to the main verb. Therefore, these two adverbial words function rather as a further description of the process of disciple-making.

⁴⁵ The ecumenical confessions (the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Creed of Athanasius) and the three forms of unity (the Belgic Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Canons of the Synod of Dort) provide good summaries of the Reformed Christian doctrine.

⁴⁶ In chapter 5, paragraph 14, the Canons of the Synod of Dort teach that God preserves his grace in humans, continues with it, and perfects it when the gospel is heard, read, and meditated upon, as well as through the use of the sacraments. See Philip Schaff, ed. *The Creeds of Christendom with a History and Critical Notes*, vol. 3, *The Creeds of the Evangelical Protestant Churches*, 6th ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985), 550–97.

- 5) Questions about living in the present (including ethics and Bible knowledge)
- 6) Questions about life in the past (including history and covenant history)
- 7) Religions (including other worldviews)⁴⁷

Almost all apologetics books deal with questions about life that can be categorized under these seven.⁴⁸ Everyone who is involved in the nurturing of small children should consciously give attention to all these matters when having conversations while continually striving to live according to the faith so that the teaching of the gospel does not create any unnecessary conflict within children. If they do so, the children under their care can experience both the teaching and the living examples and see how the biblical doctrine and Christian worldview provide satisfactory answers to these essential life questions.

2. Teach and Guide Children to Defend the Faith

First Peter 3:15 clearly expects all believers to be prepared and thus ready to give answers and witness to the hope that is in them. Also, the Canons of Dort confess this in chapter 5, paragraph 15, where unbelievers are contrasted with believers: “This teaching about the perseverance of true believers and saints ... is something which the flesh does not understand, Satan hates, the world ridicules, the ignorant and the hypocrites abuse, and the spirits of error attack. The bride of Christ, on the other hand, has always loved this teaching very tenderly *and defended it steadfastly as a priceless treasure.*”⁴⁹

When the Bible encourages believers in 1 Timothy 6:12 to always be prepared to defend the faith and to fight the good fight it includes children. Second Corinthians 10:3–4 states that this fight is a spiritual battle (see also Eph 6:12) against Satan and the unbelievers. It is obvious that Christian children should be able to handle claims of other worldviews from a very young age. It is essential for children from a very young age to be guided in order to be equipped to explain and defend their faith against other views and religions. When children are confronted with questions and claims from other worldviews, parents need to be equipped to provide satisfying answers from the Christian worldview for their children at their level.

⁴⁷ James Sire, *The Universe Next Door: A Basic Worldview Catalog*, 3rd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1997), 23.

⁴⁸ Natasha Crain, *Keeping Your Kids on God's Side* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 2016) is a comprehensive book that offers excellent ways to explain life's questions within these categories to children in a simple manner and how to start these conversations with children.

⁴⁹ This version of the confession can be found on the website of the Reformed Churches in South Africa, <http://www.cjbf.co.za/belydenisse/english/cod.html>. Italics added for emphasis. For more on the Canons of Dort, see Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, 3:595.

Conclusion

Children in the preschool phase are not only susceptible to faith formation, but they have a real interest in making sense of their world, which notably includes questions regarding matters of faith. Of all the theories investigated, only Piaget claims that children under the age of seven cannot think abstractly, though he contradicts himself when he admits that small children do have the ability to use (abstract) words to refer to objects, as well as their imagination to assign emotions to objects such as their toys. Other development psychologists also agree that the abstractness of language, for instance, is present from birth and that these children are even born with a readiness for faith.

Therefore, everyone who is involved in nurturing and educating these young children should be equipped to assist parents in their task of guiding their children in spiritual formation, as parents have the most impact upon children's faith formation and their ability to defend their faith. Developmental psychology theories are only descriptive, so the Bible should be used as the only source that gives prescriptive guidelines for faith formation because the Bible is the only revelation from God that Christians have received for the shaping of their faith.

Everyone involved in nurturing preschool children should, therefore, not only teach these children about the Christian worldview but also actively guide them to defend their faith against other worldviews. It is vital to develop curricula on faith formation and related course material that include worldview aspects that will guide children in the shaping of a Christian worldview. More attention should thus be given to the development of apologetic course material within the various contexts in which preschool children grow up.

