

True for You, But Not for Me
Paul Copan
(2nd edition, Bethany House Publishers, 2009)
Study Questions for Small Groups

Introduction

1. Read Psalm 25:5; 51:6; 69:13; John 3:21; 4:23; 8:32; 14:6; 17:17; Eph. 4:15. What do these Scriptures tell us about truth? How is truth bound up with life?
2. Statistics show that the corrosive effects of relativism are being felt in our society. What are the implications of relativism (a) *politically*, (b) *economically*, (c) *educationally*, (d) *socially*, (e) *spiritually/religiously*?
3. In your own educational experience, how have you observed relativism at work? Give some examples of conversations with relativists.
4. How do current movies or books reflect the impact of relativism?
5. Relativists aren't motivated by logical consistency. How does the fact that relativism is primarily *personally* motivated (the quest for autonomy) affect how you respond to the relativist? How does the concept of "idolatry" help us in connecting with relativists?
6. Discuss why relationships are particularly important for reaching relativists.
7. "Evangelism is a process, not an event." Does this ring true in your experience? How would this change how we introduce people to Jesus Christ?
8. What do you think of the three-tiered approach to apologetics (Truth-God-Jesus)? Is this a helpful place to start? Would you offer an alternative approach?
9. As you anticipate studying this book, what do you hope to gain from this undertaking?

Part One: Absolutely Relative

1. Read Jeremiah 23:36 and Habakkuk 1:4. In what ways do passages such as these reflect our relativistic age?
2. Does one's angle or perspective alter the truth of what happened in, say, an auto accident? Why or why not?

3. Though we may strongly disagree with relativism, does the relativist offer any helpful insights about perspective, limitation, or bias?
4. What is *truth*? (See pp. 19-20; you may want to check the lengthy endnote for further elaboration.) How does truth relate to *knowledge* (p. 21)? What is *objectivity*? Why think that truth is inescapable? Why does truth matter?
5. The book points out various expressions or aspects of relativism (philosophy, religion, morality, beauty). Did any of these aspects stand out to you as you read about them? How does relativism have a bearing on your own profession or discipline?
6. Though relativism seems so “open,” in what ways can it be oppressive? When the Christians talk about “truth,” can they sometimes come across as arrogant know-it-alls? How can this be avoided?
7. Discuss the idea that without the possibility of truth, power becomes the inevitable alternative.
8. Why does commitment to objective truth offer a proper context for tolerance?

Chapter 1: “That’s True for You, But Not for Me.”

1. Re-read Alister McGrath’s quotation about relativism (p. 26). Offer your comments on it.
2. “To get along, one must be a selective relativist” (p. 26). What are signs or indications of selective relativism in our culture?
3. In what way is relativism self-contradictory and incoherent?
4. What is the self-excepting fallacy, and how does it apply to the relativist? Does this self-excepting fallacy apply to other statements or slogans you have heard?
5. How can we carry on the conversation with the relativist beyond pointing out inconsistency?
6. What is the difference between paradox and contradiction? Is this a helpful distinction? In what ways?
7. Why is it strange to hear relativists talking about rights?
8. As relativists live out their lives, what sorts of truths do they take for granted every day?

Chapter 2: “So Many People Disagree—Relativism *Must* Be True.”

1. In Psalm 51:6, we read that God desires “truth in the innermost being.” Compare this biblical point to the mindset of relativism.

2. What is the difference between the *difficulty* of finding truth and the *(im)possibility* of finding it? Why is this important?
3. What does disagreement prove or disprove when it comes to truth and relativism?
4. Why is it helpful to ask the relativist for *reasons* for thinking relativism to be the case?
5. Discuss the *facts vs. values* distinction so common in our society today. What are some of the implications with this view? What are some problems with it?
6. What are the difficulties with the “environment produces all your beliefs” statements?
7. What are some bedrock truths on which the relativism tries to base his relativism?

Chapter 3: “You’re Just Using Western Logic.”

1. Have you come across these sorts of “Eastern” claims? Talk about your conversations.
2. What did Alan Watts discover and why is his discovery significant?
3. Discuss the difference between *inventing* logical laws and *discovering* them.
4. What is the religious relevance of the logical laws of *non-contradiction* and *excluded middle*?
5. What is the idea behind “double-truth”? What are some obstacles to such a view?
6. To say that language creates or shapes logic is problematic. Why?
7. Why is it that skepticism, despite its apparent detachment from truth, can’t itself escape making truth-assumptions?
8. How does error itself point us toward truth?

