

Does God Exist?

A Debate in the Spirit of Presuppositionalism

January 2006

This paper is the reconstruction of a debate that took place sometime early in 2006 between me, Brian Bosse, and an atheist from Australia.¹ The resolution of the debate was in the form of an interrogative.

Resolution: Does God Exist?

The debate was scheduled to last five rounds, but ended up only lasting two – opening statements (1500 words each) and rebuttals (1000 words each). It was cut short because the atheist abandoned the debate. I wanted to reconstruct the debate because it was my attempt to honor Van Til’s presuppositional apologetic method made popular by the late Greg Bahnsen. The arguments I put forth in my opening statement were inspired by Greg Bahnsen’s debate with Edward Tabash.² I have edited the debate to a small degree for formatting purposes only. The debate opens with the atheists’ opening statement.

Atheist’s Opening Statement

Does the Christian God Exist?

The idea of deities has been with humanity from the earliest of times. The notion that there is a supernatural reason for occurrences was used to fill in the blanks in human knowledge at the time. That which was unknown was attributed to god. At such times the acts of lightening, earthquakes, etc..., were each personification of god’s powers. As our knowledge of the world around us has increased the domain of God or gods has decreased. Jeremy Griffith describes

¹ This debate occurred on the Christian Logic website (www.christianlogic.com) in the debate section of the discussion forums. This section is no longer available.

² This debate can be found at Covenant Media Foundation (www.cmfnow.com).

how early religions were used to confront the issue of the human condition – how man can be capable of such great good as well as acts of atrocious evil. His analysis of religious concepts places them in the role of a necessary evil that allowed for the ongoing function of the human species when the answers necessary were not yet available.³

God, as opposed to god, is merely a difference of total versus limited powers. The gods of polytheistic religions had powers over separated areas of life or the universes, but outside of these areas were distinctly human in nature. The monotheist's God, on the other hand, is to be considered all powerful, the creator of all, in essence ruling out human frailties.⁴ The Christian God is one of a series deities worshipped by monotheistic religions. The sole descriptor of this being is found in the Christian Bible where he is described as being “omnipotent (all powerful), omnipresent, and omniscient (all knowing). Additional attributes such as holiness, goodness, grace, love, mercy, faithfulness, justice and wisdom are all ascribed to God.”⁵ The Bible does not only give us a descriptor of the Christian God himself, but also gives us a very in-depth description of the world which he created.

So What of the Christian World?

If the Christian God exists, then the description given in the Bible should match completely with the observable world in which we live. The opening chapter of the Bible lists in detail the manner in which the world was created. If the world distinctly matched the description given, then a conclusion could be reached that the world being described was the one in which we

³ Griffith J., *A Species in Denial - Foundation for Humanity's Adulthood*, Australia, ©2003, pgs. 25-44, 65.

⁴ Collins, *A Dictionary of the English Language*, Harper-Collins Publishing, Great Britain, ©2003, pg. 697.

⁵ Campbell, Johnston, Walvoord, & Witmer, *The Theological Wordbook: The 200 Most Important Theological Terms and Their Relevance for Today*, Word Publishing, ©2000, Nashville, pg. 141.

inhabit. Our world, however, does not match the description of the God's world in the Bible; therefore, we can conclude that the world in which the Bible is referencing is not that of Earth.

In the Bible, it is quite explicit that the world is stationary and all other objects revolve around it. Joshua ordered the sun to stand still in the sky above the lands of Gibeon (Joshua 10:12-13), this quite explicitly infers the fact that the sun revolves around the world. Further evidence of this understanding of this cosmology is witnessed in Psalms where on numerous occasions the writer gives evidence that the world rests on pillars and will not be moved (Psalm 93:1, 96:10). This is quite at odds with what has been observed on Earth, though. The Earth rotates on its axis, its axis wobbles over time (Chandler Wobble), it rotates around the sun, and even the very continents themselves are constantly moving. The one thing that can be said about our world is that it never stops moving!

