

Saving Salvation

Paul Miller

Abstract

Evangelicalism was birthed in a revivalism that celebrated salvation as available only through faith in Christ. Some Evangelicals now propose a “wider hope,” arguing that explicit faith in Christ is not necessary for salvation. This “wider hope” must be understood and resisted. It guts Evangelicalism of its very heart, strips it of its central contribution to the world, badly distorts Scripture, and misunderstands the Catholicism to which it looks for support.

Bio

Paul M. Miller is an attorney who works in business and in partnership development, conducting research on contemporary mission themes. Paul served with Youth With a Mission in Afghanistan, The Netherlands and England from 1972-1989. Returning to the USA, he was awarded an M.A. in Public Policy and then a J.D. in law from Regent University in Virginia. He then worked alternately as a lawyer and in partnership development with Interdev from 1994-2002 before earning his Ph.D. in 2010 from the Oxford Centre for Mission Studies. His thesis was entitled, *Evangelical Mission in Cooperation with Catholics: A Study of Evangelical Missiological Tensions*. Paul lives in Seattle with his wife Mary. He has two children, a daughter living in New Zealand and a son in Seoul, Korea.

Saving Salvation

Introduction: *Love Wins*

Rob Bell set the U.S. Evangelical presses alight in 2011 with his best-selling book *Love Wins*. Bell denies hell, affirms a form of universalism and argues “a story about a God who inflicts unrelenting punishment on people because they didn’t do or say or believe the correct things ... isn’t a very good story.”¹ Bell, a widely respected Evangelical pastor with a solidly Evangelical heritage² comes to the very conclusions that theological liberalism pushed long ago.³

¹ R. Bell, *Love Wins* (New York: HarperOne, 2011), 110. Bell does not deny wholesale hell’s existence; he simply redefines it radically: rather than a place of “eternal punishment,” Bell reads hell to be “an intense experience of correction.” (Bell 2011:91) Once thus corrected, we can hope that many will turn back to Christ for salvation (see Bell 2011:106-109).

² Bell is a Wheaton College graduate, did his M. Div. at Fuller Theological Seminary, then interned at Pasadena’s Lake Avenue Church, and then became founding pastor of Grand Rapids, Michigan mega-church Mars Hill.

³ Hell is highly contested! “[H]istorian Gary Dorrien of Union Theological Seminary — the citadel of Protestant Liberalism — has observed, it was the doctrine of hell that marked the first major departures from theological orthodoxy in the United States. The early liberals just could not and would not accept a doctrine of hell...” (R. A. Mohler, Jr., ‘We Have Seen All This Before: Rob Bell and the (Re)Emergence of Liberal Theology’, AlbertMohler.com, March 16, 2011. Available at:

That a prominent Evangelical should arrive at such conclusions seems surprising given Evangelicalism's revivalist, missionary roots.⁴ These roots were all about preaching which sought to "awaken, convert or save souls."⁵ The absolute importance of spreading abroad a salvation available only in Christ was its very heart. Evangelicalism was "salvation centered," characterized by a "convertive piety" focused on the "personal experience of regeneration through the new birth ... as the essence of Christianity."⁶ John Wesley (1703-1791) was typically Evangelical when, recounting his own 1738 conversion at Aldersgate, London, he recorded in his diary:

I felt, my heart strangely warmed, I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone for my salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away *my* sins, even *mine*, and saved *me* from the law of sin and death.⁷

Wesley, having found Christ himself and knowing that others equally needed this salvation, immediately turned around to share these glad tidings with others:

I began to declare in my own country the glad tidings of salvation, preaching three times ... to a large crowd in the Minorities... The next day I went to the condemned felons in Newgate and offered them free salvation ... repentance and remission of sins.⁸

Here, too, he was typically Evangelical. George Whitefield (1714-1770) was being typically Evangelical when he chose as his very first printed sermon "On the Nature and Necessity of our Regeneration or New Birth in Christ Jesus." Regeneration in Christ was central because it was a "necessity."

These were the convictions that undergirded the revivalists at home and catapulted abroad Evangelicalism's vibrant mission history. William Carey, oft called the "father of modern missions," wrote his manifesto *An Enquiry into the Obligation of Christians to Use Means for the Conversion of the Heathens* because he thought something must be done for "the salvation of the heathen ... fellow-sinners ... lost in ignorance and idolatry."⁹ Man was divided into the lost and saved; crossing this

<<http://www.albertmohler.com/2011/03/16/we-have-seen-all-this-before-rob-bell-and-the-reemergence-of-liberal-theology/>>

⁴ D. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in modern Britain* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992); S. Grenz, *Renewing the Center* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000), 16. Leonarda De Chirico, an Italian Evangelical, represents those historians of Evangelicalism who, while accepting its revivalistic roots, argue for the overweening importance of its Reformation roots (see L. De Chirico, *Evangelical theological perspectives on post-Vatican II Roman Catholicism* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2003), 305-308).

⁵ J.C. Ryle, *Christian Leaders of the 18th Century* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1978), 14.

⁶ Grenz 2000:17, 44. John Stott argues for "the centrality of salvation" in the Bible, noting both that "it is no exaggeration to say that that Christianity is a religion of salvation" and that "His [Jesus'] very name embodies his mission, for 'Jesus' means 'God the Saviour' or 'God is salvation'." (J. Stott *Christian Mission in the Modern World* (London: Falcon Books, 1975), 83)

⁷ A. Dallimore, *George Whitefield*, vol. I (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1970), 185, 187

⁸ Wesley, *The Journal of John Wesley*, ed. P. L. Parker (Chicago: Moody Press, 1974), 65

⁹ W. Carey, *An Enquiry into the Obligation of Christians to Use Means for the Conversion of the Heathens* (Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, 2004), 3

divide meant having “crossed over from death to life” (Jn. 5:24)¹⁰ – something only possible through a faith-response to Christ. Historically, these have been Evangelical basics, but they are basics which have been put into question in Bell’s approach.

