

Lesson 7

“Overcoming the Unbeliever’s Metaphysical Bias”

Based on Lecture 4 of

Greg L. Bahnsen’s *Basic Training for Defending the Faith*

“For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness”

(Romans 1:18)

In the previous lesson, we focused on Dr. Bahnsen’s argument regarding the antithesis separating the believing and non-believing worldviews. He showed its importance by highlighting it as the relentless undertow running throughout Scripture. God’s word traces the antithesis from the fall of Adam in the Garden at the beginning of history to the judgment of the reprobate in Hell at the end of history. The antithesis is so important God had to send his Son to die on the cross in order to rectify it in our redemption (John 3:16; Rom. 4:24–5:1, 10–11; 2 Cor. 5:15–21), which effects our new birth (1 Peter 1:3), our arising from spiritual death to spiritual life (Rom. 6:3–9), our becoming a new creation (2 Cor. 5:14–21).

Dr. Bahnsen has demonstrated both philosophically *and* biblically that we may *not* assume any neutrality in thought. This denial of neutrality frustrates the unbeliever who will not recognize the radical nature of the antithesis. He refuses to acknowledge it because of his inner awareness of God which leads to his own moral culpability before his Maker. This is Paul’s message in the first two chapters of Romans: Even though “that which is known about God is evident” (Rom. 1:19) being “clearly seen” (Rom. 1:20b), the unbeliever “suppresses the truth in

unrighteousness” (Rom. 1:18). Consequently, he stands exposed before God “without excuse” in God’s world (Rom. 1:20d; 2:1).

The unbeliever professes neutrality and claims innocence before God. He charges that the Christian is engaged in a leap of faith in his commitment to God because there is no evidence for the God in whom he believes. But the unbeliever’s thinking is vain and futile *in principle*. You must challenge him at the worldview level by exposing his lack of foundation assumptions capable of supporting his outlook on life. You must understand that the unbeliever’s thinking is vain—*in principle*. He has many successes *in practice*, but these are due to his inconsistencies: he could not support his worldview on assumptions that deny God who alone can provide order, purpose, and meaning for human thought and experience. As Dr. Van Til expressed it: “Non-Christian science has worked with the borrowed capital of Christian theism, and for that reason alone has been able to bring to light much truth.”¹ That is, the unbeliever is living on presuppositions which can be justified only on the basis of the Christian worldview.

The proper approach to apologetics is by means of *worldview* analysis. Consequently, as Dr. Bahnsen insists, you *must* know the *Scriptures*. Your philosophical arguments have no meaning or justification apart from the worldview established in the Bible. And that worldview includes the Bible itself as the revelation of God. Richard Pratt well emphasizes this necessity for apologetics, noting that since your response to the unbeliever must always be according to biblical revelation

¹Cornelius Van Til, *Christian Theistic Evidences* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1975), 64. Cited in Greg L. Bahnsen, *Van Til’s Apologetic: Readings and Analysis* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1998), 377.

“it is imperative that the defender of the faith be well studied and familiar with the Bible. One can hardly argue by truth if he is ignorant of truth. Every aspect of biblical revelation is able to be used in apologetics, and the effectiveness of the apologist will depend to a great extent on his ability to handle accurately ‘the Word of truth’ (II Tim. 2:15). In the Word of God lies the truth of the Spirit which will convince the unbeliever of his need of the Savior and the sufficiency of Christ’s death and resurrection for salvation.”²

In Dr. Bahnsen’s present lecture—his fourth—he begins explaining apologetics in action. He warns you of the anti-metaphysical bias in contemporary thought and shows you how to respond to it. We will develop two studies on this particular lecture.

I. Central Concerns

As Dr. Bahnsen taught us in an earlier lecture, worldviews involve three fundamental issues: (1) Metaphysics (which deals with the nature of reality), (2) epistemology (which deals with the nature of knowledge), and (3) ethics (which deals with the nature of morality). But how can you intelligibly *establish* your view of reality, knowledge, or ethics? This is an important question that you must answer in order to apologetically engage the unbeliever. Biblical apologetics engages *worldview analysis*.

²Richard L. Pratt, *Every Thought Captive: A Study Manual for the Defense of Christian Truth* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1979), 87.

Metaphysics Today

Though metaphysics is a central component in any worldview, as you look around you will discover that much of the modern world discounts the value of metaphysics and resists metaphysical inquiry. Since the Enlightenment of the 17th and 18th centuries—especially since the work of the famed philosopher and skeptic David Hume (1711–1776)—the modern scientific mind has developed a general hostility toward metaphysics. And the Christian apologist must understand this.

The article on “metaphysics” in *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* comments that “the exact nature of [metaphysics] has been constantly disputed, *as indeed has its validity and usefulness.*”³ In fact, the next article in this authoritative dictionary is titled: “metaphysics, opposition to,” which points out that “the anti-metaphysical theory of the Logical Positivists . . . argued that metaphysical statements were nonsensical, [and] *put metaphysics out of fashion, where on many popular views it remains.*”⁴ The article continues by noting that:

Opposition to metaphysics has come from both within philosophy and outside it. . . . The deference to empirical science displayed by the Logical Positivists is still a feature of much Anglo-American analytic philosophy, creating an intellectual climate inimical to the pursuit of speculative metaphysics. . . .