To illustrate this point, I (Jonker Venter) will use another example that involves my son. It is common for young children in kindergarten to become sick every now and then. Sinus congestion made my son sick so often that it started frustrating him, even to the point where he started questioning why God made bacteria in the first place. Through prayer and the teaching of creation and sin entering into the world, he concluded that even bacteria were meant to have a good purpose. By viewing bacteria and sickness as a result of the fall, he made peace with the fact that God is still good, and therefore we can and should still worship him.

INTERVIEW

Interview with Os Guinness

PETER A. LILLBACK

(February 19, 2020)

PETER LILLBACK: *Let me offer a prayer and then we will begin.*

Father, thank you for the joy of pausing for a moment and lifting our hearts to you and your glory and your goodness. Please hear our request for your guidance in this interview. We thank you for the fruitful labors and ministry of Os Guinness through the years; for the impact you have allowed his work to have. And we pray it might be abiding for generations to come. Bless this conversation now for the good of your people, and we are truly grateful that it is by your grace that we come together. We ask this all in Jesus's name. Amen.

OS GUINNESS: Amen.

PL: *For this issue of Unio cum Christo we have the joy of interviewing Dr. Os Guinness. He is extraordinarily well known around the world in the areas of apologetics and Christian leadership, with a particular concern for religious liberty. It is my joy to interview him, and I am grateful for his emphasis on public theology, the witness of the church in the public square, and the importance of defending the faith. Thank you, Dr. Guinness, for being with us. I would like to ask you to begin by sharing a bit about your life, including how you came to faith in Christ.*

OG: Well, I am a descendent of a well-known Irish family that produces beer but also many missionaries. My grandparents and parents were missionaries in China, and I was born in China. But I spent most of my teenage years back in England, with my parents in China under house arrest. So my journey to faith was at school, through a close friend, and through reading

C. S. Lewis, particularly *Mere Christianity*. There was a kind of a debate in my mind over two years between atheists like Friedrich Nietzsche and Jean-Paul Sartre, and my own hero on that side, Albert Camus, and on the other side, people like Blaise Pascal, G. K. Chesterton, and C. S. Lewis above all. And it was through reading *Mere Christianity* that I actually came to faith.

PL: *Well that is marvelous. So C. S. Lewis enjoys in heaven knowing that his labors impacted you! Let me ask you this question: L'Abri is part of your story, and you got to know Dr. Francis Schaeffer along the way. How did these experiences shape your life, ministry, and approach to apologetics?*

OG: I was at London University in the early 1960s, and we had wonderful teachers at the University, people like John Stott, Martyn Lloyd-Jones, and Michael Green, but while it is fair to say that they gave us rich, deep, blocks of theology, it had absolutely no relation to culture, which was typical of Evangelicalism at that time. And there we were in what was called Swinging London, the counter-culture—the films of Ingmar Bergman, student radicalism, drugs, sex, and rock and roll—and there was no understanding of any of that. So it was really intriguing to me when a friend, Ranald Macaulay, Schaeffer's son-in-law, introduced me to his father-in-law. My first three weeks when I went out to L'Abri after I graduated were incredibly revolutionary in my thinking. For the first time, I knew we were free to think about anything and everything under the lordship of Christ. While that was obviously less important than my conversion, it was practically more important because it launched me on an understanding of how we engage the modern world. So I owe a huge debt to Schaeffer, above all for his passion for the Lord, for people, and for truth. Though he was not a scholar, those three things outweighed any flaws he may have had. And I owe the world to him.

PL: *How would you describe his apologetic if you were to distill it?*

OG: Well, his apologetic was very personal and practical. People have often contrasted it with that of someone like Cornelius Van Til, which was much more philosophical and theoretical. In contrast, Schaeffer had an incredible way of talking to people. He would ask questions to get into their lives and then really explore what was the treasure of their heart. And if you watched him you could see that after a minute or two—he was not aware of it—his eyes would fill with tears because he was so empathetic with the story and the things people had gone through. He was remarkable. I have never seen anyone who was a better apologist one-to-one.



