Newbigin’s first chapters analyze the environment in which westerners have grown used to interpreting the Christian faith. His selective tour through recent historical and contemporary intellectual history describes a cultural context, often called modernity, in which claims are sorted into two separate and hard-to-relate categories. The first is absolute, objective, public fact, which exists regardless of whether anyone recognizes it ("2+2=4"). The second is relative, subjective, private value, which lies entirely in people’s minds ("God is love").

Especially because it seems so natural to us, we need to note several features about this paradigm or way of ordering, gaining, using, and teaching knowledge.

It is not the only such way. In fact, historically it is not even a very popular one. While this paradigm is ‘dogmatic’ in claiming to be a universal arrangement (10, 18), in fact it arises through peculiar historical circumstances in the Europe of the last three centuries (1-3). Modernity has arisen out of the Christian way, challenged it, and begun to eclipse it so successfully that today it supplies the ‘plausibility structures’ even of Christians (8-9). While it claims to offer freedom of conscience, in fact it coerces the acceptance of the things it calls ‘facts’ (through mandatory education, for instance) and discourages universal claims about the things it calls ‘values’ or ‘opinions’ (by condemning as ‘oppressive’ or ‘judgmental’ the commending of one’s values to others) (14-16).

According to its paradigm, only values communicate purpose. Because values lie in individual consciences, separating facts from values makes the universe amoral and human beings sovereign moral agents whose will is all the purpose there is (16-18).

In this environment, whether a claim counts as a fact or a value becomes a major social battle. For instance: does the Christian doctrine of creation belong in the public or private domain? Should French Muslim girls be allowed to wear headscarves in school? Is evangelism intolerably rude? Is sincerity all that really matters in religious belief? (25-26).

Neither ‘fact’ nor ‘value’ describes fundamental Christian claims such as “Jesus is Lord.” These are public in being universal, yet personal in not being coercive (5-6, 10-12). Q: So what is that claim if it is neither a fact nor a value-statement?

Some Christians respect the fact/value dichotomy by reducing Christianity to a set of objective facts. Others do it by reducing Christianity to a subjective school of interpretations. Modernity is thus responsible for the existence and destructive divide between ‘fundamentalist’ and ‘liberal’ Christianity (24). Q: Then what are these things, if they are not the apostolic faith?

Modernity relativizes the claims of Christian faith, domesticating it and turning it into something other than the apostolic traditions we call biblical Christianity: ‘a religion’ among many (9-10). Even conservative apologists do this – when they try to prove that Christianity is ‘reasonable’ by modern standards. Even their persuasive efforts are retreats from apostolic Christian faith that have generally hastened Christianity’s demise (2-3). Q: So Christianity should not be proven? But wouldn’t that leave it as one subjective religion among many?

Not coincidentally, this relativizing serves the needs of the modern state to turn religious difference into multicultural diversity and keep the peace among different religious groups (25). But don’t modernity’s many achievements prove its worth and thus disprove historic Christian faith? No. While modernity is proud of scientific culture, in fact science predates it and (as philosopher of science Michael Polanyi shows) cannot work according to its structures. Science has direction and requires commitments, faith, doubt, intuition, and engagement (19-22) – just like Christian faith, history, and other traditions of working and knowing. The next chapters will develop both these similarities and the distinct character of untamed Christian faith.
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