More recent hostility to metaphysics comes from the post-modernists and deconstructionists, who wish to proclaim that philosophy—and certainly

³Ted Honderich, ed., *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995) 556. Emphasis added.

⁴Honderich, ed., *Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, 558. Emphasis added.

metaphysics —is dead. These writers represent metaphysics as a temporary aberration of the Western intellect.”⁵

In an article titled “Beyond Experience: Pragmatism and Nature’s God,” Professor Robert S. Corrington of Drew University speaks of the “current and fashionable bias against metaphysics.”⁶

The popular and influential astronomer Carl Sagan (1934–1996) maintained a strong anti-metaphysical bias. In one review of his *The Demon-Haunted World: Science as a Candle in the Dark* (1996), Gary McGath noted: “Sagan’s brand of skepticism leads him to the conclusion that there can be no basic principles of reality known beyond the results of scientific experimentation—that is, there can be no valid metaphysics which is more than just conjecture.”⁷ Sagan said it best in the introduction to his Cosmos series: “The universe is all that is or ever was or ever will be.”⁸

This denigration of metaphysics is important in that this attitude has strongly influenced Western culture. Dr. Bahnsen notes that “this anti-metaphysical attitude has been one of the crucial ingredients which have molded culture and history over the last two hundred years.”⁹ We will respond to this overt anti-metaphysical bias shortly. But you should also be aware of a more

⁵Honderich, ed., *Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, 559.

⁶Robert S. Corrington, “Beyond Experience: Pragmatism and Nature’s God,” in *The American Journal of Theology and Philosophy* 14:2 (May 1993), 147.

⁷Gary McGath: www.mcgath.com/demon.html.

⁸Carl Sagan, *Cosmos* (New York: Random House, 1980), 4. Notice his metaphysical assumption that the future will be like the past so that he can claim that the Universe is all there ever will be.

⁹Greg L. Bahnsen, *Always Ready: Directions for Defending the Faith*, ed. Robert R. Booth (Powder Springs, GA: American Vision, 1996), 178.

subtle opposition to metaphysics which derives from the relationship of metaphysics and epistemology.

In arguing for animal rights, legal authority Kyle Ash deems it necessary to dis-establish metaphysics (ontology) in order to rid ourselves of our pride in the human species:

“Renunciation of speciesism is essential to a modernization of international law, which discards an ontological approach for an approach more scientific, objective, and consensus based.”¹⁰

Metaphysics and Epistemology

In the unbelieving intellectual circles which do allow a limited role for metaphysics, the bias continues but in a different direction. As Dr. Bahnsen explains in his lecture, where metaphysics is tolerated today it is assigned a subordinate position to epistemology. Some philosophers argue that to choose between available worldview options you must first establish your epistemology then apply it to the facts to learn what reality is all about. That is, you should establish your theory of knowledge without encumbering it with metaphysical considerations. In this widespread approach, worldviews are adopted by a two step procedure known as “philosophical methodism”: (1) You establish your method of research and understanding (epistemology); (2) then using that epistemology you determine your metaphysical conclusions. This seems reasonable and is certainly a widespread method.

This bias favoring epistemology over metaphysics is strongly influenced by our modern enamorment with science. The impressive insights made by modern scientific discovery and practical technological achievements have elevated “scientific method” (an epistemological

¹⁰Kyle Ash, “International Animal Rights: Speciesism and Exclusionary Human Dignity,” *Journal of Animal Law*, Michigan State University College of Law (11) 198: www.animallaw.info/journals/jo_pdf/vol11_p195.pdf

consideration) above metaphysics. This has created something of a “Science said it, I believe it, therefore it’s true” mentality. *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* highlights this bias among scientists: “This hostility [against metaphysics] is paralleled in the popular writings of many scientists, who seem to think that any legitimate issues once embraced by metaphysics now belong exclusively to the province of empirical science.”¹¹ The *Infoplease Encyclopedia* well captures our fascination with science today:

The technological advances of modern science, which in the public mind are often identified with science itself, have affected virtually every aspect of life. . . . Perhaps the most overwhelming aspect of modern science is not its accomplishments but its magnitude in terms of money, equipment, numbers of workers, scope of activity, and impact on society as a whole. Never before in history has science played such a dominant role in so many areas.¹²

Encarta summarizes the scientific method which has elevated science to this exalted position: “In the 20th century, scientists achieved spectacular advances in the fields of genetics, medicine, social sciences, technology, and physics. . . . Whatever the aim of their work, scientists use the same underlying steps to organize their research: (1) they make detailed observations about objects or processes, either as they occur in nature or as they take place during experiments; (2) they collect and analyze the information observed; and (3) they formulate a hypothesis that

¹¹*Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, 559.