Additionally, the Bible through the genealogies listed within it has been used to calculate that the Biblical world started between 6000 and 10,000 years ago. It was at one stage supposed by Archbishop Usher (Ireland) in 1654 that the Earth was created on October 26th, 4004 BCE at 9 a.m. in the morning (PST). These claims are in direct contradiction to those verifiable facts of science. Zircon crystal deposits have been found in Western Australia which has been dated at 4.3 billion years old, with many other rock formations exceeding 3.5 billion years.⁶

From a current perspective, the Biblical world makes little sense as we can verifiably prove that the description of Earth given in the Bible is erroneous. However, if viewed from the mind of a member of an ancient civilization that would have populated the earth between 5000 and 8000

⁶ There was no precise reference for this quote given by the atheist; however, he did mention Dalrymple, ©1991, p. 474.

BCE, the conclusions are quite simply reached. The end of the last ice age occurred at 10,000 BCE and it was only after this period that civilization really began to take hold throughout much of the world.⁷ The human mind does not deal well with a lack of understanding; so, answers must be created to fill these voids in our knowledge. Religion was created to answer these questions through abstract descriptions intermingled with actual historical events. Weaving history into an explanation about how we came to be. It is only through science that now we are able to understand and move away from these erroneous concepts about our past (Griffith [2003] p.183).⁸ “Religions catered for the insecurity created by the human condition. Therefore, by explaining and ameliorating the human condition – bringing dignifying biological understanding to humans ‘sinful’, corrupt state – the need for religions is obsolete.”⁹

The God as evidenced in the Bible did not create the world in which we exist today. His world was that of the stone or bronze aged civilizations who needed a simple explanation to allow the people to get on with living their lives.

In the Absence of Fact

The Christian God has escaped all of our means to observe or sense his presence through verifiable means. He has eluded scientific notice by astronomers, chemists, biologists, zoologists and physicists, and no new events have been attributed directly to him in the last 2000 years. We cannot see him, taste him, hear him, touch him or smell him. What method is there that could prove the existence of such a being? To prove the existence of such a being is plausible one must resort to proving that such a being or element is necessary as part of some larger known

⁷ Hawking S., *A Brief History of Time*, Bantam Books, Great Britain, ©1989, p. 8.

⁸ Griffith J., *A Species in Denial - Foundation for Humanity's Adulthood*, Australia, ©2003, pg. 183.

⁹ Ibid., pg. 164.

fact which is verifiable and that there is no other alternative which is viable. Even when this is done, the actual existence of such matter will still be unverifiable as new plausible explanations may become available in the future which may better explain the existence of the observed phenomenon.

One commonly proposed reason rests on the presumption of first cause. Everything observed has some cause or reason for being. Nothing has been verified to have come from nothing. So, since we have a universe, there must have been something that began it; *ergo*, God must exist. But if God existed then what created him? If he always existed then why cannot the universe have always existed? If he was created by a higher power, then who created it? And so on *ad infinitum*! According to the Russian Scientists Lifshitz and Khalatnikov, the universe quite probably existed prior to the “big bang.” If it existed prior to this event then there is no reason why it should have a starting point.¹⁰

Another major argument stems from the unlikelihood of our planet being able to sustain life. The chances of any world being habitable are roughly 1 in 10¹² (Hugh Ross – cited in Boa & Bowman [2002] p.74). The probability of any world matching all of the requirements from the right solar system to the correct distance from a sun of the right size and so on is astronomically small. But it must be remembered that there are a lot of planets! The probability is not 1 in 10¹² overall but for this planet. Our planet was just the lucky one. If I were to enter a lottery with the same probability of winning and the lottery had one condition that if god interfered the result was void, and I won, would any reasonable person require that I forgo my prize as an “act of god”

¹⁰ Hawking S., *A Brief History of Time*, Bantam Books, Great Britain, ©1989, p. 52.

had just occurred? The chance was ridiculously small that I would win, but win I did – that is what makes gambling a gamble!

As for signs of intelligent design or intervention being observable in the world, this point is one of much conjecture. Why would any intelligent designer create a sun that exhibits radiation and then not give our planet sufficient protection to protect the inhabitants from its effects? Why is our planet the only habitable planet in our solar system? Why not all of them? Why is there no mechanism for reconvertng carbon out of the atmosphere? Why is the environment so fragile and why so little margin for error? An intelligent designer wouldn't have made so many mistakes or wasted so many opportunities, the world smacks of pure chance. Our planet happened to fall in just about the right place for life to survive. It ain't perfect but it has to do until we can find a better one. The same concepts can be applied to intelligent design in creatures. So many defects are observable that it is difficult to imagine that they were designed by any competent designer.