That Bell should put these basics into question becomes less surprising once one looks past Bell and the local church to academic institutions that feed Evangelicalism’s churches. Here, Bell-like discussions about the fate of the unsaved and un-evangelized have been going on for decades. With the publication of Sir Norman Anderson’s *Christianity and Comparative Religions* (1970) a major Evangelical thinker¹¹ began to suggest salvation might be available outside a faith-response to Christ, Anderson wondering: “Might it not be true of the follower of some other religion that the God of all mercy has worked in his heart by his Spirit ... enabling him, in his twilight as it were, to throw himself on God’s mercy.”¹² Clark Pinnock similarly advocated a more “inclusivist” approach in *A Wideness in God’s Mercy* (1992) and *Flame of Love* (1996), as did John Sanders with *No Other Name* (1992). Professor Amos Yong, a Pentecostal, wrote in a similar vein with *Beyond the Impasse* (2003) and *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh* (2005) in which he – following Clark Pinnock’s similar explorations – took a “pneumatological” approach, examining how the Holy Spirit might be active beyond the walls of the church and beyond where the message of Christ is known. Terrance Tiessen also wrote his highly regarded *Who Can Be Saved?* (2004), tackling inclusivism from a committedly Reformed perspective. In the same year, Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen added his sober study of the theology of religions (i.e., the study of the role of other religions in God’s plan), *Trinity and Religious Pluralism*, indicating his own preference for an inclusivistic approach to salvation.¹³

Kärkkäinen, like Amos Yong, took what he called a Pentecostal Pneumatological approach, even while criticizing the standard Pentecostal approach to other religions. He wrote:

Pentecostals['] ... thinking about the ministry of the Spirit in the world lags behind. Not only that, but – aligning with the more conservative wing of the church – they have also been the first to raise doubts about any kind of saving role of the Spirit apart from the proclamation of the gospel. Most often Pentecostals have succumbed to the standard conservative / fundamentalist

¹⁰ Leading British Evangelical Charles Simeon (1759-1836), in typical Evangelical fashion, described his own conversion in these terms from Jn. 5:24. (H.C.G. Moule, *Charles Simeon* (London: Methuen & Co., 1905), 18)

¹¹ Anderson served as a missionary to Egypt in the 1930s, later becoming president of both the Church Pastoral Aid Society and the Bible Churchman’s Missionary Society, and was an active Anglican layman regarded as a leading expert on Islamic law.

¹² Quoted in J.I. Packer, “Good Pagans and God’s Kingdom,” *Christianity Today*, January 17, 1986, 25

¹³ Most of Kärkkäinen’s book is an objective presentation of others’ positions. However, his chapter 4 first presents the inclusivism of Roman Catholic theologian Gavin D’Costa and then notes that “D’Costa’s proposal ... is one of the closest to my own current understanding.” (V-M. Kärkkäinen *Trinity and Religious Pluralism* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2004), 68, 75) But, if Kärkkäinen agreed with D’Costa, D’Costa subsequently disagreed with himself! That is, he later abandoned his inclusivistic stance as insufficiently reflecting “the official Catholic position.” (G. D’Costa, *Christianity and World Religions* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 30)

view of limiting the Spirit's saving work to the church (except for the work of the Spirit preparing one to receive the gospel).¹⁴

Kärkkäinen, then, was prepared to accept a “saving role of the Spirit apart from the proclamation of the gospel” and rejects – as “lag[ging] behind,” and, even worse, “fundamentalist” – limiting the work of the Spirit in other religions to that of “preparing one to receive the gospel.”

What is striking here is that these views by Kärkkäinen and his predecessors do not represent the weird fringe of Evangelicalism; rather, these were responsible theologians from solidly conservative institutions. Amos Yong, a past president of the Society for Pentecostal Studies (2008-09), is both Professor of Theology at Regent University School of Divinity (Virginia Beach) and its director of the doctor of philosophy program. Regent understands itself as conservatively charismatic-Pentecostalist, abhorring any compromise with theological liberalism. Similarly, Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen is Professor of Systematic Theology at Fuller Theological Seminary, a leading American Evangelical institution which, in the 1970s, became the “largest independent, regularly accredited theological seminary in the world.”¹⁵ Equally, Terrance Tiessen is a professor of theology and ethics at Providence Theological Seminary (formerly Winnipeg Bible College), which identifies itself as a resolutely “evangelical institution ... stand[ing] in the line of the historic orthodox traditions of the Church” which “In particular ... affirms a high view of Scripture, the unique atoning work of Christ, and the mission of the Church to spread the gospel of salvation.”¹⁶

Inclusivism a problem?

Is any of this a problem? Need Evangelicals be worried by these developments? This paper answers with a resounding “Yes.” Inclusivism is a problem because it actually guts Evangelicalism of its central message and reason for being, thereby nullifying its central contribution both to the non-Christian world and to the wider body of Christ. But before explaining why this is so, first, an explanation of terms.

Three Positions: Exclusivism, inclusivism and Pluralism

Roughly speaking, there are three different schools of thought responding to the question of what happens to those who have never heard the gospel: exclusivist, inclusivist, and pluralist. Mainstream Christian orthodoxy until the nineteenth century held the “exclusivist” position – that Christ alone is the Savior of the world and that only those who profess Christ can be saved.¹⁷ This certainly narrows the options; at the same time, the exclusivist position does not necessarily translate into complete

¹⁴ Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, “Pentecostal Pneumatology of Religions” in *The Spirit in the World*, ed. Kärkkäinen (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), 155-180, 170

¹⁵ G. Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987), 264. Fuller’s aim, in addition to academic excellence and cultural impact, was to become “a leading spiritual center for training evangelists and missionaries who would help win America and people from all the world to Christ.” (Marsden 1987:vii)

¹⁶ Providence Theological Seminary, “About Us” [online], 2012: Found at: <http://www.providenceseminary.ca/seminary/about_us/> [Accessed 11 January 2013]

¹⁷ D’Costa 2009:7, 25

pessimism regarding the fate of the un- evangelized. John Stott, for instance, refused to speculate either positively or negatively on their fate because “God ... has not revealed how he will deal with those who have never heard.”¹⁸

The second school of thought, inclusivism, agrees with the first half of the exclusivist gospel – that Christ alone is Savior – while disagreeing with its second half, that knowledge of Christ’s saving work is absolutely necessary. Inclusivists hold that one can benefit from Christ’s saving work even without hearing about it and believing it. As John Sanders puts it, inclusivists “hold that the work of Jesus is ontologically necessary for salvation (no one would be saved without it) but not epistemologically necessary (one need not be aware of the work in order to benefit from it).”¹⁹

The third school of thought, pluralism, holds that, “All the major religions are more or less equally true and valid as paths to salvation.” It asserts that Jesus is one savior among many. No Evangelical advocates pluralism. Sanders, Tiessen and the rest all stoutly affirm that only in Christ’s death has God made provision for mankind’s salvation.