Chapter 4: “Who Are *You* To Judge Others?”

1. Read Matthew 7:1-5. Talk in more detail about how the term “judging” has been ripped out of its context in our society.
2. Have you ever been wrongfully accused of “judging” another? Recount your experience(s).
3. How should we think correctly or consistently about judging? When is judging wrong? When is it appropriate?
4. How should God’s grace shape our understanding of judgmentalism?
5. Why is important to balance truth and love (Ephesians 4:15)?
6. How is the relativist being inconsistent when he tells us, “Don’t judge”?

Chapter 5: “Christians Are Intolerant of Other Viewpoints!”

1. Professing Christians have been accused of “intolerance.” In what ways is this true? In what ways is it false?
2. How has “tolerance” been defined in our contemporary culture? How *should* it be defined? Why is it important to make these distinctions?
3. What does the Bible have to say about tolerance?
4. In light of this discussion of tolerance, how should we engage in religious dialogue? What are some important guidelines for interacting with persons from other religions?
5. Relativists will often smuggle in certain qualifications such as “...just as long as you’re tolerant” or “...just as long as you don’t hurt anyone.” Why is this a problem for the relativist?
6. Why is it important to differentiate between the limits of tolerance in different spheres (e.g., tolerating adultery in society vs. in the church)? How should churches show tolerance with their members? What are the limits of tolerance in a church setting?
7. Discuss Tim Keller’s comment on the truth of God’s inclusive love (p. 47). How does this strike you? How should Christians interact with others in light of this insight?

Chapter 6: “What Right Do *You* Have To Convert Others to Your Views?”

1. Read Acts 4:1-31 (esp. vv. 17-20). What strikes you about this passage? What motivates the disciples to proclaim the good news to others?
2. Why is there such resistance to persuasion/evangelism in our society? In what ways is some of this resistance justified? In what ways is it not?
3. Have you experienced negative responses to talking about your faith?
4. In their opposition, what do these “anti-evangelists” assume about religious truth?
5. How does proclaiming the good news reflect love and concern for others?
6. When people refer to evangelism as “forcing religion down your throat,” what should our response be?
7. In what ways do we see people today “evangelizing” for certain secular causes?

Chapter 7: “It’s All a Matter of Perspective.”

1. Have you ever had conversations that resemble the author’s conversation with the linguist?

2. How should we respond to the claim that “each culture has its own language game”?
3. Though we don’t have a God’s-eye perspective on reality, does this mean we can’t really know? Why or why not?
4. What is the dilemma for the perspectivalist (“it’s all a matter of perspective”)?
5. Is genuine knowledge possible for the perspectivalist? Why or why not?
6. What is the problem with truth as socially constructed?

Chapter 8: “Perception Is Reality.”

1. Though Berkeley’s view of reality isn’t the main point of this chapter, how would you articulate his perspective? Do you find this view counter-intuitive?
2. What do you think of the question: “Why believe something that seems false to us when we have no good reason to accept it?”
3. What do most people today mean when they say, “Perception is reality”?
4. Try to rephrase C.S. Lewis’s quotation (p. 58). What do you think of his insight?
5. What responses to the perception-is-reality slogan do you find convincing? Can you think of others?

Chapter 9: “That’s Just *Your* Opinion.”

1. Have you ever heard the line, “That’s just *your* opinion”? Tell your story to the group.
2. When you have heard this line, how did you respond? Upon reflection, how would you have responded differently?
3. What do you think about suggested response to this opinionarian slogan—“What about obviously *wicked* or *false* opinions?”
4. This chapter suggests treating the opinionarian’s approach like that of the skeptic’s. Can you think of other parallels?
5. Why is important to ask the opinionarian the reason he takes the opinion (!) he does?

Chapter 10: “You Can Choose Whichever Religion You Want.”

1. Have you encountered the pick-your-own-religion mindset? Tell about your experiences and conversations.
2. Have you seen syncretism in among professing Christians/within churches?
3. What is your reaction to the pagan’s dismissal of “dogma” or “tradition”?
4. What is the appeal of preference-based approaches to religion?

