

TRUE OR FALSE, WHO DECIDES: A DISCOURSE ON RELATIVISM

By: Scott K. Leafe, M.Div, D.Min.

Introduction

The ancient Greek philosopher Protagoras said, “Man is the measure of all things, of the existence of the things that are and the non-existence of the things that are not.”¹ When taken individually, truth, then, is a measure of a person’s will—what is true for one person may be false for another, and vice versa. As we group individuals into cultures, what is right or wrong in any circumstance is often a function of the predominant will of the distinct culture. In other words, specific truth claims for one culture can be opposed to truth claims of another culture based on their particulars. In the end, “It’s all relative.”

Such individual and cultural expressions of “truth” are examples of the dilemma of relativism, a system in which what is “true” is determined subjectively by each person or culture, and there often exists no objective, authoritative truth that governs or applies to all humanity universally. With this dilemma in view, the aim of this study will be to evaluate relativistic truth-claim systems in light of biblical evidence for objective, non-arbitrary, and universal standards of truth that are sourced in the words and character of the triune God of Christianity.

Overview of Relativistic Truth

From the perspective of modernity, “truth” was generally grounded in real or perceived objective evidence and reason, a “head belief” that Millard Erickson observes represents the correspondence theory of truth. Erickson writes, “Truth is a measure of propositions and is

¹ Plato, “Theaetetus; Sophist,” in *Plato in Twelve Volumes* (Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press; W. Heinemann, 1921), 152a.

present in the propositions, which correctly correspond to the states of affairs that they claim to present.”² In other words, objective evidence was translated into truth, individually and culturally, until alternative or otherwise plausible objective evidence compelled embracing a new truth. However, with the evolution of late-modernism, or postmodernism, the basis for truth became subjective feelings or tastes. Erickson writes, subjective truth “is not a matter of correspondence with the object known, but rather of the effect of that object and idea on the knowing subject.”³ Simply put, the basis for truth moved from the head (reason) to the heart (feeling).

As will be shown in this study, the ebb and flow of truth claims beneath the umbrella of relativism generally range from the “feelings-based” relativism of individuals, to the “group think” of cultural relativism, through the halls of situationism, and to the extremes of antinomianism (in its various forms).

Individual Relativism

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) attempted to prove that knowledge of reality is obtained by way of subjective categories of the mind. Experience and reason form the basis for knowledge; truth is experience-based.⁴ Nietzsche posited that no truth transcends history, only the specific truths of specific perspectives.⁵ Prominent German philosophers such as Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) and Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860) borrowed from Kant and turned to

² Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1998), 164.

³ Ibid., 47.

⁴ John D. Hannah, *Our Legacy: The History of Christian Doctrine* (Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress, 2001), 96.

⁵ See *Nietzschean Perspectivism* in Linda C. Raeder, “Postmodernism, Multiculturalism, and the Death of Tolerance: The Transformation of American Society,” *Humanitas* 30, no. 1-2 (2017): 63.

“perspectivism.” Cornelius Van Til notes that perspectivism “was able to incorporate contradictions, given that every truth was simply a truth for a particular person.”⁶ Os Guinness explores the hypocrisy of such claims, writing, “If ‘truth’ is merely the compliment we pay to claims and ideas that we agree with, then ‘lies’ are only the insult we level at claims and ideas that differ from our own. Seen that way, there are only relativities to counter relativities, supposed lies to counter supposed lies, and of course power to counter power.”⁷

Charles Taylor adds that the most significant shift in the post-1960s West has been in the area of expressive individualism, “that each one of us has his/her own way of realizing our humanity, and that it is important to find and live out one’s own, as against surrendering to conformity with a model imposed on us from the outside.”⁸ According to James Smith, this expressive individualism has become the “ethical base” characterized by the “do your own thing, who am I to judge?” mantra of individual relativism.⁹ The locus, then, of individual relativism becomes the social construction of the self. Russell Almon notes, “In a world that is fast-changing, the result is potentially an unstable, impermanent, and fluid self. The consequence here is that the fluid, postmodern self may be little more than a bundle of fluctuating relationships and momentary preferences.”¹⁰

⁶ Cornelius Van Til and K. Scott Oliphint, *The Defense of the Faith*, 4th ed. (Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Pub., 2008), 148n6.