If Evangelicals reject pluralism, is their embrace of inclusivism dangerous? Inclusivists unanimously deny it is. Terrance Tiessen devotes an entire chapter defending inclusivism against the criticism that it allegedly “cut[s] the nerve of mission motivation,” commenting:

The proposal I am putting forward is clearly accessibilist (salvation is accessible to all, even other religions) and ... concern about this position has been expressed by evangelicals who fear that it will undermine the church’s missionary passion.... I sense a fear that if we could not assure churches that everyone is lost who does not hear about Jesus ... then the church would be unprepared to make the sacrifices necessary.²⁰

¹⁸ D. Edwards and J. Stott, *Evangelical Essentials: A Liberal-Evangelical Dialogue* (Downers Grove, ILL: InterVarsity Press, 1988), 327, quoted in C. Morgan, “Inclusivisms and Exclusivisms,” in C. Morgan & R. Peterson, eds., *Faith Comes by Hearing: A Response to Inclusivism* (Downers Grove, ILL: IVP Academic, 2008), 17-39, 32. Stott’s approach is different from “soft inclusivism” which “allows the ... bare possibility [] that God in his grace may save some who have never heard of Christ, assuming that ... in response to his grace ... they cast themselves in repentance and faith upon the God discernible, however dimly, in Creation.” (D. Carson, *The Gagging of God: Christianity confronts pluralism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), 279) Unlike these “soft inclusivists,” Stott does not posit general revelation as the means by which sufficient revelation may come to the unevangelized. He simply refuses to speculate on the matter, leaving this too to God.

¹⁹ John Sanders, *No Other Name* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1992), 215-16, quoted in Morgan 2008: 33. And see Amos Yong, *Beyond the Impasse: Towards a Pneumatological Theology of Religions* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003), 23

²⁰ Terrance Tiessen, *Who Can Be Saved? Reassessing salvation in Christ and World Religions* (Downers Grove, Ill: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 70, 260-1

Amos Yong also recognizes undercutting “motivation for missions” is a hot issue, but rebuts the fear, saying, “I don’t believe that abandoning the exclusivistic position leads to the abandonment of Christian mission as many fear.”²¹

However, the reason they remain unworried is because they completely misconstrue the nature of the problem – seeing it as a “motivational” issue. But “motivation” is not the central issue. Yong himself inadvertently points to the central issue when, thinking he is successfully rebutting Evangelicals fears, he criticizes this motivational concern as a “primarily pragmatic rather than a theological argument.”²² Precisely! Thinking Evangelicals agree with Yong! The primary issue raised by inclusivism is not whether one can pragmatically keep Evangelicals jollied along to give and go for missions – the motivational question – but is rather profoundly doctrinal and theological. Motivation for mission is ultimately rooted in one’s doctrine of mission. But it is precisely here at the doctrinal level where problems arise out of the inclusivist view: first, in inclusivism’s affirming salvation’s availability through other religions; second, in their downgrading of salvation itself; and thirdly, in the door they inadvertently open to pluralism.

Problem #1 – Salvation through other religions

Inclusivist Evangelicals seek to preserve the uniqueness of Christ as Savior. Thus they universally deny that other “religions as such” have any salvific efficacy. So Tiessen writes (I highlight for clarity), “I do not think that God has raised up other religions, *as such*, to be instrumental in his saving work,” then adding that “non-Christian religions, *as such*, do not have saving instrumentality.”²³ Kärkkäinen also resorts to the “as such” qualification, stating, “I further agree with D’Costa that other religions are not salvific *as such*.”²⁴ Amos Yong joins in, writing, “An evangelical inclusivism does not propagate the notion that the religions themselves save *as such*...”²⁵ And before any of them, Clark Pinnock was mining the rich resources of this little clause, writing, “Religions *as such* do not mediate salvation. Modal inclusivism acknowledges the presence of God in this sphere [i.e., religion] but does not endorse the salvific character of religion *per se*.”²⁶

All this sounds initially reassuring – but only initially. It fails to prevent inclusivists from going on to assert the very position that they appeared to deny – that salvation is mediated through other religions. So, for instance, Clark Pinnock wrote:

This [the Spirit at work in religions] does not make religions salvific *as such*, however. The Spirit is the power of God unto salvation, not to religion. God

²¹ Yong 2003:51; Amos Yong, “From Azusa Street to the Bo Tree and Back” in *The Spirit in the World*, ed. Kärkkäinen (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), 203-26, 213-14

²² Yong 2003:51

²³ Tiessen 2004:385, 32-33

²⁴ Kärkkäinen 2004:179

²⁵ Amos Yong, “Whither Theological Inclusivism? The Development and Critique of an Evangelical Theology of Religion,” in *Evangelical Quarterly* 71:4 (1999), 327-48, 341. Available at: <http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/eq/1999-4_327.pdf>

²⁶ C. Pinnock, “An Inclusivist View,” in D. Okholm, T. Phillips, eds., *Four Views on Salvation in a Pluralistic World* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1995, 1996), 95-123, 116

may use elements in them as a means of grace.... We must be alert to the possibility that God is effectively at work in the religious dimension.... Religions *as such* do not mediate salvation. Modal inclusivism acknowledges the presence of God in this sphere [i.e., religion] but does not endorse the salvific character of religion *per se*. Present in every sphere, God is drawing people to himself in a variety of ways, which can include the religious sphere.²⁷

Pinnock attempts here to differentiate the God who is doing his saving work to save *in* other religions from the religion itself (which cannot save). But this seems dangerously close to a “distinction without a difference.” Tiessen – whose argument parallels Pinnock at this point – admits the fundamental “ambiguity” of his argument which simultaneously asserts that other religions are not salvific as such yet that God does use those religions to save, that God works savingly *through* those religions. He writes, “I am aware of a certain amount of ambiguity ... [s]ince I have granted that God saves people outside Christianity ... living within the context of another established religion ... [such that] *it would have to be granted* that some of the truth [which elicits the saving faith response] ... is transmitted *through* their religious tradition.”²⁸ Tiessen, then, is perfectly clear on this point – that saving truth comes “through” other religions.²⁹ Other religions, then, *are* salvific. But this is not ambiguity; this is simple self-contradiction.

This self-contradictory stance hides just how radical the inclusivist position is. They appear to deny non-Christian religions’ salvific role, whereas in reality they embrace it. Where this must go is clear from Tiessen who, when following the logic of his argument, finally admits, “Given the perspective that I have put forward, I grant that the member of another religion may be personally in a saving relationship to God, in spite of the fact that their religion, as such, is erroneous....”³⁰ His position,

²⁷ Pinnock 1995, 1996:116. Pinnock’s inclusivism takes a different tack than does Tiessen’s. While Tiessen believes a non-Christian may, present-tense, actually be in a saving relationship with God while still a non-Christian, Pinnock posits a sort of half-way house. He posits a “premessianic believer” who is “latently a member of Christ’s body and destined to receive the grace of conversion and explicit knowledge of Jesus Christ at a later date.” (Pinnock 1995, 1996:117)

²⁸ Tiessen 2004:393 (emphasis added)