5. What are the dangers of a preference-based approach over a truth-based approach?
6. In what ways can humans easily make God into their own image?
7. The chapter discusses God's not being "safe." In what ways have you experienced this? How have you seen God's goodness in these experiences?
8. Have you taken religion classes in university settings that have emphasized religious experience over against religious truth? Discuss your encounter with this and your response to it.

Part Two: The Absolutism of Moral Relativism

1. This section begins with some horrific examples of evil. What are some other clear examples of violations of objective moral standards, regardless of culture or period of history?
2. What is moral relativism? What examples can you think of that illustrate the pervasive influence of moral relativism?
3. Why is relativism inept at explaining horrendous evils?
4. What is the importance of differentiating between discovering moral truths and inventing them?
5. Review the terms on pages 68-69. Make sure you are familiar with them, as this will be helpful to know as you read through this section.

Chapter 11: "Why Believe in *Any* Moral Values When They're So Wildly Different?"

1. A common explanation for moral beliefs is that they are produced by naturalistic evolution. Have you heard this before? How have the conversations gone?
2. What other explanations for morality have you come across?
3. Why might cultural anthropologists conclude that morality is relative? In what ways do they appear to have a point? In what ways are their conclusions faulty? Is it a fair conclusion that morality is "relativistic and pluralistic" (p. 71)?
4. Read Romans 2:14-15. What is Paul saying about the conscience? Is the conscience infallible? What God-given purpose does it serve?
5. Is it helpful to talk about the distinction between moral principles and their cultural expressions or applications?
6. Why is it important to keep in mind that moral conflict does not entail that no moral standards exist?

7. Just because some people have “their own motivations” for committing terrorist acts, what is the problem with using this to justify their actions?
8. What moral gray areas can you think of? How does the discussion of this subject (p. 74) address these areas?

Chapter 12: “Your Values Are Right for You, But Not for Me.”

1. Discuss conversations you’ve had about “creating your own morality.”
2. Despite the claim that we create our own ethics, what moral realities are inescapable?
3. Talk about the suggestion that when it comes to morality, some people need help, not arguments (p. 78).
4. Discuss the inherent friendship problem relativists create for themselves (p. 77). How have you seen this exemplified in the lives of relativists you know.
5. In what ways do moral relativists borrow from other worldviews (like theism) to get along in life?
6. Why is relativism a failure in terms of creating a society conducive to human flourishing?
7. We’ve seen that relativism illustrates the quest for human autonomy. Discuss the last paragraph of the chapter and how this plays out in the moral realm.

Chapter 13: “Who Are *You* To Impose Your Morality on Others?”

1. Have you traveled to (or read about) other cultures that permit and even encourage morally problematic practices?
2. Describe the cultural anthropologist’s dilemma.
3. In what ways should we respect other cultures? In what ways should we not?
4. What are some of the inconsistencies displayed by many cultural anthropologists?
5. Is “imposition of morality” ever permissible? If so, when? When should we be cautious about this?
6. What is the “yuck factor” and why is it important?
7. What are some “bedrock” moral truths that shouldn’t be questioned?
8. What is the reformer’s dilemma, and why does it matter?
9. What is meant by adjudicating between conflicting moral beliefs? Why is this a problem for the relativist?
10. How do relativists do their own kind of “imposing”?

Chapter 14: “You Can’t Legislate Morality.”

1. The chapter begins with the a discussion of abortion and “imposing one’s morality” on the unborn. What is the tragic irony relativism creates about this question?
2. Does the statement “You can’t legislate morality” articulate a grain of truth?
3. Why is the condemnation of “legislating morality” naïve and unsustainable?
4. How do you respond to the question, “Well then, *whose* morality should be legislated?”
5. Why is it impossible to be neutral about morality?
6. What kinds of moral violations should the government punish? When does the government overstep its bounds on “legislating morality”?

Chapter 15: “It’s Arrogant To Say Your Values Are Better Than Others’.”

