

stress on the ~~fm~~ great fundamental issues. Students were more and more trained by certain members of the faculty to wish to make a big fuss over every little separate minor ~~mp~~ point of doctrine, often on points on which the best Reformed scholars would disagree among themselves. The impression was generally made that the Reformed Faith consists of a thousand different ~~mp~~ points, and that ~~if~~ to abandon any one of these points means to head toward disaster. Students went out ready to fight on minor issues and seemingly not having near the interest the earlier students had in reaching people for the Lord and helping them to grow in grace, ~~for~~ I felt more and more that my time was being wasted. My last three years there I was quite unhappy over the way things were going.

One very special reason for the way ~~reason~~ I felt this way, as I only gradually came to realize, was the teaching of Dr. Van Til. Dr. Van Til claimed that he was ~~only~~ really only following a consistent ~~Calvinist~~ Calvinist lines, but as I heard the impression made on students it became clear that what he was doing was strongly opposing the apologetics of Dr. Warfield, that looked for evidences of the truth of the Scripture and presented these. As it was told to me by enthusiastic students the idea was that one has to presuppose Christianity. Without it you could really know nothing. You must presuppose the triune God. Personally I could not see why one should presuppose Christianity rather than presuppose Buddhism or Mohammedanism. ~~Mohammedanism~~ It seemed to me that one should find some real reason for taking a his stand in one direction or the other. This Van Til would call a belief in a human autonomy. One has no right God. God judges us. We must simply accept the views of Christianity and ~~then~~ then go on from there. Dr. Van Til was often criticizing what he called probability arguments. One must never take a stand on any probability. One must have only certainty. It was quite interesting to me then to read the small autobiographical article that Dr. Machen wrote ~~in~~ in which Dr. Machen told how great a part had been played in his own training by an illustration that he has heard, that a man must cross the ocean in a boat. One leaky, in poor condition, and had a drunken captain. The ~~other~~ other boat looked to be in excellent condition. However, he said, somebody says, "How do I know that this boat for which everything ~~that~~ I can see shows it to be