²⁹ Amos Yong also denies non-Christian religions salvific ability “as such” while adding that salvation can come “through” them: “[R]eligions are instruments of the Holy Spirit working out the divine purposes in the world and the unevangelised, if saved, at all, are saved through the work of Christ by the Spirit (even if mediated through the religious beliefs and practices available to them).” (Yong 2005:236) It is true he later calls this a “tentative proposal,” but it is a proposal he has maintained for so many years that it is clear that it is one he holds with conviction. It is not “tentative” in the sense that it is merely a trial suggestion about which he is agnostic and awaiting more proof before making a decision; no, it is tentative in the sense that he is ready to jettison it upon disproof – but until it is disproved, it is a conviction he holds. The burden of proof is not on him but on the other wanting to dislodge him. So, his position on salvation of non-Christians is no more tentative than *any* knowledge we as humans (even as Christians) hold dear, given that Yong holds that “all knowledge is provisional, relative to the question posed by the community of inquirers, and subject to the ongoing process of conversation and discovery.” (Amos Yong, “On Divine Presence and Divine Agency: Toward a Foundational Pneumatology,” *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 3, no. 2 (2000):168) If all knowledge is “provisional” – just another name for “tentative” – then for Yong to call his inclusivism “tentative” means he holds it no more or *less* firmly than anything else he knows.

³⁰ Tiessen 2004:441

then, is crystal clear. It is also revolutionary! If accepted, it would fundamentally change Evangelicalism's traditional understanding of Christianity's purpose and mission to the world and to other religions. Tiessen is proposing here that salvation is available elsewhere than in Christianity. It means that when talking to non-Christians, when going out to the "unreached" whether across the street or across the sea, one cannot assume they need to hear about Jesus for their salvation. After all, though "unreached" by the Christian gospel, they may already be saved.

In my own case, such a doctrine might have changed my significant encounter in 1972 with an elderly Indian Christian, Hiram Hyratt, in North India. At the time, I was a 21-year-old, wandering around India deeply caught up in Indian mysticism and yoga. Mr. Hyratt, spotting me across a Mussoorie street in my turban and lungi, crossed the street to engage me, invite me to dinner and there to share the gospel of Christ with me. This was an encounter that within a week led to my own conversion to Christ and subsequent involvement in missions. My life took a whole new direction. But Mr. Hyratt's action arose out of his doctrinal conviction that what I had in Indian mysticism and yoga was not salvific, that for that I needed the gospel and Christ. Why should Hiram have crossed that street, if I was already saved?

Inclusivists, of course, do not believe they are contradicting themselves by their religions-as-such-don't-save but Christ-saves-through-other-religions claim. And in one sense they are right, but only because they change the ordinary meaning of the first part of their assertion. That is, they locate the salvific deficiency in a "non-Christian religion" not in its being "non-Christian" but in its being "religion." So Hinduism or Islam fails to save not because it is non-Christian and lacks Christian elements; it fails because it is a religion. As Tiessen's 25th Thesis states, "No religion saves people – only God does."³¹

This at first appears salutary; in fact, it is highly worrisome. The problem here is that Christianity equally falls before the same criticism; it too is a religion! Indeed, Tiessen argues, "even Christianity is not a means by which God accomplishes salvation.... As a human institution, Christianity does not save."³² Amos Yong argues in a similar vein, "Karl Barth ... affirmed salvation as revealed in Christ even while denying that salvation is to be found in 'Christianity,' the latter being like any other religious tradition, representative of the human attempt to reach God."³³

But to argue that, "No religion saves people – only God does," is to push the focus onto the wrong point entirely. Evangelicals have never held that religion without God saves. This is not the real issue. The real issue is whether God is specially connected with Christianity – that collection of beliefs, values, practices and institutional expressions – in a special way that he is not with other religions. Is the biblical corpus, Old and New Testament, God's special revelation, or is it not? When

³¹ Tiessen 2004:28, 384

³² Tiessen 2004:386, 384

³³ Yong 2003:23. Yong references Barth, "The Revelation of God as the Abolition of Religion," in *The Doctrine of the Word of God*, vol. 1, pt. 2 of *Church Dogmatics*, §17. Elsewhere, relying again on Barth, Yong urges Pentecostals to "insist on another Barthian claim: that every religion, including the Pentecostal religion (!), is itself fallen and in need of Christ's redemption." (Yong 2009:216)

Christian theologians in the past differentiated “special revelation” from “general revelation,” the assumption was that Christianity was special vis-à-vis other religions. This was the whole point. But, when addressing the question of whether salvation is uniquely tied to Christianity and its gospel message, the inclusivists argue no. So Tiessen wrote:

No religion saves people – only God does. But ... God may graciously give faith to individuals while they live in the context of a non-Christian religion. In such instances, God may use the revealed truth that people encounter as a part of their religious tradition to elicit that saving faith.³⁴

This stance is altogether new for Evangelical Christianity, while it has long been liberal Christianity’s posture. It was precisely this issue of a narrowed salvation, which in the past so offended liberal Christians about Evangelicalism. I well recall an ecumenical gathering in Strasbourg, in which I presented American Evangelicals’ range of views on political involvement. Afterwards, a liberal Lutheran pastor challenged me; “Why are you Evangelicals so pro-violence and aggression?” The conference being at the time of the Iraq invasion by America, I assumed he was referring to many American Evangelicals’ support for the war. But no, he clarified, “I meant why do you Evangelicals insist on conversion?” To him, an insistence on conversion was “violence against the person”; it insisted people were wrong, were bad, needed “saving,” and must abandon their beliefs and adopt mine. That is psychological violence, he said. Inclusivism takes us ever toward this Lutheran pastor’s position.

Problem #2 – Its stance on salvation as a central concept

Inclusivism is worrying enough in its stance on the salvific potential within other religions. Moreover, it is equally worrisome in the underlying rationale it uses to reach this conclusion – especially in its demotion of the centrality of the very notion of “salvation.” So Yong criticizes exclusivism, for being “more concerned with the question of salvation with regard to those who have not heard the gospel than ... allow[ing] each religious tradition to define itself [when it might have no concern for salvation].”³⁵ That is, if a non-Christian religion does not define itself in such a way as to put salvation in the center, then Christian exclusivism’s insistence on salvation as central distorts one’s understanding of that religion. In the same spirit Yong asks, “yet is it fair that the soteriological issue has dominated the field of inquiry [in the theology of religions] to date?”³⁶ It would seem self-evident to a Christian that the answer is, “Yes, it *is* fair”; but it is only self-evident if one is convinced that salvation is an unavoidably central issue in religion – and here precisely is the rub for Yong.

Demoting the issue of salvation is every bit as radical a step as asserting salvation’s availability through other religions. It is radical in its re-interpretation of the very purpose of religion. That said, one can understand the attraction of this view to certain inclusivists. If the very issue of salvation becomes relatively unimportant, then it largely defuses the importance of how one regards the salvific potential of non-

³⁴ Tiessen 2004:384

³⁵ Yong 2003:27; Yong 2009:217

³⁶ Yong 2003:28

Christian religions. This then becomes a secondary issue about which we can amicably differ.