⁷ Os Guinness, *Fool’s Talk: Recovering the Art of Christian Persuasion* (Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Books, 2015), 194.

⁸ Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007), 486.

⁹ James K. A. Smith, *How (Not) to Be Secular: Reading Charles Taylor* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2014), 87.

¹⁰ Russell L. Almon, “The Postmodern Self in Theological Perspective: A Communal, Narrative, and Ecclesial Approach,” *Ecclesiology* 13, no. 2 (2017): 184.

Notwithstanding Almon, Gary Santillanes proposes that “we can be justified in adopting relativism if it serves as the best explanation of the moral phenomena. Relativism can be justified if it is a plausible account of morality and is superior to its explanatory rivals.”¹¹ But Santillanes seems to be arguing for a moving target as the superiority of explanatory rivals is subjective at best. Consider the present-day irony of individual relativism that is the current “eat our own” cultural climate. Inwardly derived individual truths and values are being evaluated against sometimes radical but otherwise evolutionary cultural truths and then ridiculed and silenced. Former relativists are no longer able to set the rules they live by and do what they think is right because the culture is now demanding adherence to some absolute cultural norm. The result is a never-ending spate of apologies in the press and throughout social media for now “abhorrent” behavior or ideas that would, in recent years, be acceptable under an individual system of relativistic truth.¹² Thus, Santillanes’ superior plausible account of morality (truth) may vary with the click of a mouse or a Tweet.

Cultural Relativism

In practical terms, cultural relativism provides for systems of constructed and negotiated values. Santillanes considers this premise and concludes, “If the relativist is right that moral values are a kind of social construction and there is no mind independent truth of the matter behind a particular value, then there is little reason to debate the capital T truth of a given value.”¹³ In other words, our culturally constructed values (again, our basis for truth) are right

¹¹ Gary Santillanes, “Studies in Moral Relativism” (Doctor of Philosophy diss., Binghamton University, State University of New York, 2016), 158.

¹² The trending pages of YouTube are replete with “I’m sorry” videos by “influencers” who have been characterized as bigoted by a mob mentality spurred by socially constructed truths regarding race and gender.

¹³ Ibid., 36.

for us, and different cultures' values (their basis for truth) are right for them. Consider the following quote of Herodotus:

When he was king of Persia, he summoned the Greeks who happened to be present at his court, and asked them what they would take to eat the dead bodies of their fathers. They replied that they would not do it for any money in the world. Later, in the presence of the Greeks, and through an interpreter, so that they could understand what was said, he asked some Indians, of the tribe called Callatiae, who do in fact eat their parents' dead bodies, what they would take to burn them. They uttered a cry of horror and forbade him to mention such a dreadful thing.¹⁴

This commonly referenced trope portrays the wide variety of culturally held historical beliefs that are elevated as truth by independent cultures. A comparable contemporary example could be female genital mutilation, a practice embraced in Muslim quarters of Africa and the Middle East, to name two, but resoundingly rejected by international non-governmental organizations and the United Nations.¹⁵ A similar disparity can be found in contemporary value arguments such as the abortion-related fetus definition debates within the United States.¹⁶

Because of culturally derived truths, cultural relativism holds it would be wrong to pass judgment on distinct cultures or sectors of cultures with substantially different values (truths) or impose a universal value (truth) standard on all.¹⁷ Each culture develops its standards of truth that, rightly or wrongly based on respective cultural perceptions, become generally accepted and

¹⁴ Herodotus, *Herodotus: The Histories*, trans. Aubrey De Sélincourt, *Penguin Classics* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex; Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1953), 190.

¹⁵ General Assembly Resolution 67/146, *Intensifying Global Efforts for the Elimination of Female Genital Mutilations*, A/RES/67/146 (New York: United Nations, December 12, 2012).