OS GUINNESS

PL: *You mentioned the distinctive approaches of Schaeffer and Van Til. They both appeal to a system that has sometimes been called presuppositional. How much of Schaeffer is Van Tilian presuppositionalism, and maybe where would be ways that would differentiate their approaches?*

OG: Well, my good friend and your friend, Dr. Bill Edgar, has explored the differences between them in much more fruitful ways.¹ But, for me, Schaeffer was so much more personal and practical. There was a great deal of evidential emphasis in his apologetics, and while he is known for presuppositionalism, my own apologetics—which grows out of his—combines both, and I do not think there is any ultimate contradiction there.

PL: *Through the years you have become known as someone who is focused on what might be called the sociology of religion. How did your interest in this area arise, and how has that impacted the way you have sought to defend the Christian faith?*

OG: Both Van Til and Schaeffer majored in the history of ideas—how ideas washed down in the rain, as Schaeffer used to say. But being a child of the 1960s, I saw that much of the impact on the church did not come from just ideas but the whole notion of modernity and its structures. When I read Peter Berger—I read *Facing up to Modernity* first—it just turned on all the lights for my understanding, not as an alternative to Schaeffer, but as a complement.² Now Schaeffer was brilliant on the history of ideas, and Peter Berger gave me an understanding of the sociology of knowledge or what you might call more simply, cultural analysis. There are so many things shaping us that do not come from thinkers at all. You could take the notion of “fast life,” 24-7-365 pressure, which we all know we live under. Where does it come from? It is not from a philosopher or sociologist or psychologist. It actually comes from clocks. You know the African saying, “All Westerners have watches. Africans have time,” and you can see that the clock has put a stamp on modern life. It is said to be the most powerful Western-invented machine. But you need sociology of knowledge or cultural analysis to understand that. That is true of a lot of things; this is why I try to balance the history of ideas with cultural analysis. But again, it is both/and and not either/or.

PL: *What do you believe to be the abiding impact of Schaeffer and L’Abri on the global stage of Christian thought today?*

¹ Cf. William Edgar, “Two Christian Warriors: Cornelius Van Til and Francis A. Schaeffer Compared,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 57.1 (Spring 1995): 57–80.

² Peter Berger, *Facing up to Modernity: Excursions in Society, Politics, and Religion* (New York: Basic Books, 1979).

OG: Well, sadly, things move so fast now that people are even saying, “Who was Francis Schaeffer?” and “Who was Billy Graham? Who was Carl Henry?” which is really quite appalling. However, as I look back over my life, and at 60 years since I came to faith in Jesus, Schaeffer’s great contribution was as a “door opener.” Evangelicalisms, certainly in Britain and much of the America, were pietistic in a good way: warm hearts, but not much of a sharp mind. So for many people, Schaeffer, for better or worse, gave them the freedom to move through the door, to think about anything—philosophy, art, culture, politics, you name it—within the framework of a Christian understanding. So even people who have been critics of his in various colleges would admit that he was the one who opened the door. They went through in different directions, but they owe that door opening to Schaeffer. Now for many of us who knew him, it has had a much deeper implication than all that we learned from him, the things I mentioned like his passion for God. For example, though he was not the greatest preacher I have heard, in almost every sermon at some point his voice would break. He was overcome by the immensity of the wonder of the truth he was proclaiming, and that sort of passion for the Lord was wonderful and inspiring.

PL: *Another area of your research and leadership has impacted the American story, including the Williamsburg Charter and your recent book, The Last Call for Liberty.³ As we look at those two works, first of all, how did your interest in this area arise, and what has happened between that first work on the Williamsburg Charter and your most recent book in the public political arena and issues of culture?*

OG: I have always been taken up with Augustine’s idea that if you want to understand a nation, you do not look at the size of its GDP, not that he talked that way, or the strength of its military or the size of its population. You look at what it loves supremely. There is no question that what America loves supremely is freedom. So I think the deepest way to analyze America is through the lens of understanding how it became a free country and where that freedom is today. That of course includes religious freedom. My work with the Williamsburg Charter (June 22, 1988) was almost providentially accidental.⁴ I wrote a single page on the genius of religious freedom and the First Amendment when I was at the Brookings Institution, and it fell into the hands of a senator’s wife who gave it to her husband. He called me and said, “I have just been appointed to the commission celebrating the

³ Os Guinness, *The Last Call for Liberty* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Books, 2018).