The otherwise admirable Lesslie Newbigin adopted a similar line (though far earlier than Yong) on the issue of whether salvation was a central question, writing:

[H]ow are we to regard the other ... faiths ... around us? I believe that the debate about this question has been fatally flawed by the fact that it has been conducted around the question, 'Who can be saved?' It has been taken for granted that the only question was, 'Can the good non-Christian be saved?'....I want to affirm that it is the wrong question and that as long as it remains the central question we shall never come to the truth.³⁷

Another prominent Evangelical, Miriam Adeney (not necessarily an inclusivist), struck a similar note when she commented, "[A]s long as evangelicals remain fixated on the question of whether someone can be "saved" through another religion, our theology of religions will remain superficial."³⁸

These are strong statements from Yong, Newbigin and Adeney: salvation ought not be so unfairly "dominant," or it is the "wrong question," or it is even a "fixation." Yong's, Newbigin's and Adeney's assertions are in equal parts challenging, intriguing, and wrong. Removing salvation from the center of Evangelicalism's theological concerns would be a grave mistake from every vantage point: scripturally, strategically and in terms of Evangelicalism's historic identity and mission. Scripturally, it would seem clear that salvation was Jesus' very purpose, that "he came to seek and save the lost," (Lk. 19:10), that the summing-up of his mission – and the root of his name – as angelically announced before his coming was that "he will save his people from their sins," (Mt. 1:21) that this was echoed after his coming by Paul's crisp observation, "Jesus came into the world to save sinners," (I Tim. 1:15) that salvation was the purpose of God highlighted by the apostles' very first sermon in Acts (Acts 2:21, 40, 47), and then repeated throughout the rest of Acts (4:12; 11:14; 15:1 etc.).

Not only is salvation central to Scripture, a look at Evangelicalism's revivalist roots reveals a salvation-orientation to be central to historic Evangelicalism. Without this salvationism *there is no* Evangelicalism. Without it, Evangelicalism is gutted of its central contribution to the world and the wider church. The stakes, then, are high in this discussion.

Problem #3 – Opens the door inadvertently to pluralism

Evangelical inclusivists unanimously and stoutly reject the pluralist position which holds there are many saviors. These inclusivists argue that the work of Jesus is ontologically necessary for salvation but not epistemologically necessary; Jesus is necessary, but an awareness of him is not. However, with their exegetical approach to Scripture it is difficult to see how they can finally resist ending up in the very pluralism they dread. That is, when exegeting apparently exclusivistic Scriptures

³⁷ Lesslie Newbigin, *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989), 176

³⁸ Quoted in Tiessen 2004:150-51, 183

such as Jn. 14:6 (“I am the way.... No one comes to the Father except through me”), Acts 4:12 (“And there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved”), or Rom. 10:14-17 (“If you ... believe in your heart you will be saved.... And how are they to believe in him of whom they have never heard? And how are they to hear without someone preaching?”) they discount the epistemological necessity of Christ on the basis that “the destiny of the un-evangelized per se is not at issue here.”³⁹ These scriptures, they say, were not written with the fate of the un-evangelized in mind and therefore should not be applied to this question.

The problem with this mode of exegesis (besides its ignoring the entire context of the wider Scripture, a context which proclaims the unique and universal saving role of Christ and the necessity of explicit faith in him) is its almost inevitable pluralistic implications. This, it seems to me, to be clear from, for instance, how John Sanders (no pluralist) deals with Rom. 10:14-17. When Paul notes that “Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved,” and then asks, “How, then, can they call on the one they have not believed in? ... not heard? And ... without someone preaching to them?” Sanders commented:

[L]ogically this means nothing more than that the confession of Christ is *one* sure way to experience salvation; Paul does not say anything about what will happen to those who do not confess Christ because they have never heard of Christ.⁴⁰

There is a problem here: If these Scriptures which apparently require the epistemological necessity of Christ for salvation faith can be relativized, then equally the ontological necessity of Christ can be relativized. That is, the very same Scriptures that affirm the necessity of faith in Christ as Savior also affirm the necessity of Christ as Savior. And if the former can be relativized on the basis that they were not penned with the un-evangelized in mind, then, on the same basis, so can the latter. Indeed, if exegetical consistency is sought, they *must* be relativized. Christ would then simply be, using Sander’s phrase, “*one* sure way to experience salvation” in the ontological sense, with others available to suit the variety of religious backgrounds. It is only sentiment that prevents inclusivists from taking this logical step, but sentiment will not sufficiently protect in the future.

³⁹ John Sanders, *No Other Name* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 62 (referring particularly to Acts 4:12), quoted in Robert Peterson, “Inclusivism versus Exclusivism on Key Biblical Texts,” in C. Morgan & R. Peterson, eds., *Faith Comes by Hearing: A Response to Inclusivism* (Downers Grove, ILL: IVP Academic, 2008), 184-200, 187. Pinnock similarly writes, “I am sure that Acts 4:12 is often taken to settle questions it does not address. . . . The first such question is the eschatological fate of unevangelized people, whether they lived before or after Christ.... Acts 4:12 does not say anything about it. The text speaks forcefully about the incomparable power of Jesus’ name to save (and heal) those who hear and respond to the good news, but it does not comment on the fate of the heathen.” (C. Pinnock, “Acts 4:12: Not Other Name under Heaven,” in *Through No Fault of Their Own? The Fate of Those Who have Never Heard*, William Crockett & James Sigountos, eds., Baker, 1991:108-9)

⁴⁰ Quoted in Peterson 2008:196

On those Roman Catholics

Lastly, Evangelical inclusivists have too quickly pigeonholed Catholicism as inclusivist, looking to them for support. For instance, Clark Pinnock stated that, “the key historical influence for inclusivism is undoubtedly the work of the Second Vatican Council.... As an inclusivist, I acknowledge my debt to the Catholic Church for its leadership in this regard....”⁴¹ Amos Yong echoes this assessment, approvingly observing that “Pinnock generally feels that Vatican II did the right thing in repudiating the doctrine of *extra ecclesia nulla salus* [outside of the church no salvation].”⁴² Veli Matti-Kärkkäinen similarly concludes that the position “inclusivists hold ... is the official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church after the Vatican II Council.”⁴³

But, of course, this is an inclusivist interpretation of Vatican II. Catholic theologians themselves, such as Gavin D’Costa, Professor of Catholic Theology at the University of Bristol, correct such misimpressions. D’Costa, the Roman Catholic theologian whose views Kärkkäinen likened to his own, has more recently turned away from his earlier semi-inclusivism, critiquing it as insufficiently Catholic.⁴⁴ He writes, “Through the process of dialogue and reflection, I have moved from being a structural inclusivist to a universal-access exclusivist.”⁴⁵ Here he takes a very firm line: “I ... argue[] that all major forms of pluralism and inclusivism are problematic in serious ways,”⁴⁶ being actually un-Catholic:

