

forces know that my ~~is~~ book sells well and get happy about it!

Once I was at the Oriental Institute in Chicago, and they had a meeting of the Linguistic Club -- the Near Eastern Club, and they had a man from the U. of Minnesota who was a behaviorist. He gave a talk in which he said we must cleanse linguistic study of the use of such words as mind, thought, concepts, etc. -- there are no such things. We simply are the product of forces; there's no such thing as thought or mind he said. This was of course linguistics he was talking about. How we should cleanse linguistics of such terms.

I raised the question. What are you trying to do them? If there are no such things as ideas, are you trying to get some ideas into our heads or what are you trying to do? He said, I'm simply trying to make you repeat the verbal behaviour that I take. Of course that's nonsense! Why bother? Why bother to try to live? You're just an animal! I'd think if that could be made clear that everybody that lives acts on the assumption that he is a real person who can make decisions. If we don't act on that we won't be here very long. I can't prove we won't be here very long if we don't act on it, but I think most everybody would admit it.

It would seem to me that that sort of approach could be made to look ridiculous. Maybe with this scientist with whom Eck deals so much maybe arguments on fulfilled prophecy is by far the best argument, and I'm not underestimating the value of it. But with most people I would think if you could bring out what the evolutionary approach really amounts to, they would see the absurdity of it. So I want to get hold of the book as soon as I can, and see what the good quotes are in it.

Because it is true that you quote from some scientist most people never heard of and it does not carry much weight. But if you quote from a man who is well known and played up on TV as much as he is, I think it would strike fire in people's minds-- ordinary people and scientists too.

He spoke about Montgomery's strong apologetic argument on the evidences of the resurrections which he did not feel as effective as fulfilled prophecy would be. I don't know about that. I know Dr. Buswell felt the resurrection was the solid basis for Christian belief. You simply can't get away from it. It certainly is used as evidential a great deal in the NT. I think it is a very good argument, but I've not worked in that particular field. It was the great evidence of the early Christians certainly.

Then he spoke about Montgomery a little bit. He regretted the way Pinnock and Montgomery have gotten sort of ~~off~~ off the main track, with Pinnock getting into Arminianism and all sorts of things, and Montgomery going to teach at Melodyland. I asked him why he ~~is~~ did it. He said, He told ~~it~~ him it was the only offer that he had. Then he told me Montgomery had been