1. Give your assessment of Emile Durkheim’s statement on changing moral values (p. 88).
2. Discuss the irony of the relativist’s belief that the absolutist’s views are inferior to his when we shouldn’t be talking about inferior beliefs at all!
3. Why are relativism and building character so opposed to each other?
4. Discuss how the diversity of moral beliefs doesn’t mean that morality is relative.
5. What role do moral character and holy living play in responding to moral relativism?

Chapter 16: “Biological Evolution Explains Morality.”

1. Does Dostoyevsky’s dictum (“If God does not exist, then everything is permitted”) make sense? Why or why not?
2. Discuss the following question: “If our moral beliefs are hardwired into us by naturalistic evolution, can we trust any of our beliefs?”
3. Why is it helpful to keep in mind the two alternatives (trivial vs. incoherent) if human beliefs are simply socially-/genetically-conditioned?
4. Naturalistic evolution and social conditioning (e.g., behaviorism) cannot account for knowledge. Discuss why (see pp. 92-93).
5. Why are moral beliefs arbitrary if naturalistic evolution is the case?
6. Explore the claim that rape can be explained naturalistically (p. 94). What are the implications?
7. What is the problem with reducing morality to mere biological instincts? What about the virtue of self-sacrifice or moral responsibility?

Chapter 17: “We Can Be Good Without God.” (I)

1. Tell stories about discussions you've had with people who insist that "people can be good without God."
2. Why is important to distinguish lack of belief in God and lack of morality (p. 98)?
3. In what way can we be good without God, and in what way can't we? How does a passage like Genesis 1:26-28 reinforce this theme?
4. Do we need the Bible to know right from wrong? What do Amos 1-2 and Romans 2:14-15 suggest?
5. What is the connection between personhood and morality? Why is God so crucial to the question of morality?
6. Why is the difference between *feeling* that we have moral duties and *actually having* them?
7. Describe the social-contract view.
8. What are the various problems with such a view?
9. Describe the utilitarian view of morality.
10. Discuss the illustration of painter Paul Gauguin's actions (pp. 101-102).
11. Without God, what kinds of problems emerge for utilitarian ethics?
12. Why does utilitarianism violate our deepest moral intuitions?
13. Which secular ethical views discussed above do you find most difficult to counter? Why?

Chapter 18: "We Can Be Good Without God." (II)

1. Are you aware of other alternative theories that seek to explain morality apart from God's existence? What are they?
2. Do you think that a good God's existence best provides a foundation for objective morality? Why or why not?
3. How can a response to the problem of evil find resources in the existence of God? Discuss this in relation to (a) a presumed design plan and (b) human dignity and worth.
4. What are your thoughts on Kai Nielsen's quotation at the end of the chapter (p. 107)?

Part Three: The Exclusivism of Religious Pluralism

1. Read Acts 17:16-34. What is Paul's strategy for communicating with those holding different worldviews?

2. Discuss the ways in which the gospel message challenged the religious pluralism of the Mediterranean world in the first century? How did Christians proclaim their message in such settings?
3. What do think of Oprah Winfrey's (and Eckhart Tolle's) comments on religious exclusivism and religion in general? Have you heard these kinds of comments in your own conversations, in movies, the media, and so on? Tell the group about them.
4. Why is religious pluralism appealing to so many?
5. How can religious pluralism affect the today's church's task of evangelism?

Chapter 19: "All Religions Are Basically the Same."

1. When the Scriptures speak of the one true God in relation to other religions, what perspective do they take about their capacity to save? See, for example, Deuteronomy 4:35, 39; Isaiah 45:22; 46:9; Daniel 3:29; John 14:6; Acts 4:12; 1 Corinthians 8:4-7.
2. What analogies supporting religious pluralism have you heard (in addition to the ones given in this chapter)? In what ways are they attractive, and in what ways are they deceptive?
3. What's wrong with the "religions are basically the same" slogan?
4. What are the implications of "all truth is God's truth" when it comes to the various religions? How is the helpful as we seek to communicate the gospel with those of another religious perspective?
5. What is your response to the assertion that religions may have a partial, preparatory role for reception the gospel (pp. 115-116)? What are the benefits to this view? What are some precautions we must take?
6. Why is it important and fruitful to think of Jesus of Nazareth as "the historical fulfillment of the greatest genuine human ideals and yearnings" in the world's cultures, religions, and philosophies?