[My] objections are based purely on tracing the contours of what scripture permits us to say: *as far as we know* the conditions of salvation require *solus Christus* [salvation in Christ alone], *fides ex auditu* [‘faith comes from hearing’], and *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* [‘no salvation outside the church’].... This is the official Catholic position.⁴⁷

This is the polar opposite of what Kärkkäinen, Pinnock and Yong affirm concerning official Catholicism. That is, Kärkkäinen reproves Pentecostals as “fundamentalist” when they insist on, first, “limiting the Spirit’s saving work to the church” and, second, when they restrict the work of the Spirit in other religions (something the Pentecostals are prepared to admit) to “preparing one to receive the gospel.” But what Kärkkäinen criticizes as fundamentalist, D’Costa asserts as officially Catholic:

⁴¹ Pinnock 1995, 1996:108-109

⁴² Yong 2003:111 n.11

⁴³ Kärkkäinen 2004:3

⁴⁴ D’Costa, however, remains heavily critical of the way many exclusivists apply their exclusivism, holding that non-Christians can still be “destined for salvation.” (D’Costa 2009:24)

⁴⁵ D’Costa 2009:44

⁴⁶ D’Costa 2009:32-3 (emphasis added)

⁴⁷ D’Costa 2009:19-21, 23, 24, 30 (emphasis added) Rather than dismissing the church’s role in salvation, Vatican II simply extended the means by which various peoples could be connected with the church even while not being Catholic. Thus, *Lumen Gentium*16 – a key Vatican II document which inclusivists rely upon – starts out in its very first sentence, “Finally, those who have not yet received the Gospel are related to the People of God in various ways.” Catholicism still insists that salvation includes being in some way “related to” the Church.

[F]inal salvation requires not only ontological ..., but also epistemological relationship to Christ. If the beatific vision requires explicit knowledge ... of the triune God, then it is not strictly correct to say that such non-Christians are actually saved by these various means [general revelation]. Rather, these means are positive preparations.⁴⁸

Ralph Martin, director of graduate theology programs at Sacred Heart Major Seminary, Detroit, Michigan, and appointed in 2011 by Pope Benedict XVI as a consultant to the newly formed Pontifical Council for the New Evangelization, also tries to bring clarity on Catholicism's teaching regarding the salvation of the un-evangelized. He points out the *Lumen Gentium* 16 (LG 16) is the "primary text" on the salvation of non-Christians, with *Ad Gentes* 7 and *Gaudium et Spes* 22 building on this central document.⁴⁹ LG 16 stated:

Those who, through no fault of their own, do not know the Gospel of Christ or his Church, but who nevertheless seek God with a sincere heart, and moved by grace, try in their actions to do his will as they know it through the dictates of their conscience – those too may achieve eternal salvation. Nor shall divine providence deny the assistance necessary for salvation to those who, without any fault of theirs, have not yet arrived at an explicit knowledge of God....⁵⁰

Clearly, this at least begins to open the door in an inclusivist direction. But Martin insists that it can only be misinterpreted in this inclusivist manner when two interpretive keys are ignored. The first interpretive key often ignored is that the *how* God can do this is left open to mystery. Rather than speculating that "general revelation suffices when combined with a general faith" or that "the Holy Spirit works salvifically even where the gospel has not been preached," as Evangelical inclusivists are wont to do, Vatican II leaves it to mystery. Martin commented:

The magisterium does not resolve the issue as to how saving grace can be applied to individual non-Christians but speaks of God acting "in ways known to himself" (AG 7), or "in a way known to God" (GS 22). The *relatio* (report on)

⁴⁸ D'Costa 2009:24. Along similar lines, Pope Benedict XVI (then Ratzinger), when acting in his role as Prefect of the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, issued the statement *Dominus Iesus* (2000) in response to the dangers of religious pluralism: "The Church's constant missionary proclamation is endangered today by relativistic theories which seek to justify religious pluralism." *Dominus Iesus* also responded to pneumatological proposals within Catholicism which separated the work of the Spirit from the preaching of the gospel, stating, "There are also those who propose the hypothesis of an economy of the Holy Spirit with a more universal breadth than that of the Incarnate Word, crucified and risen. This position also is contrary to the Catholic faith, which, on the contrary, considers the salvific incarnation of the Word as a trinitarian event.... Whatever the Spirit brings about in human hearts and in the history of peoples, in cultures and religions, serves as a preparation for the Gospel...." (*Dominus Iesus* 4. Available at: <http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000806_dominus-iesus_en.html>)

⁴⁹ Ralph Martin, *Will Many Be Saved? What Vatican II Actually Teaches and Its Implications for the New Evangelization* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2012), 7

⁵⁰ Martin 2012:57

on LG 16 notes that the Council fathers wanted the “how” left open to theological reflection.⁵¹

The second interpretive key often ignored is the last three sentences *Lumen Gentium* 16. Martin points out that it is “the last three sentences ... [that] contain a key to overcoming a doctrinal confusion,” but that these sentences “are almost always ignored.” These last three sentences make clear that “the conditions under which people can be saved who have never heard the gospel are very often, in fact, not fulfilled.”⁵² In other words, the hopeful note read into LG 16 is not really there. These last three sentences in LG 16 read:

But very often, deceived by the Evil One, men have become vain in their reasonings, have exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and served the world rather than the Creator (cf. Rom 1:21:25). Or some there are who, living and dying in this world without God, are exposed to final despair. Hence to procure the glory of God and the salvation of all of these, the Church, mindful of the Lord’s command, “preach the Gospel to every creature” (Mk. 16:16) takes zealous care to foster the missions.⁵³

If the first part of LG 16 offered a more optimistic possibility, its last part calls attention to the pessimistic reality: Man is not naturally good and does not avail himself of the means of salvation. Therefore, for salvation, man needs to have the gospel preached to him.⁵⁴

Lessons from Roman Catholicism

Evangelicals should learn from Catholicism, particularly its experience that inclusivism erodes mission. Ralph Martin spoke of Catholicism’s post-Vatican II,

⁵¹ Martin 2012:20. This was also Cardinal Ratzinger’s approach in *Dominus Iesus*: “With respect to the way in which the salvific grace of God — which is always given by means of Christ in the Spirit and has a mysterious relationship to the Church — comes to individual non-Christians, the Second Vatican Council limited itself to the statement that God bestows it ‘in ways known to himself.’ [citing *Ad gentes*, 7] (*Dominus Iesus* 21)