⁴ “The Williamsburg Charter,” *Religious Freedom Center of the Freedom Forum Institute*, <https://www.religiousfreedomcenter.org/about/charter/>.

bicentennial of the Constitution,” and added, “Would you like to meet the Chief Justice who is the head of the commission?” I had only been months in the country and I had lunch with Chief Justice Warren Burger. And he said to me, “I am embarrassed. We have millions to celebrate free speech, but almost nothing on behalf of religious freedom. What would you suggest?” Almost like Nehemiah as the cupbearer before the king, I prayed and suggested what became the Williamsburg Charter in June 1988. It was followed by the Religious Freedom Restoration Act in 1993. Looking back, we can see that those two events were the high water mark of 300 years of the American celebration and protection of religious freedom.

Since then, there has been a sea change that has cast a shadow over religious freedom. I call the villains the three dark Rs. One, the *reducers* who have reduced religious freedom to freedom of worship rather than the comprehensive right that it is. Second are the *removers*, particularly those after 9/11 who were horrified by the face of religion in public life and now see religious freedom as freedom *from* religion and not *for* religion. And third and most fatefully are the *rebranders*. Religious freedom used to be the first liberty, and it has now been rebranded as a code word for bigotry and discrimination. Today, you can see that religious freedom is under threat from the left as it has never been in the whole of American history.

PL: *That is a very powerful expression of our current milieu. Which raises the question, what do you believe are the biggest risks to religious liberty today? And should Christians really be concerned, given the divine promise of the survivability of the church and the all-encompassing character of divine purpose and providence?*

OG: Religious freedom is in essence the “freedom to be faithful.” That is why it is so important for us. It is obviously less important than faith in Jesus itself, but it is very important. If we look back over history, Christians were the pioneers: for instance, Tertullian in the second century and Lactantius, who was the tutor to Constantine’s son. But then sadly we were the perpetrators of some of the worst violations of religious freedom through the medieval times: “Error has no rights,” the Inquisition, and so on. Then with the Reformation, in Thomas Hywels and Roger Williams, we have the rediscovery of religious freedom. So, we Christians have a mixed record. We were the pioneers, we were the perpetrators of some of the worst deeds in history, and today, wherever people are persecuted, we too are persecuted.

I think there are many reasons why it is absolutely essential for the human future. It is the key to a civil society. It is the key to social harmony in a highly diverse world. And above all, it is the first liberty. When freedom of conscience and the civil public square—one is the inner forum and the

other is the outer forum—are guaranteed, you have the chance of a society that upholds freedom with justice. So it is incredibly important.

PL: *To those that would appeal to providence taking care of the matter and argue that it is not our concern, would you say that it is a misuse of the biblical doctrine? Or what would you counsel someone that says the church should just leave it alone and God will take care of our freedom?*

OG: I think that seems irresponsible. You know at the heart of faith and freedom is the notion of initiative and responsibility. Obviously, our brothers and sisters in the early church had very little room to move under the power of the Caesars, but we in the Western world, Europe and America, and many other parts of the world too, still have open societies. We are responsible as citizens to stand for these things, not just for our sake but for the human future; the passivity of saying we will just leave it all to God is terrible. The Lord is sovereign, but we are significant and responsible, so we are junior partners under him on behalf of freedom and justice.

There has been a sea change over religious freedom. Looking at the huge polarization in the United States at the moment, the deepest division I see is between those who understand America and freedom from the perspective of 1776 and the American Revolution, which was largely but not completely biblical from the influence of the Reformation, and those who understand America and freedom from the perspective of 1789 and the French Revolution and its heirs. Now the French Revolution only lasted ten years in France before Napoleon squelched it, but its ideas remain in some parts of the world through communism and the cultural Marxism of the progressive left. You see a fundamental threat to America that is deeper than anything America has faced. This threat is not external like communism during the Cold War or Hitler in World War II. Rather, it is internal. That is the greatest threat to freedom, and many are asleep at the wheel.