¹⁶ The debate here is that the personhood of a fetus is not an objective fact. For example, one group argues a fetus is not a full person and, therefore, abortion is permissible (right). Conversely, another group argues a fetus is a full person, and no person should be harmed; thus, abortion is wrong. Both groups are still making truth claims about the world, which are permissible under relativism. See Santillanes, 50n12.

¹⁷ For a comprehensive defense of pluralistic relativity, see David B. Wong, *Natural Moralities: A Defense of Pluralistic Relativism* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

practiced by its members. Such standards of truth become the product of “group think” and remain, for the most part, based on the human experience manifested by individual relativism.

In many ways, the effects of cultural relativism on society mimic ancient Israel when they had turned from God and his truth and commands in Scripture. The consequences were dire, and the prophet Jeremiah cried out of death in the city of Jerusalem. Given the circumstances (i.e., the sacking of Jerusalem by Babylon), there was indeed death in the city and nation. But Jeremiah was also speaking of a more comprehensive death. Francis Schaeffer comments, “Because Jewish society of that day had turned away from what God had given them in the Scripture, there was death in the *polis*, that is, death in the total culture and total society.”¹⁸ Similar present-day death throes have been documented by Linda Raeder who observes that cultural relativism has “lead not only to an explicit rejection of the traditional American conception of justice but also traditional views of religion, morality, marriage and the family, sex roles and practices, and capitalism, indeed every value and institution historically associated with American society.”¹⁹ One must only read the daily headlines to corroborate Raeder’s conclusions.

Situationism

A relativistic system deemed “the new morality” raced onto the scene in the late 1960s. The system was labeled *situation ethics* by Joseph Fletcher’s provocative book of the same title published in 1966. Fletcher asserted that “situations” determine what is right or wrong, true or

¹⁸ Francis A. Schaeffer, *How Should We Then Live?: The Rise and Decline of Western Thought and Culture*, 50th L’Abri Anniversary ed. (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway Books, 2005), 226.

¹⁹ Raeder, 83.

false, based on the premise that there are no universal moral principles. Fletcher's summary rule is: Do the most loving thing. Fletcher explains his position as follows:

Christian situation ethics has only one norm or principle or law (call it what you will) that is binding and unexceptionable, always good and right regardless of the circumstances. That is "love" – the *agapē* of the summary commandment to love God and the neighbor. Everything else without exception, all laws and rules and principles and ideals and norms, are only contingent, only valid if they happen to serve love in any situation.²⁰

Plainly put, situationism holds that there are no absolute truths, no absolute right or wrong actions, but right or wrong can be found by doing the most loving thing in each new situation.²¹ Therefore, truth is relative to each situation, and a belief is true if the result is the most loving outcome. Under such a relativistic system, moral laws (truths) contained in Scripture are reduced to mores that can be massaged to fit a given situation.

Antinomianism

Perhaps the most extreme relativistic system is *antinomianism*. The word is based on the Greek prefix *anti-* (meaning "against/instead of") and the noun *nomos* (meaning "law").²² This system holds that there are no binding moral laws or truths, that everything is relative (in its most extreme manifestation, existential nihilism). Nietzsche proposed such a view declaring, "God is dead and we have killed him." When God died, all objective truth died with him.²³ Consequently, since there are no God-given truths, people must create their own truths, will their

²⁰ Joseph F. Fletcher, *Situation Ethics: The New Morality, Library of Theological Ethics* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997), 30.

²¹ Wayne A. Grudem, *Christian Ethics: An Introduction to Biblical Moral Reasoning* (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, 2018), 42.

²² Frederick W. Danker, Walter Bauer, and William Arndt, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 677.

²³ Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, *The Portable Nietzsche*, trans. Walter Kaufmann, *The Viking Portable Library* 62 (New York: Viking Press, 1968), 95. Cited in Norman L. Geisler, *Christian Ethics: Contemporary Issues & Options*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010), 25.

own good.²⁴ Anarchy may then emerge, and the heretofore fictionally dystopian cultures of the style of “Mad Max” become plausible if not predictable. Perhaps such outcomes are represented in the present-day ANTIFA movement that engages in non-violent and violent tactics to overthrow historical governmental and non-governmental institutions based on disparate truth claims.