Natural laws have now been developed that explain better the manner in which the current world came to be than the simple uttering of the ancient tribesmen. The role of god is constantly declining as our own understanding correspondingly increases and verifiable evidence for god's existence is still lacking.

Christian Theist's Opening Statement

I would like to highlight what is at issue in this debate. Taking a cursory look at the resolution someone might conclude that this debate simply concerns the question of God's existence.

However, to do so would be to oversimplify the issue. How one answers the question cannot be fully appreciated apart from considering the philosophical foundation upon which that answer rests. This foundation (worldview) provides the underlying structure necessary to justify our respective positions regarding God's existence. My opponent is proposing an atheistic worldview, and I am proposing a Christian theistic worldview. Ultimately, these two competing philosophical systems are at the heart of the matter, and our concern must necessarily be the objective merits of the case that can be made for each system.

So, how should the difference of opinion between the theist and the atheist be rationally resolved? My opponent has given us clues as to how he thinks this is accomplished when he says in his opening statement, "It is only through science that now we are able to understand and move away from these erroneous concepts...The Christian God has escaped all of our means to observe or sense his presence through verifiable means...We cannot see him, taste him, hear him, touch him, or smell him...To prove the existence of such a being...one must resort to proving that such a being...is necessary as part of some larger known fact which is verifiable..."

Essentially, my opponent claims that the way to prove the existence of God is through scientific standards based upon verifiable, empirical evidence. This leads to a very fundamental point; namely, the idea that "all existence claims are settled on the basis of some empirical scientific method" is an idea that is itself not empirically proven. Rather, it is an assumption by which

other things are proven. My opponent's commitment to an empirically based epistemology¹¹ is the very foundation upon which he wishes to settle this debate. It is precisely at this point I would like to engage my opponent.

My case for the existence of God is based on the impossibility of the contrary. My argument for God's existence is that without Him it is impossible to prove anything. Ultimately, the atheistic worldview is irrational, and cannot consistently provide the preconditions for reasoning and science – the very tools my opponent wishes to use to argue against Christianity. In other words, by denying the God of Christianity the atheist's worldview becomes unintelligible – not even being able to justify its own empirical epistemology.

To illustrate this, I want to look closely at one necessary precondition for science itself – the uniformity of nature. The uniformity of nature is the assumption that the future will be like the past. Apart from this assumption, science and all reasoning would be impossible. Consider for the moment how anyone learns from experience. Take fire for instance. Most of us know that if we put our hand too close to a flame that it will get burned. How does someone through an empirical experience come to this general conclusion? It is based on two premises: (1) the particular experience itself, and (2) the idea that future occurrences of a similar action (putting your hand too close to the flame) will get a similar result (your hand getting burned). Based on these two things, we conclude generally that fire will burn our hand if we get it too close to the flame. Premise (2) is the assumption that nature is uniform, and apart from this assumption we could never learn anything from our experiences, and science becomes impossible. Since my

¹¹ *Epistemology* is a technical term that in the field of philosophy is the study of how we know what we know. An epistemology based on empiricism holds to the commitment that knowledge comes primarily through sense based experience - what we can see, feel, hear, touch and smell. My opponent's epistemology is empirically based.

opponent wants to use science to settle the issue, then one would think his worldview should be able to account for the necessary precondition to practice science, namely that of uniformity. However, the fact of the matter is that his worldview is incapable of accounting for the uniformity of nature, and as such he is incapable of justifying his use of science. Consequently, my opponent cannot even account for what he is trying to do in this debate. By denying the Christian worldview, my opponent has destroyed the very foundation upon which he wishes to stand.

To support this claim, I would like to turn to two well renowned atheistic philosophers – David Hume and Bertrand Russell. Both argued that there is no justification for the assumption that the future will be like the past, insisting that our conclusions relative to induction¹² are not founded on reasoning or any process of the understanding. Concerning Hume and the problem of induction, the online encyclopedia Wikipedia says, “Hume suggested two possible justifications (for induction) and rejected them both. The first justification is that, as a matter of logical necessity, the future must resemble the past. But, Hume pointed out, we can conceive of a chaotic, erratic world where the future has nothing to do with the past – or, more tamely, a world just like ours right up until the present, at which point things change completely. So there is nothing logically necessary about the principle of induction. The second justification, more modestly, appeals only to the past reliability of induction – it’s always worked before, so it will probably continue to work. But, Hume pointed out, this justification is using circular reasoning,