PL: *What is the church, broadly conceived, doing today to advance the gospel effectively or to blunt or diminish the clarity of the good news of Christ?*

OG: As you know well, the church is exploding in the global south. Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia, where I happened to be born in north central China, are the epicenter of the fastest growth of the church in 2000 years. You see much of the fullness of the gospel, not only preaching but healing and deliverance and community, all sorts of dimensions that we have sadly long lost in parts of the West. And I would argue—and have done in a good many books, including *Impossible People*—that we are not only the victim of ideas that are against us—secularism, relativism, and various obvious ideas

—but we have fallen captive to some of the shaping powers of modernity in ways that are unfortunate.⁵ We therefore need a revival and a reformation and an awakening in the Western world.

PL: *Can authentic Christian intellectuals be simultaneously scientifically astute and maintain an historic Christian worldview as they engage debated issues such as creation and evolution, gender, and sexual identity?*

OG: I would answer with a grand “Yes, of course!” The West is a cut-flower civilization, looking nice but uprooted from its roots. We owe a lot to the Greeks and the Romans, but the main roots of our Western world come from the gospel and the Jews. Notions such as human dignity and freedom and truth and words, including the rise of modern science, arise from the Judeo-Christian tradition. Now what we are implacably opposed to, and they are opposed to us, is scientism or naturalistic science that views the scientific method as the sole way of understanding life, and that is simply inadequate. For example, the naturalistic scientists and the atheists—like Sam Harris or B. F. Skinner or John B. Watson—have a no better view of freedom than the ancient Babylonians, who believed in the stars, or the Greeks, who believed in fate, because they believe only in determinism. Naturalistic science is so reductionistic that it is a positive danger today, as it gives neither the values nor the foundations we need. I am from Oxford and am incredibly grateful to the Lord for people like Andrew Briggs, Lionel Tarassenko, and Ard Loouis, who are eminent scientists and professors in their fields, Francis Collins at the head of the National Institutes of Health, and all those who understand that a strong view of faith and a strong view of science go hand in hand.

PL: *What are the greatest opportunities for Christian influence and thought today as well as perhaps some of the greatest risks facing Christians?*

OG: I think it is time for Christians in the West to get off the back foot. We are on the defensive, which is a scandal. If you think of it, there are groups compared with us who are tiny. Take our friends the Jews. They are less than two percent of America, but they punch well above their weight intellectually, financially, and in the world of entertainment in Hollywood. We who are followers of Jesus are huge in numbers, and we are called to be salt and light, but our influence is puny. So it is time for us to re-explore the great

⁵ Os Guinness, *Impossible People: Christian Courage and the Struggle for the Soul of Civilization* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2016).

foundational issues and move out into public life. Above all, not just to speak them out, but to live them out.

I mentioned, for instance, human dignity. We are moving from a post-truth world to a post-rights world. Not long ago, people were saying the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) was the “Bible of humanity” and would sweep the world. Not today. It is now described as Eurocentric or unfounded. But where did human worth come from? It came from Genesis 1:26 and 27. You can see that the Genesis declaration is quite literally the Magna Carta of humanity. So we need to explore all these things, as we have been forced to be defensive: words, civilities in crisis, truth, covenant, freedom, justice, and peace. We are the champions and the guardians of the greatest truths that made our Western civilization. It is becoming “a cut-flower civilization,” so it is up to us to stand for them for the Lord’s sake, not for the West’s sake.

PL: *As you look at your extensive writings, which works that you have authored should be the first for someone to read to understand your perspective and concerns, and which do you think is your most enduring in impact?*

OG: You could tell me better than I could! My bestselling book by a long way is *The Call*.⁶ It goes to the heart of our discipleship, an individual’s longing for purpose and fulfillment, and the breaking of a narrow pietism and engaging with life through our callings. So I am not surprised that that is by far my best selling, and maybe my most important book. But there are many that I love. I love my little book *Renaissance: The Power of the Gospel However Hard the Times*.⁷ It has not sold all that many but has the heart of things I think we need today. I have recently published two books on freedom. I have just finished a first draft of a third one, which is a more constructive view of Exodus and freedom. As I said earlier, I think freedom is the issue of the hour: certainly in America but also for the human future. I have no idea which ones will survive and which ones will not, but *The Call* is certainly my most important.

PL: *The first time I saw the name of Os Guinness on a book it was one called The Dust of Death. What caused you to write that book?*

OG: I never thought of being a writer, but I came to the United States in 1968: six weeks from the east to the west coast, and Berkeley and Harvard. I

⁶ Os Guinness, *The Call: Finding and Fulfilling God’s Purpose for Your Life*, revised and expanded 20th anniversary edition (Nashville: Nelson, 2018).

