

interesting incident of how the modernists fight for toleration. They want to be tolerated. There is room in the church for different views, etc. But once they get control they seize it, really take it. That finishes up that then, doesn't it.

Here's this little pamphlet called Our Faculty prepared by the Student's Committee on Publications, Westminster Student Assn'n 1931. It tells a little about each member of the faculty. There is my picture, and here where it tells about VanTil I never read this until recently. It says, Dr. VanTil's main thesis is that either the God of the Bible is God, or there is no God. Since pragmatism idealism, personalism, and all other such philosophies of the day deny the God of the Bible, it follows, says Dr. VanTil, that the God they would substitute is not God at all. Christian theism is the only position that consistently a thinker can hold. All other philosophies rob the universe of God."

That's pretty much nonsense in my opinion. But that summarizes what most of the students over the years have become tremendously enamoured over, and it cuts the ground from real Christian apologetics it seems to me.

Neher: Would you be a little more specific as to what's wrong with the statement.

What's wrong with the statement is the argument for believing in the God of the Bible is that all substitutes are not God at all, I think that can be proven, but that's proof. His argument is that you can't take probability ~~theories~~ theories. There is really no proof. We must presuppose the God of the Bible. It's an argument that there is no God unless you take this God. Many today are ready to say, Yes there is no God. He says the wisdom of God meets the wisdom of this world on its own grounds and triumphs. He insists you can't meet the wisdom of the world on its own ground. There is