¹² *Induction* is another term used to discuss the uniformity of nature issue. Induction is the reasoning process by which one reasons from the particular to the general. Looking back at our earlier example of fire, we reasoned from the particular case of our hand getting burned when we put it too close to the flame to the general conclusion that any time we put our hand too close to the flame it will get burned.

justifying induction by an appeal that requires induction to gain any force. The problem of justifying induction is still with us.”¹³

The sixth chapter of Bertrand Russell’s *The Problems of Philosophy* states, “The inductive principle, however, is equally incapable of being proved by an appeal to experience. Experience might conceivably confirm the inductive principle as regards the cases that have been already examined; but as regards unexamined cases, it is the inductive principle alone that can justify any inference from what has been examined to what has not been examined. All arguments which, on the basis of experience, argue as to the future or the un-experienced parts of the past or present, assume the inductive principle; hence we can never use experience to prove the inductive principle without begging the question... Thus all knowledge which, on a basis of experience tells us something about what is not experienced, is based upon a belief which experience can neither confirm nor confute, yet which, at least in its more concrete applications, appears to be as firmly rooted in us as many of the facts of experience. The existence and justification of such beliefs... raises some of the most difficult and most debated problems of philosophy.”¹⁴

Clearly, these two great philosophers argued that an empirical epistemology couldn’t provide the justification for induction. My opponent wants to argue against God’s existence using science, but his own worldview is not even capable of providing one of the necessary preconditions for science, namely, the uniformity of nature. By denying the Christian worldview, my opponent’s worldview is shown to be foolish not being able to comport with human experience and ending

¹³ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_Hume

¹⁴ <http://www.ditext.com/russell/rus6.html>

up in irrationality. However, within the Christian worldview, all we need do is turn to the Bible to see how we can account for such a necessary fundamental assumption concerning human experience. We read in Colossians 1:16-17, “For by Him all things were created, both in the heavens and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or authorities – all things have been created through Him and for Him. He is before all things, and in Him all things hold together.”¹⁵ Within the Christian worldview, God created the world, and this world reflects the uniformity that He imposes on it by His governing.

In conclusion, my argument for the existence of God is simply that if you deny the Christian worldview, then your affirmed worldview is unintelligible leading to irrationality and arbitrariness. By denying the Christian God my opponent ends up not even being able to account for what he wants to do in this debate. Given my opponent’s worldview, the ability to practice science and the reasoning process itself is destroyed. Of course, my opponent does practice science. However, to do so he must borrow from the Christian worldview. The Bible says that the fool has said in his heart there is no God. This is not name calling, but rather is a description of what happens to a person when they deny their creator. In the most fundamental sense, unbelief destroys the basis for all knowledge. In His light we see light.

¹⁵ *The New American Standard Bible* – Updated Edition, the Lockman Foundation, Anaheim, California, ©1998.

Atheist's Rebuttal

This world unfortunately is the only one in which we have any experience. Thus, to state that without God (the topic in question) that chaos would reign and scientific analysis would be impossible is merely your opinion. You have yet to provide any evidence of worlds in which there are demonstratively no gods and in which your predictions are correct and worlds in which god surely exists and order prevails. If what you are attempting to imply is that god is axiomatic to science then you would be in error. An axiom is something taken as a truth because all parties involved accept it. I do not accept god as being real and thus he cannot be axiomatic.

You stated that scientific analysis borrows from a Christian worldview, I would contend this both erroneous and irrelevant. The Christian worldview is merely an amalgam of the older Jewish worldview and that held by the Gentiles. These in turn borrowed from earlier worldviews such as the Babylonians. Furthermore, scientific analysis would seem to owe more to a Greek worldview than to the Christian worldview as the former encourages analysis through philosophical discussion whereas Christianity encourages a reliance on dogmatic belief systems. If the Christian worldview is essential to a scientific understanding, then what is specifically different about the Islamic worldview which similarly holds to the premise of one singular god? Or the Buddhist worldview which believes in a higher power? Or an atheistic worldview? You are aiming to prove the Protestant Christian God exists but so far have offered no evidence to prove this claim but merely conjecture, thus irrelevant.