As has been shown, relativistic systems either struggle to find static or universal truths or jettison truth systems altogether (nihilism). Such should not be a surprise given the predominant basis for truth within these systems is experiential. As the human experience is tainted by sin,²⁵ the expected output would be the mishmash that is relativism. To coin a phrase from the computer programming world, “Garbage in; garbage out.” However, there is a solution to this truth dilemma that will be explored in the section that follows.

The Objective Truth of Christianity

In the human arena, truth deals with what is right and wrong. Christian truth deals with what is right and wrong for a Christian. Should there be a difference? The Apostle Paul argues,

For when Gentiles who do not have the Law do instinctively the things of the Law, these, not having the Law, are a law to themselves, in that they show the work of the Law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness and their thoughts alternately accusing or else defending them (Rom. 2:14-15 NASB).

²⁴ Douglas Groothuis summarizes the antinomian sentiments of more recent relativists from academia, writing, “To say we know the objective truth about ultimate issues is to set up a ‘metanarrative’ this is intrinsically oppressive and exploitative (Jean-François Lyotard). Various ‘interpretive communities’ (Stanley Fish) determine their own truth. Texts, whether religious or otherwise, do not have any fixed, objective meaning; therefore they are neither true nor false in themselves (Jacques Derrida). Truth is what our colleagues will let us get away with (Richard Rorty) or what the power structures deem to be so (Michel Foucault). Finally, there is no ‘God’s-eye view’ of anything; therefore, there is no objective truth.” Douglas R. Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics: A Comprehensive Case for Biblical Faith* (Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic, 2011), 128-29.

²⁵ Such is original sin, which is defined as the sinful state and condition in which men are born. Simply stated, it refers to the corruption of the entire human nature. Every part of a person is adversely affected: intellect (2 Cor. 4:4); conscience (1 Tim. 4:2); will (Rom. 1:28); heart (Eph. 4:18); and the total being (Rom. 1:18–3:20).

In other words, even non-believers, who show no discernible knowledge of the truth of God's Word, demonstrate the work of God's truth has been written on their hearts—all people possess a conscience. Moreover, a knowledge of God has been implanted in each person by virtue of every human being created in God's image. This knowledge is intuitive knowledge about God—his essential being. With this truth in mind, Paul continues by writing,

“what can be known about God is plain to them” (Rom. 1:18 NASB); and “they fully know God's righteous decree that those who practice such things [ungodly things] deserve to die” (Rom. 1:32 NASB); and even those who have no access to the special revelation of God nonetheless “do by nature the things required by the law” (Rom. 2:14 NASB)—because “they show that the work of the law is written in their hearts” (Rom. 2:15 NASB).

Then Paul adds an important conclusion: “So people are without excuse” (Rom. 1:21 NET).

Simply put, failure to recognize God as the source of truth does not absolve anyone, even an atheist, from their duty to embrace and conform to God's decretive will.

Scripture endorses the immutability of God's character (cf. Mal. 3:6; Jam. 1:7).

Axiomatically, then, moral obligations flowing from his nature (e.g., the command not to murder [Gen. 9:6]) are binding on all peoples everywhere and at all times.²⁶ Because commands from Scripture stem from and reflect God's nature, they are neither arbitrary (relative) or irrational. For example, because God represents perfect justice, he knows which acts are just and prescribes them while forbidding unjust acts. Equally, certain acts are inherently right, and others inherently wrong because they do or do not reflect God's character, who is the Creator of all.²⁷

²⁶ Clearly, not all that God wills must flow from his immutable nature. For example, God's testing of Adam and Eve regarding eating fruit from the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil is not a command that transcends to us today.

²⁷ John S. Feinberg and Paul D. Feinberg, *Ethics for a Brave New World* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1993), 30.