⁵² Martin 2012:xi-xii (emphasis added)

⁵³ Martin 2012:57-8

⁵⁴ Martin’s book-length treatment of this theme especially addresses two major Catholic theologians, German Jesuit Karl Rahner, and the Swiss priest Hans Urs von Balthasar (who died two days before formally becoming a cardinal), claiming their excesses on this theme have contributed significantly to the confusion. Of Rahner, famous for his suggestion of “anonymous Christians,” Martin argues that he “goes considerably beyond Vatican II.” (Martin 2012:100) Concerning von Balthasar, Martin characterizes him as adopting “quite conscious efforts to affirm orthodoxy while proposing theories that are not consonant with it....” (Martin 2012:166)

John Allen, the Vatican correspondent for the *National Catholic Reporter*, writes: “Catholic liberalism enjoyed a heyday from the late 1960s through the mid-1980s.... [Since] 1978, however, Catholicism has become steadily more evangelical.... The last two high-profile Vatican censures of a theologian during Ratzinger’s term at the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, and his first such case as pope, involved writers working in the area of Christology.... All three cases involved setting limits to claims that Christ and the Holy Spirit are active in non-Christian religion.” (John Allen, *The Future Church: how ten trends are revolutionizing the Catholic Church* (New York: Doubleday, 2009), 56, 71-2) I do not suggest that von Balthasar was theologically liberal; I only say his soteriology was not conservative regarding the unevangelized.

“crisis in which the very idea of missions finds itself.”⁵⁵ Similarly, Catholic missiologist, Stephen Bevans, cited research showing that after 1968 “the numbers [of Catholic missionaries] moved into a steady and often precipitous decline,” concluding that “the growing insecurity about what was the exact nature of mission in a post-Vatican II church surely fueled this development.”⁵⁶ Bevans explained:

[W]ith Vatican II’s acknowledgement of the possibility of salvation outside of explicit faith in Christ ... many Catholics – including missionaries – no longer saw missionary activity as an urgent need. If people could be saved by following their own consciences in the context of their own religions, why try to convert them?⁵⁷

“Catholics have the vague impression that the Second Vatican Council somehow changed the Church’s position regarding the world religions,” says Martin, an impression that led inexorably to a radically new evaluation of world mission. Martin recounted:

One nun in Africa summed up her change of approach to me. She no longer viewed her work among Moslems as an opportunity to lead them to see and receive Christ as their Savior and Lord, but rather “to make them better Moslems.” ... The largest Catholic missionary movement in the United States ... declared, “Maryknoll missionaries work side-by-side with Muslims in the Philippines, Bangladesh, Tanzania, Yemen, the Sudan ... as a service to Muslims, without the ulterior motive of conversion.” A Maryknoll missionary in Yemen expresses the new focus of his missionary commitment like this: “Respecting one another’s religious vocation, ... some Muslims and I now work together for our common conversion to the value of the kingdom of God.”⁵⁸

Conversion to Christ is replaced by conversion to vague kingdom values. Catholic leaders such as Cardinal Josef Tomko, Prefect of the Congregation for the Evangelization of the Peoples, began to resist this trend which made “dialogue equal” to proclamation and which “reduc[ed] evangelization to mere dialogue and

⁵⁵ Martin 2012:13. Martin cites Ratzinger’s finding that, “The cause of this crisis lay in ... lost ... urgency. What drove the great missionaries at the beginning of the modern era ... was the conviction that salvation is in Christ alone ... [that] untold millions ... would thus be hopelessly doomed to eternal ruin without the message of the gospel.” (Joseph Ratzinger, *Theological Highlights of Vatican II* (New York: Paulist Press, 1966), 172, cited in Martin 2012:13-14) Cardinal Schönborn of Austria similarly refers to the “crisis” and “collapse of theology” following Vatican II when, with all the old certainties being questioned, 80,000 priests deserted their priestly vocations between 1965 and 1975. (see Alpha Leadership Conference, Albert Hall, 14 May 2013, available at: <<http://player.vimeo.com/video/66252031?title=>>)

⁵⁶ S. Bevans and J. Gros, *Evangelization and Religious Freedom: Ad Gentes, Dignitatis Humanae* (Rediscovering Vatican II) (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2009), 59

⁵⁷ Bevans and Gros 2009:58-59, cited in Martin 2012:188

⁵⁸ Ralph Martin, *Crisis of Truth* (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1982), 59-60

development, with the abandonment of ... preaching the Gospel ... and the flight to social works, as well as the great reductive talk about the 'values of the Kingdom'."⁵⁹

Seeing the danger of this trend, Pope Paul VI⁶⁰ and John Paul II began calling the church back to its roots, insisting on the necessity of mission as the "new evangelization" which prioritizes, as Pope John Paul II's 1979 apostolic exhortation *Catechesi Tradendae* put it, "the initial ardent proclamation by which a person is one day overwhelmed and brought to the decision to entrust himself to Jesus Christ by faith."⁶¹ Here, Evangelicals should learn from Catholics the lessons they have learned in having tread this path before us.

Conclusion

Inclusivists are right to concern themselves with a difficult question: the fate of the un-evangelized. It is an issue that is truly disturbing. Inclusivists are also right to insist that God is at work in the wider world beyond the church and in cultures even before the gospel has arrived there.⁶² This is God's world, all of it, even when it is fallen. Inclusivists err, however, in two matters. First, they are too willing to erode Scripture's plain insistence on the necessity of faith in Christ for salvation. This is a basic. Without this fundament, the whole house collapses. Second, inclusivists err in their willingness to speculate where the Bible is silent. Seeing the Bible is silent on the fate of the un-evangelized, they want to fill in the gaps.

A speculative, inquiring mind is no bad thing. However, a basic rule of Bible interpretation is that, when speculating in areas where the Bible is not clear (i.e., the fate of the un-evangelized), we ought not to allow our speculations to undermine where the Bible *is* clear (i.e., on the necessity of explicit faith in Christ). Far more

⁵⁹ Ralph Martin, *The Catholic Church at the End of the Age: What is the Spirit Saying?* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1994), 50, citing Cardinal Tomko, "Proclaiming Christ the World's Only Saviour," *L'Observatore Romano* (English ed.), April 15, 1991, 4

⁶⁰ Pope Paul VI addressed "excuses which would impede evangelization" arising out of Vatican II, commenting in his encyclical *Evangelii Nuntiandi*:

The most insidious of these excuses are certainly the ones which people claim to find support for in such and such a teaching of the Council. Thus one too frequently hears it said, ... why proclaim the Gospel when the whole world is saved by uprightness of heart? Anyone who takes the trouble to study in the Council's documents the questions upon which these excuses draw too superficially will find quite a different view. (*Evangelii Nuntiandi* 80).