I find your choice to take this debate down the path of a philosophical discussion rather odd in light of the outlook of the bible on the matter. It quite succinctly advises believers to avoid this

area of analysis. “Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ” (Col. 2-8). So it seems to the author of Colossians at least that philosophy relies on the atheistic worldview and thus is one of the tools of the non-believers. Philosophy by very nature requires an open unrestricted outlook on the world, something that is quite the opposite of that encouraged by the Bible (Luke 10-21). If you wish to argue from a philosophical basis I would like to see some Biblical reference that indicates that my reading of the above quote is in error. Else I must assume that you are not in fact a Christian in the true sense of the word, as you argue against the will of your God. The God you proclaim would be one of your own minds creation; as opposed to the God of the bible. This would in essence render your argument void.

Reason and the logical empirical analysis upon which science is based are mere abstracts not physical entities; they exist merely as the by-processes of the operation of the human mind. In the words of Ayn Rand, “Empiricism is not the best way to knowledge, it’s the only way.”¹⁶ You are correct in saying that we make scientific analysis upon the basis of observable repetitive occurrences. Indeed science is based on this! The origins of science are based upon a myriad of repetitive occurrences from which we deduced that reality is not chaotic or completely random in nature. But that given the same circumstances similar reactions will follow.

However, I do not hold to the point that the existence of a questioned object can only be done through our observable senses. Our senses do provide us with the most inherently useful and likely most correct method of analysis. It is also possible to discern the existence of the immaterial if no other explanation is possible - as you yourself mention. However, to do this

¹⁶ No reference was given.

requires an even higher standard of proof than proving the existence of an object we can sense. The unknown must be proven as part of a larger known fact - and even then its true existence will still be in doubt. To what larger verifiable fact is god inherently necessary? To what is the existence of god axiomatic?

The past is not always the same as the future. Your actions today will certainly differ from those experienced by yourself tomorrow. We assume fire will burn the same tomorrow as it does today because it is the same substance. If fire is hot, then it will burn. If it is not then it is not fire. Nature is replete with chaotic variations, not uniformity. No two trees or individuals are the same and no two experiences will be had twice in the same fashion. Thus NO uniformity exists to be explained. Tomorrow will not be the same as today in the same manner as yesterday was not the same as today. However the same results can be expected from your actions tomorrow as occurred today as fire will still be hot and blades still sharp and it is upon this premise that empirical evidence is based.

You simply create a pointless argument to divert attention from the true topic of the debate – “the existence of god” - to another topic of philosophy. The mindset or worldview of all people have similarities, but you claim small portions as the particular property of Christianity without backing up such a claim yet then go on to do exactly the same thing by your reliance on epistemological philosophy. Simply put, God or no god how could reality be proven to be any different than the way in which it actually is? Unless this can be done your inference that reality relies on god is mere conjecture.

Christian Theist's Rebuttal

Rebuttal of the Atheist's Opening Statement

My opponent's opening statement argument can be reduced to the following syllogism...

Premise 1: If the Christian God exists, then the biblical description of the world matches the observable world.

Premise 2: The biblical description of the world doesn't match the observable world.

Conclusion: The Christian God doesn't exist.

This argument is a valid form of *Modus Tollens*. Therefore, if the premises are true, the conclusion necessarily follows. Because of word limits I will accept the first premise as is.

Regarding premise 2, my opponent has put forth 3 supporting arguments.

Argument 1 – In the Bible it is quite explicit that the world is stationary and all other objects revolve around it.

Phenomenological language is language which describes things as they appear to the naked eye. When biblical writers describe the universe around them, they do so in terms of external appearances and not with a view to scientific, technological precision. This isn't unusual in our human experience. Take for instance the forecast given by a meteorologist. He uses scientific terminology, and state of the art technology. He speaks of dew point, barometric pressure, cold/warm fronts, precipitation probability, etc... However, at the end of the forecast it isn't unusual to hear, "Sunrise tomorrow will be at 5:53 A.M." Do any of us think the weatherman is

asserting that the sun revolves around the earth? No! We realize he is using phenomenological language, and we take it as such. We should do no less for the biblical writers.

Argument 2 – Further evidence...is witnessed in Psalms where on numerous occasions the writer gives evidence that the world rests on pillars and will not be moved (Psalm 93:1 96:10).