Chapter 20: "All Roads Lead to the Top of the Mountain."

1. What do we mean by "exclusivism" or "particularism"?
2. What are four key points in John Hick's more sophisticated religious pluralism?
3. What is the "Copernican revolution in theology"?
4. What does Hick mean that religions are true in one sense but false in another?
5. Why is it important to remember that analogies don't prove a point, but only illustrate it?

6. Read 1 Timothy 4:1-5. Notice how the further a doctrine is removed from grace, the more demonic it becomes. How can religion—even “Christian” versions—create obstacles for properly relating to God.

Chapter 21: “Christianity Is Arrogant and Imperialistic.”

1. Why are the labels “pluralist” and “exclusivist” misleading?
2. Discuss the different ways that pluralism is exclusivistic (pp. 125-127). Which of these ways stands out to you?
3. How does pluralism distort or water down other religious perspectives?
4. How did religions like Buddhism or Islam or Christianity begin? Did doctrine matter to their founders?
5. What are the similarities and differences between relativism and religious pluralism, on the one hand, and religious exclusivistic beliefs (e.g., Christianity, Islam).
6. In light of this chapter’s discussion, what are some guidelines for undertaking religious dialogue with Muslims, Buddhists, and so forth?

Chapter 22: “If You’d Grown Up in Thailand, You’d Be a Buddhist.”

1. What is the “geography objection”? Why does it seem to be a problem to many Christians?
2. What are various possible inferences that can be drawn from the problem of geography? Can you think of any others that aren’t mentioned?
3. Consider the analogy from politics. Is this a helpful response to the geography objection?
4. Why is the cultural conditioning of the pluralist so significant?
5. What are some other reasons for being skeptical about the pluralist’s approach “from below”?
6. Consider: How would you respond to a pluralist who says, “The reason you’re a Christian is because you grew up in a Christianized culture”?

Chapter 23: “Mahatma Gandhi Was a Saint If Ever There Was One.”

1. Review the pluralist’s “saintliness criterion” and its relationship to salvation/liberation.
2. What are the pluralist’s foundational assumptions? How may these be harmful in actually detecting/discovering religious truth?
3. How does pluralism’s conception of deity differ from that of the Christian faith?

4. In what ways might religious pluralism diminish moral transformation and devotion to God?
5. Discuss the “nest of problems” for the pluralist’s “moral fruits” criterion (pp. 137-139). Which one stands out to you as a significant problem for pluralism? Why?
6. How does the doctrine of the Trinity offer a richer resource and foundation for morality than religious pluralism?
7. Why is important to go beyond moral fruitfulness to other considerations in assessing religions?

Part Four: The Uniqueness of Jesus: Myth or Reality?

1. What do you think of John Hick’s assessment of Jesus?
2. Is comparison of Jesus’ elevated status to that of Buddha’s a fair one? Why or why not?
3. Is the Lord-liar-lunatic trilemma accurate?

Chapter 24: “You Can’t Trust the Gospels: They’re Unreliable.”

1. How do you respond to the charge that the Bible has been corrupted over the centuries so that we can’t be confident about what it says?
2. What is wrong with starting from the assumption that the Gospels are “sacred Scripture” when talking with a skeptic?
3. What should we say to those who raise questions about the “Gnostic Gospels” (as in the *Da Vinci Code*)?
4. Who bears the burden of proof regarding the reliability of an ancient historical document? Why?
5. How do you respond to the charge that the Gospels are anti-Semitic?
6. Why are philosophical presuppositions important when it comes to accepting the historical reliability of the Gospels?
7. In reading this chapter, have you found the case for the Gospels’ reliability to be more solid than you thought? In what ways?
8. Must we have extra-biblical sources to accept the Gospels’ reliability? Why or why not?

Chapter 25: “Jesus’ Followers Fabricated His Stories and Sayings.”

1. What kinds of criticisms of the Gospels have you encountered?
2. What do you think of John Dominic Crossan’s claim that “faith is about the meaning of history, not about the facts of history”?

