

to prove that arguments for the existence of God aren't any good, that evidences for Christianity aren't any good, they only give you probability; we can't be satisfied with probability we must have certainty. So let's imagine we have it. He wrote an 80 pp. syllabus or discussion about Francis Schaeffer's and he said in it that students said to him, Isn't F. Schaeffer's view substantially the same as yours? Francis does use the word presupposition occasionally. But he doesn't mean by presupposition what VanTil does. He means the starting point for a discussion. I don't think VanTil wanted to get into any public controversy with Schaeffer, so he simply wrote this for his students to answer this. I believe it was c. 80 pp. which they mimeographed and sold in the Westminster bookstore, and I don't know where Dr. Vannoy bought it or I think someone gave him a copy and he lent it to me. I went through it. He quotes about 5 points from Schaeffer to show that Schaeffer really believes in evidences and he does not really presuppose, and he repeats it over and over and over. Everything he says in those 80 pp. he could have said in 8 pp. That's my judgment.

Incidentally last time you seemed surprised at the bitterness they showed me when I left the group. That was the thing that disturbed me so much as things developed there. Was this sectarian spirit that developed. The last 2 or 3 years I was at Westminster here were these 8 professors. They were the greatest authorities in the world on the Reformed faith--that was the student's attitude. I was one of them. Whatever any one of them said, that was the answer and some problem would come up and we'd get in faculty meeting and get a discussion and there may be four different views, but the students == but that idea got among the students: these are the great authorities on whatever they say. One fellow said to me, I