The science of interpretation, whether it is the Bible or any other book, is called hermeneutics. One of the principle rules of hermeneutics is the principle of *sensus literalis*, which essential means that we interpret literature according to its genre. For example, historical narrative is interpreted as historical narrative, and not as poetry. Concerning this, my opponent has quoted from a section of the Bible whose literary content is poetry. Poetry is highly figurative, and isn't meant to be taken literally. In Shakespeare's *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (II, ii, 2-3) the thief Pistol declares, "Why, then the world's mine oyster, which I with sword will open."¹⁷ Would someone interpret this passage as asserting that the world is an oyster? Pistol was speaking figuratively. In the same manner, the psalmist is describing God's reign, sovereign control, and regulation of His creation. It's not to be taken literally as my opponent has mistakenly done.

Argument 3 – ...the Biblical world started between 6000 and 10,000 years ago.

This issue is debated within Christian circles, and many Christian theologians believe that the account in Genesis can be reconciled with an earth that is perhaps billions of years old. My opponent quoted Dr. Ross (a Christian creation scientist) in his opening statement. As such, I assume my opponent accepts Dr. Ross as a representative of Christianity. In Dr. Ross' book

¹⁷ <http://www.enotes.com/merry-windsor-text/act-ii-scene-2#oyster>

Creation and Time,¹⁸ he devotes several chapters arguing for and defending the view that the Bible allows for the earth/universe to be billions of years old. The point is this, if the earth is billions of years old, the Bible doesn't necessarily contradict this. On the other hand, if the earth is 7000 years old, then the Bible doesn't necessarily contradict this either. In other words, my opponent's premise 2 cannot be established by an appeal to age of the earth.

A Short Reply to the Atheist's Rebuttal

My opponent has rebutted my opening statement on two grounds...

1. Philosophical issues are out of bounds for Christians.
2. The philosophical issue of induction is irrelevant.

In support of point 1 he quotes Colossians 2:8, which reads (NASB), "See to it that no one takes you captive through philosophy and empty deception, according to the tradition of men, according to the elementary principles of the world, rather than according to Christ."¹⁹

My opponent interprets this to mean that Christians should not practice philosophy. Actually, this verse teaches that our philosophy (worldview) shouldn't be based upon the traditions of men, which are empty and deceptive, but rather based upon Christ. A very respected Christian theologian, F.F. Bruce, concerning verse 8 says, "Paul does not condemn philosophy as such, but a philosophy... which seduces believers from the simplicity of their faith in Christ."²⁰

¹⁸ Hugh Ross, *Creation and Time*, Reasons To Believe, Colorado Springs, © 1994.

¹⁹ *The New American Standard Bible* – Updated Edition, the Lockman Foundation, Anaheim, California, ©1998.

²⁰ F.F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, International Commentary of the New Testament, ©1984, pg. 98.

My opening statement is completely consistent with Colossians 2:8. The case I made is that the question of God's existence is a question about worldviews, and if you deny the Christian worldview, which is necessarily built upon Christ, then whatever worldview you adopt is unintelligible, or in the words of Colossians it is "empty deception." All in all, my opponent's first objection fails.

Concerning the second objection, I have asked my opponent to justify his use of science in his attack on Christianity. He hasn't done so, but rather chooses to say it's irrelevant. He is gravely mistaken. All worldviews attempt to take man's knowledge and experience, interpret it and relate it in an intelligible fashion. One of the most fundamental assumptions that make up any intelligible worldview is the uniformity of nature. As has already been argued, without this assumption science becomes impossible. My opponent's epistemology is empirical and he wants to use science. Therefore, at the very minimum my opponent's worldview should be able to account for uniformity, which is a necessary precondition for science. If it cannot account for it, then his worldview fails to make intelligible our experience, and his assuming the uniformity of nature, which he necessarily does, is inconsistent with his own worldview! By denying God, his worldview becomes empty deception. This is supremely relevant to our debate.

Concluding Remarks

Having read through the debate a couple of years after the actual debate itself, I find much that I would say differently. There was nothing outstanding in the debate, and it certainly lacked sophistication. However, I am happy to have participated in it, and I have never regretted the time spent studying Van Til's presuppositional method. It remains my deep conviction that apart from the triune God of Christianity knowledge is impossible. *Sola Deo Gloria!*