Available at: < http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_p-vi_exh_19751208_evangelii-nuntiandi_en.html >

⁶¹ CT 25. Available at:

<http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_16101979_catechesi-tradendae_en.html>

⁶² Don Richardson's works – *Eternity in their Hearts* (Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1981) and *Peace Child* (Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 2005) – detail God's presence in pre-Christian cultures, including prophetic fore-tellings of the Gospel. Relying on Acts 14:16-17 ("let all nations go their own way. Yet he has not left himself without testimony"), Richardson refuses to label every aspect of non-Christian religions as false and demonic. God's witness is there. But Richardson is clear that God's witness here is in preparation for the Gospel, not a substitute for it. He distinguishes God's "redemptive" (i.e., preparatory) hand from his "redeeming" hand (i.e., actually saving work). (Richardson 1981:61) Bruce Olson's *Bruchko* (Lake Mary, FL: Charisma House, 2006) echoes Richardson's approach in telling his story among the Motilone Indians in Colombia and Venezuela; and Daniel Kikawa does likewise in his *Perpetuated in Righteousness: The Journey of the Hawaiian People From Eden to the Present Time* (1994), concerning the pre-Christian Hawaiians.

prudent is John Stott's approach, who observed that God "has not revealed how he will deal with those who have never heard it [the gospel]. We have to leave them in the hands of the God of infinite mercy and justice."⁶³ Inclusivists have spotted a troubling matter, but speculation is not the way to solve it. Dialogue with and build friendships with adherents of other religions? By all means, but we should never sacrifice the Gospel along the way.

⁶³ D. Edwards and J. Stott, *Evangelical Essentials: A Liberal-Evangelical Dialogue* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1989), 327, cited in Tiessen 2004:38

Bibliography

Allen, J., 2009. *The Future Church: How Ten Trends are Revolutionizing the Catholic Church*. New York: Doubleday.

Alpha Leadership Conference, 14 May 2013. Albert Hall. Available at:
<<http://player.vimeo.com/video/66252031?title=>>.

Bell, R., 2010. *Love Wins*. New York: HarperOne.

Bebbington, D., 2000. *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Bevans, S. and Gros, J., 2009. *Evangelization and Religious Freedom: Ad Gentes, Dignitatis Humanae (Rediscovering Vatican II)*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Carey, W., 2004. *An Enquiry into the Obligation of Christians to Use Means for the Conversion of the Heathens*. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing.

Carson, D., 1996. *The Gagging of God: Christianity confronts pluralism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 2000. *Dominus Iesus*. Available at:
<http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000806_dominus-iesus_en.html>.

Dallimore, A., 1970. *George Whitefield*, vol. I. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust.

D'Costa, G., 2009. *Christianity and World Religions*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

De Chirico, L., 2003. *Evangelical theological perspectives on post-Vatican II Roman Catholicism*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Grenz, S., 2000. *Renewing the Center*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Kärkkäinen, V-M., 2004. *Trinity and Religious Pluralism*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing.

_____, 2009. "Pentecostal Pneumatology of Religions" in *The Spirit in the World*, ed. Kärkkäinen. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 155-180.

Kikawa, D., 1994. *Perpetuated in Righteousness: The Journey of the Hawaiian People From Eden to the Present Time*.

Marsden, G., 1987. *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Martin, R., 1982. *Crisis of Truth*. Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books.

_____, 1994. *The Catholic Church at the End of the Age: What is the Spirit Saying?* San Francisco: Ignatius Press.

- _____, 2012. *Will Many Be Saved? What Vatican II Actually Teaches and Its Implications for the New Evangelization*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Mohler, Jr., R. A., 2011. "We Have Seen All This Before: Rob Bell and the (Re)Emergence of Liberal Theology," *AlbertMohler.com*, March 16, 2011. Available at: <<http://www.albertmohler.com/2011/03/16/we-have-seen-all-this-before-rob-bell-and-the-reemergence-of-liberal-theology/>>.
- Morgan, C., 2008. "Inclusivisms and Exclusivisms," in C. Morgan & R. Peterson, eds., *Faith Comes by Hearing: A Response to Inclusivism*. Downers Grove, ILL: IVP Academic, 17-39.
- Moule, H.C.G., 1905. *Charles Simeon*. London: Methuen & Co.
- Newbigin, L., 1989. *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Okholm, D., T. Phillips, eds., 1995, 1996. *Four Views on Salvation in a Pluralistic World*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 95-123.
- Olson, B., 2006. *Bruchko*. Lake Mary, FL: Charisma House.
- Packer, J.I., 1986. "Good Pagans and God's Kingdom," *Christianity Today*, January 17, 25f.
- Peterson, R., 2008. "Inclusivism versus Exclusivism on Key Biblical Texts," in C. Morgan & R. Peterson, eds., *Faith Comes by Hearing: A Response to Inclusivism*. Downers Grove, ILL: IVP Academic, 184-200.
- Pinnock, C., 1991. "Acts 4:12: Not Other Name under Heaven," in *Through No Fault of Their Own? The Fate of Those Who have Never Heard*, William Crockett & James Sigountos, eds., Baker.
- Providence Theological Seminary, 2012. "About Us" [online]: Found at: <http://www.providenceseminary.ca/seminary/about_us/> [Accessed 11 January 2013].
- Ratzinger, R., 2012. *Theological Highlights of Vatican II* (New York: Paulist Press, 1966), 172, cited in Martin:13-14.
- Richardson, D., 1981. *Eternity in their Hearts*. Ventura, CA: Regal Books
- _____, 2005. *Peace Child*. Ventura, CA: Regal Books.
- Ryle, J.C., 1978. *Christian Leaders of the 18th Century*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust.
- Sanders, J., 1992. *No Other Name*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Stott, J., 1975. *Christian Mission in the Modern World*. London: Falcon Books.

Tiessen, T., 2004. *Who Can Be Saved? Reassessing salvation in Christ and World Religions*. Downers Grove, Ill: InterVarsity Press.

Wesley, J., 1974. *The Journal of John Wesley*, ed. P. L. Parker. Chicago: Moody Press.

Yong, A., 1999. "Whither Theological Inclusivism? The Development and Critique of an Evangelical Theology of Religion," in *Evangelical Quarterly* 71:4 (1999), 327-48, 341. Available at: <http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/eq/1999-4_327.pdf>.

_____, 2000. "On Divine Presence and Divine Agency: Toward a Foundational Pneumatology," *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 3, no. 2:168.

_____, 2003. *Beyond the Impasse: Towards a Pneumatological Theology of Religions*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

_____, 2009. "From Azusa Street to the Bo Tree and Back" in *The Spirit in the World*, ed. Kärkkäinen. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.