3. Can we have confidence about key historical claims regarding Jesus of Nazareth? If so, why?
4. Why is it inappropriate to automatically dismiss the Gospel writers' passionate conviction? What about those who do so?
5. What good reasons exist for taking the Gospels seriously?
6. What is wrong with the idea that the earliest Christian communities fabricated Jesus-stories/-sayings in order to address immediate concerns?
7. Why think that the Gospels provide us information about Jesus within one generation of his death and resurrection (p. 157)?
8. Why is the testimony of 1 Corinthians and Galatians so important for establishing the very early emergence of the Christian proclamation?
9. What should we keep in mind when attempting to harmonize the Gospels' alleged discrepancies?
10. What is the criterion of embarrassment and why is this important?

Chapter 26: "Jesus Is Just Like Any Other Great Religious Leader"

1. Have you heard arguments that diminish the standing of Jesus as savingly unique? What do you think of those arguments?
2. Why is the "Eastern" religious/philosophical interpretation of Jesus inadequate?
3. What are the reasons for claiming that Jesus is unique? Which ones stand out to you?
4. What reasons are there for thinking that a high view of Jesus emerged early in the church's existence?
5. What are the problems with the view that Jesus' death and resurrection are "just like" the dying-rising god myths?

Chapter 27: "But Jesus Never Said, 'I Am God.'"

1. If Jesus was really divine, why didn't he just say, "I am God?"
2. What are the implications of Jesus' saving uniqueness if he was (and is) divine?
3. What are the indications that Jesus' earliest followers believed that Jesus stood in the place of God?
4. Why is it inadequate to consider Jesus "just another good moral teacher" or "God-conscious man"?
5. What is the Old Testament's expectation of Yahweh's doing a dramatic new work, and how does Jesus fulfill this picture?

6. How is the humiliation/crucifixion of God's Servant (Jesus) an indication of God's saving activity and Jesus' authoritative status?

Chapter 28: "People Claim JFK and Elvis Are Alive, Too!"

1. Read 1 Corinthians 15:1-11. What stands out to you concerning the historicity of Jesus' bodily resurrection?
2. Why are JFK or Elvis "sightings" inadequate parallels to Jesus' bodily resurrection? How should we approach such claims?
3. What about miraculous claims in other religions?
4. What are the four key facts surrounding Jesus' resurrection, and why are they important?
5. What do we tell people who claim that the Christian faith is just a "leap in the dark" (i.e., without any solid evidence)?
6. What is significant about the earliest Christians worshiping a crucified Messiah?
7. Why is Jesus' bodily resurrection another argument for his saving uniqueness?
8. What are some of the key naturalistic arguments against Jesus' bodily resurrection, and what are some important responses to them? Can you think of any other responses? Which naturalistic argument do you find the strongest?

Part Five: "No Other Name": The Question of the Unevangelized

1. Have you found the problem of the unevangelized to be perplexing? In what ways?
2. Why are terms like "exclusivist" and "inclusivist" potentially confusing?

Chapter 29: "It Doesn't Matter What You Believe—as Long as You're Sincere."

1. Review Jonathan Edwards' experience (p. 183). Have you had similar experiences?
2. What is wrong with sincerity as the sole criterion for salvation?
3. What do we mean by sincerity being the *result* of God's grace rather than what *prompts* God to respond?
4. Can you give clear examples of persons being sincere though still wrong?

5. How does the “unsafe” God challenge our (sometimes empty) notions of “sincerity”?
6. In what way may the “sincerity factor” indicate a kind of pride or boasting?
7. What do you think of J.I. Packer’s three points at the end of the chapter (p. 185)?

**Chapter 30: “If Jesus Is the Only Way to God,
What About Those Who Have Never Heard of Him?”
RESPONSE #1: THE AGNOSTIC VIEW**

1. What do you think of the story of Kozlow? Discuss your impressions.
2. How does considering God’s universal, loving desires help us as we grapple with the question of the unevangelized? Why is God’s character such an important factor in this discussion?
3. What is meant by the question of the unevangelized being “secondary”? Why is this important?
4. Why is it all right to take an agnostic position on the question of the unevangelized?