⁷ Os Guinness, *Renaissance: The Power of the Gospel However Hard the Times* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2014).

met Mario Savio, who led the Free Speech Movement in 1964, went to the Fillmore West and listened to Grace Slick and Jefferson Airplane. A hundred cities were ablaze, and that was the year that Martin Luther King was assassinated, and then Bobby Kennedy. Then you had the so-called police riots at the Chicago Convention. When I came back, I realized that what was happening in the US was of incredible importance, certainly for the West, but even wider. Then at L'Abri, I gave a series of ten lectures on the 1960s, and people came up and said, "You should write this." At first, I just shrugged it off. Then my old English teacher from my school in England came by, and he encouraged me too. So I thought, well, I will give it a try. L'Abri gave me six weeks off to write *The Dust of Death*, which I did.⁸ It did so well that it launched my writing, and I have enjoyed trying to do more since then.

PL: *So how many books in print total approximately are now bearing the name of Os Guinness?*

OG: I have absolutely no idea, and I do not particularly bother about the numbers. But it must be somewhere around 200 to 250 thousand. My books have sold far more in Korea than in my own home country, England.

PL: *Interesting. Well, what opportunities do you think Westminster Theological Seminary might have for the advance of the kingdom of Christ in the coming decades as you look at this school, which has enjoyed a long friendship with you?*

OG: I love Westminster Seminary, above all for its great faithfulness. That is the central issue of our time over against Protestant revisionism, the sexual revolution, and the progressive left. The central issue is Christian integrity and faithfulness. Beyond that, Westminster has a wonderful Reformed framework for thinking, so your graduates should be in the lead in terms of intellectual engagement with our modern world. Those are the two things that stand out for me. But if I could say so gently, Westminster is too often known for its little internal squabbles, which sadly blunt the incredible impact that it should be having.

PL: *Thank you for taking this time to interview with us. I want to conclude with an open-ended question. Are there any other issues that you might wish to clarify or comment on for our readers as we conclude our discussion?*

OG: Let me just comment on the challenge that Evangelicals are responsible for Donald Trump, they will pay for it, and so on. As I said, the polarization

⁸ Os Guinness, *The Dust of Death: A Critique of the Establishment and the Counter Culture, and the Proposal for a Third Way* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1973).

we are facing revolves around the central issue that I identify in my book as being between Sinai and Paris.⁹ It has come down to us in terms of 1776 against 1789. However, I think we need to define the central crisis of our time more clearly, and then align ourselves more carefully in terms of that. I personally thank God for the wise things Trump has done, although he has a character that leaves a lot to be desired. Indeed, he has done an extraordinary number of good things for the country, but we have to show where we agree and where we disagree. Evangelicalism has now become conflated with him. When the coming reaction takes place, which is bound to happen, whenever he leaves office, after one or two terms, there is going to be a huge backlash, and society will probably lean more towards the progressive left. Unless we clarify where we are, we are going to be in trouble and just swept away as if we were merely conservative or merely political. Thus, we have to have a much better understanding of the reality we face, and a much clearer articulation of who we are and what we stand for. Along with others, I tried to state that in “The Evangelical Manifesto” in 2008, which in many ways prefigures the problems we face today as Evangelicals and points the way forward.¹⁰

PL: *Well we want to thank you so very much for your thoughts. You have given us a great deal to think about, and our prayer is that God would continue your fruitful labors for many years to come. Would you please conclude with a prayer that we can share with our readers?*

OG: OK, thanks, Pete.

Lord, thank you that you are sovereign over this fascinating, crazy, challenging world. You are Lord. And so we ask that you will give us wisdom and trust, obedience, and courage, that each of us in our callings and in our churches and communities may so be faithful to you that we may serve your purposes in our generation. We pray in Jesus’s name. Amen.

⁹ Guinness, *The Last Call for Liberty*.

¹⁰ Cf. Os Guinness, “The Evangelical Manifesto,” *Os Guinness*, 2020, <http://osguinness.com/publicstatement/the-evangelical-manifesto/>.