Because Christian norms are sourced from Scripture and Scripture is God's self-revelation, God's Word can show that an action or decision is right or wrong, just or unjust, true or false. On this basis, John and Paul Feinberg add that "by reflecting on God's attributes and the world he made, reason can see the reasonableness of what God has prescribed. For the same reasons . . . reason on its own can reach some perception of what should and should not be done."²⁸ To reiterate the Apostle Paul: "So people are without excuse" (Rom. 1:21 NET).

As the absolute standard of truth (John 17:17), Walter Kaiser suggests Scripture can be used in four different ways in connection with moral and truth-based decision-making: 1) as a guide—pointing out the appropriate route, 2) as a guard—warning against wrong decisions or courses of action, 3) as a compass—helping us gain our orientation, and 4) as a principle—consolidating abstract ideas that encapsulate many examples found in Scripture. In these ways, Christians can move through their daily lives equipped with a grid of absolute truth through which relativistic truth claims can be appropriately filtered.

Conclusion

In 1984, Schaeffer presciently warned of the growing infection of relativism on society. He wrote,

Something has happened in the last sixty years. The freedom that once was founded on a Biblical consensus and a Christian ethos, has now become autonomous freedom, cut loose from all constraints. Here we have the world spirit of our age—autonomous man setting himself up as God, in defiance of the moral and spiritual truth which God has given....[T]he world spirit of our age rolls on and on claiming to be autonomous and crushing all that we cherish in its path."²⁹

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Francis A. Schaeffer, *The Great Evangelical Disaster* (Westchester, Ill.: Crossway Books, 1984), 22-23.

On this phenomenon, the neo-orthodox theologian Reinhold Niebuhr wrote, “Man is mortal, that is his fate; man pretends not to be mortal, that is his sin.”³⁰ Though miles apart doctrinally, Schaeffer and Niebuhr recognized the tide change from modernity (reason) to postmodernism (relativism) and the growing abandonment of absolute truth standards.

Unfortunately, the tide shift has been somewhat of a tsunami. Ensuing relativistic systems have arisen, and some have been briefly articulated in this study. All relativistic systems require humankind (individually and culturally) to assume the role of the “truth-maker,” each person or culture as their own god. Ultimately, Nietzsche’s “God is dead” philosophy has been embraced by at least Western cultures and has even infected Christianity with its relativism.³¹

Genuine truth begins with God’s Word. The apostle Paul reminds that “all Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting, and training in righteousness, so that the man of God may be thoroughly equipped for every good work” (2 Tim. 3:16-17 NIV). Thus, the entirety of Scripture is not only the norm of Christian values and truth but is the timeless and immutable truth applicable to all people. With such a perspective, J. I. Packer provides the following instructional imperative:

Keep two truths in view. First, God’s law expresses his character. It reflects his own behavior; it alerts us to what he will love and hate to see in us. It is a recipe for holiness, consecrated conformity to God, which is his true image in man. And as such (this is the second truth) God’s law fits human nature.³²

David Noble suggests that even forms of relativism contain some grain of truth that finds its origins in Christian Scripture, “but no other system can claim to be the whole truth, handed

³⁰ Reinhold Niebuhr, *Beyond Tragedy; Essays on the Christian Interpretation of History*, *History Essay Index Reprint Series* (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1971), 128.

³¹ Consider specific Christian denominational responses and policies adopted in the past decade regarding sexual orientation by way of example.

³² J. I. Packer, *Growing in Christ* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1994), 232.

down as an absolute truth from God to humanity.”³³ Consequently, believers must not be swayed by the oft soothing aroma of relativism and must recognize the eternal, fixed, and universal truth of God’s Word. Such lives must then be dedicated to obeying it—something far too rare today.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer once penned,

“Who stands fast? Only the man whose final standard is not his reason, his principles, his conscience, his freedom, or his virtue, but who is ready to sacrifice all this when he is called to obedient and responsible action in faith and in exclusive allegiance to God—the responsible man, who tries to make his whole life an answer to the question and call of God. Where are these responsible people?”³⁴