**Chapter 31: “If Jesus Is the Only Way to God,
What About Those Who Have Never Heard of Him?”
RESPONSE #2: THE INCLUSIVIST (WIDER-HOPE) VIEW**

1. Discuss the story of Joseph and his grandfather at the beginning of the chapter. What questions does this raise? How does Scripture address such examples?
2. Set forth the key tenets of the inclusivist position, and discuss their merits.
3. In what ways is the inclusivist position helpful? In what ways might it prove problematic?
4. Discuss what you think of Lesslie Newbigin’s position of “humble inclusivism” (p. 197).
5. What do think of the suggestion that God is able to work beyond the boundaries of the gospel’s proclamation?
6. What are some misunderstandings of the inclusivist position (pp. 198-200)? How do inclusivists respond?

**Chapter 32: “If Jesus Is the Only Way to God,
What About Those Who Have Never Heard of Him?”**

A Brief Critique of the Inclusivist/Wider-Hope View

1. Does the Emeth-Aslan dialogue concerning the false god Tash create certain theological problems?
2. Can the inclusivist position be a bit *too* inclusive?
3. This chapter reviews certain concerns regarding inclusivism? What is your assessment of these concerns?
4. What do you think is a biblical course to take regarding inclusivism?

Chapter 33: “If Jesus Is the Only Way to God, What About Those Who Have Never Heard of Him?”

RESPONSE #3: THE ACCESSIBILIST/MIDDLE-KNOWLEDGE VIEW

1. What is middle knowledge? What is meant by the specific term *accessibilism*?
2. Does the middle knowledge position seem to mesh well with Scripture?
3. How does God influence free-willing human agents (cp. p. 208)?
4. What is meant by the statement, “No one is born at the wrong place and at the wrong time”?
5. What do you think about the lyrics of Percy Dermer’s hymn (p. 209)?
6. What are the key tenets of the middle knowledge/accessibilist position? Do any stand out to you as being helpful?
7. What is “transworld depravity,” and why is this important?
8. What about the “close calls” scenario (pp. 213-214)? Does this make sense?
9. Discuss the Manila Declaration’s statements about the question of the unevangelized (p. 214)? What is your assessment of these affirmations?

Wrap-Up Session

1. What one or two key things have you learned from this particular book study? (If there is time, take this further. Review what else stands out to you from the book.)
2. What questions do you have that were left unanswered or unexplored?¹
3. Have you had any good conversations with non-Christian friends since you started the book study? Has the content of the book been helpful in these

¹ Do keep in mind that the related books *“That’s Just Your Interpretation,” “How Do You Know You’re Not Wrong?”*, *When God Goes to Starbucks*, and *Loving Wisdom* deal with a wide range of issues not covered here.

discussions? Has the book enabled you to approach/see non-Christians with different eyes? How has your witness been helped through this book?

Can something be true for you and not true for me? In other words, is the truth relative or is the truth fixed? How you answer this question shapes the way you look at the world. Renowned philosophy professor Paul Copan provides an excellent road map through this tricky and vitally important issue. Post navigation. Here's The List Of People That Epstein's Lawyer Is Blaming For His Sudden Death. As long as you keep liking, sharing, commenting, clicking on our articles, subscribing to our newsletter and tell your friends about IWB, we'll keep standing up, speaking out and fighting back! Search for: If you're running an ad-blocker it's costing me money. Paul Copan starts his book, True For You But Not For Me, by stating that there is a real truth, and that having a different perspective on something does not eliminate the chance of discovering real truth. Furthermore, relativism (the belief that a universal objective truth does not exist) is merely an alternative perspective. Religious relativism is the idea that a religion could be true for one person, but untrue for another. Moral relativism proposes that there is no, "objective ethical right and wrong and that morality is an individual or cultural matter." Aesthetic relativism is the idea that all standards for art are equally valid "beauty is in the eye of the beholder. Can something be true for you and not true for me? In other words, is the truth relative or is the truth fixed? How you answer this question shapes the way you look at the world. Renowned philosophy professor Paul Copan provides an excellent road map through this tricky and vitally important issue. Donate today to PragerU! <http://l.prageru.com/2eB2p0h>. To view the script, sources, quiz, and study guides, visit <https://www.prageru.com/video/true-for-you-but-not-for-me>. Yes, you can sit on a couch and not appear to be moving, but since the earth, at the equator, is rotating at 1100 miles per hour, you are, from that perspective, moving "and very fast. I'm not talking about that kind of relative. Let's confine ourselves to the more everyday questions of truth.