Christians should answer Bonhoeffer’s petition by living out the objective truth of God’s Word, by loving God with their whole body, soul, spirit, mind, and strength (Matt. 22:37); by treating others the way they also want to be treated (Matt. 22:39). Such believers would be found in the halls of government, standing firm against tyranny and racism, or at the “tip of the spear” in the mission field, sacrificing everything for the sake of the gospel. In the main, however, such believers are quite regular people living extraordinary lives, showing the world that there is an absolute truth standard and that God’s truth is worth believing and living.³⁵

³³ David A. Noebel, *Understanding the Times*, 2nd abridged and rev. ed. (Manitou Springs, CO: Summit Press, 2006), 132.

³⁴ Dietrich Bonhoeffer and Joan Winmill Brown, *The Martyred Christian: 160 Readings from Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 1st Collier Books ed. (New York; London: Collier Books; Collier Macmillan, 1985), 157.

³⁵ Noebel, 132.

Bibliography

- General Assembly Resolution 67/146. *Intensifying Gloabal Efforts for the Elimination of Female Genital Mutilations*. A/RES/67/146, December 12, 2012.
- Almon, Russell L. "The Postmodern Self in Theological Perspective: A Communal, Narrative, and Ecclesial Approach." *Ecclesiology* 13, no. 2 (2017): 179-96.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich and Joan Winmill Brown. *The Martyred Christian: 160 Readings from Dietrich Bonhoeffer*. 1st Collier Books ed. New York; London: Collier Books; Collier Macmillan, 1985.
- Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, and William Arndt. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Erickson, Millard J. *Christian Theology*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1998.
- Feinberg, John S. and Paul D. Feinberg. *Ethics for a Brave New World*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1993.
- Fletcher, Joseph F. *Situation Ethics: The New Morality*. Library of Theological Ethics. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.
- Geisler, Norman L. *Christian Ethics: Contemporary Issues & Options*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010.
- Groothuis, Douglas R. *Christian Apologetics: A Comprehensive Case for Biblical Faith*. Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic, 2011.
- Grudem, Wayne A. *Christian Ethics: An Introduction to Biblical Moral Reasoning*. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, 2018.
- Guinness, Os. *Fool's Talk: Recovering the Art of Christian Persuasion*. Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Books, 2015.
- Hannah, John D. *Our Legacy: The History of Christian Doctrine*. Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress, 2001.
- Herodotus. *Herodotus: The Histories*. Translated by Aubrey De Sélincourt. Penguin Classics. Harmondsworth, Middlesex; Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1953.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. *Beyond Tragedy; Essays on the Chrisitan Interpretation of History*. History Essay Index Reprint Series. Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1971.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm. *The Portable Nietzsche*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. The Viking Portable Library 62. New York: Viking Press, 1968.
- Noebel, David A. *Understanding the Times*. 2nd abridged and rev. ed. Manitou Springs, CO: Summit Press, 2006.
- Packer, J. I. *Growing in Christ*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1994.

- Plato. "Theaetetus; Sophist." In *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, vol 12. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press; W. Heinemann, 1921.
- Raeder, Linda C. "Postmodernism, Multiculturalism, and the Death of Tolerance: The Transformation of American Society." *Humanitas* 30, no. 1-2 (2017): 59-85.
- Santillanes, Gary. "Studies in Moral Relativism." Doctor of Philosophy diss., Binghamton University, State University of New York, 2016.
- Schaeffer, Francis A. *The Great Evangelical Disaster*. Westchester, Ill.: Crossway Books, 1984.
- _____. *How Should We Then Live?: The Rise and Decline of Western Thought and Culture*. 50th L'Abri Anniversary ed. Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway Books, 2005.
- Smith, James K. A. *How (Not) to Be Secular: Reading Charles Taylor*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2014.
- Taylor, Charles. *A Secular Age*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Van Til, Cornelius and K. Scott Oliphint. *The Defense of the Faith*. 4th ed. Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Pub., 2008.
- Wong, David B. *Natural Moralities: A Defense of Pluralistic Relativism*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.