¹²“Revolutions in Modern Science,” *Infoplease Encyclopedia*: www.infoplease.com/ce6/sci/A0860979.html

explains the behavior of the phenomena observed.”¹³ This elevates epistemology to its dominant position over metaphysics. Dr. Bahnsen explains our current situation:

Antagonism to metaphysical claims is quite simply the allegation that “pure reason” apart from sense experience cannot itself provide us with factual knowledge. Metaphysical statements speak of a suprasensible reality which is not directly experienced or verified by natural science. . . . Those antagonistic to metaphysics argue that all informative or factual statements about the objective world must be derived empirically (based on experience, observation, sensation), and therefore human knowledge cannot transcend particular, physical experience or the appearance of the senses. . . .

Because metaphysical claims could not be brought to the critical test of sense experience, they were concluded to be senseless.¹⁴

In such an environment as we have today, method becomes central to both the intellectual and common outlooks. Therefore, since epistemology deals with how we come to know (involving scientific method), it receives priority over metaphysics. Dr. Bahnsen notes further of this modern antagonism against metaphysics:

Herein lies the offense of metaphysics to the modern mind. Metaphysics presumes to tell us something about the objective world which we do not directly perceive

¹³“Science,” *Encarta* (http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761557105/Science.html#s2)

¹⁴Greg L. Bahnsen, *Always Ready*, 184.

in ordinary experience and which cannot be verified through the methods of natural science.¹⁵

* * * * *

Opponents of metaphysics (and thereby of the theology of the Bible) view metaphysical reasoning as conflicting with empirical science as the one and only way to acquire knowledge.¹⁶

As renowned atheist philosopher Anthony Flew expressed the modern scientific antipathy toward metaphysics: “It has been held that the human mind has no means of discovering facts outside the realm of sense experience.”¹⁷

To understand the significance of the anti-metaphysical complaint, we should recall Dr. Bahnsen’s definition of “worldview,” which we studied in Lesson 3: “A worldview is a network of presuppositions (which are not verified by the procedures of natural science) regarding reality (metaphysics), knowing (epistemology), and conduct (ethics) in terms of which every element of human experience is related and interpreted.” Note that a worldview involves presuppositions “which are not verified by the procedures of natural science.” This is taboo in our science-fixated world.

¹⁵Bahnsen, *Always Ready*, 182.

¹⁶Bahnsen, *Always Ready*, 184.

¹⁷Anthony Flew, “Metaphysics,” in *A Dictionary of Philosophy*, 2nd ed. (New York: St. Martin’s, 1984), 229. Cited in Bahnsen, *Always Ready*, 191. Interestingly, in late 2004 Flew declared he was no longer an atheist. ABC News reported the following: “A British philosophy professor who has been a leading champion of atheism for more than a half-century has changed his mind. He now believes in God more or less based on scientific evidence, and says so on a video released Thursday.” (<http://abcnews.go.com/US/wireStory?id=315976>). However, his view is contrary to Christianity, being more deistic (see Glossary).

Our Christian Response

In his lectures and in his writings Dr. Bahnsen takes to task this anti-metaphysical bias. And in order to strengthen your ability to defend the faith, you should as well. But what shall you think about this antagonism to metaphysics? And how can you respond to this common objection generated out of the remarkably successful, naturalistic scientific world?

Actually, we can levy a devastating response against the critics of metaphysics. Consider the following seven problems with the anti-metaphysical position.

1. Epistemological method is not neutral. Though the anti-metaphysical crowd claims to be concerned with neutrality in their elevating epistemology, you will recall from Dr. Bahnsen's first message that neutrality in human thought is impossible. He provided you with ample evidence to that end, and here we will focus a little more on the matter as we consider the question of *method* in reasoning.

Dr. Van Til argues that "the question of method is not a neutral something. Our presupposition of God as the absolute, self-conscious Being, who is the source of all finite being and knowledge, makes it imperative that we distinguish the Christian theistic method from all non-Christian methods."¹⁸ As Dr. Bahnsen expresses it, every method of reasoning, every system of thought presupposes either the truth or falsity of Christian theism. All worldviews are, at base, either one of two foundational options: Christian or Non-Christian, believing or non-believing. You need to understand this as a Christian apologist, and the non-Christian needs to be made aware of this as you challenge him. Dr. Van Til explains the situation that exists from the perspective of the Christian system:

¹⁸Cornelius Van Til, *An Introduction to Systematic Theology* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1974), 9. Cited in Bahnsen, *Van Til's Apologetic*, 62.

There are two mutually exclusive methodologies. The one of the natural man assumes the ultimacy of the human mind. On this basis man, making himself the ultimate reference point, virtually reduces all reality to one level and denies the counsel of God as determinative of the possible and the impossible. Instead of the plan of God, it assumes an abstract notion of possibility or probability, of being and rationality. . . .

On the other hand there is the Christian position. When consistently expressed it posits God's self-existence and plan, as well as self-contained self-knowledge, as the presupposition of all created existence and knowledge. In that case, all facts show forth and thus prove the existence of God and his plan. In that case, too, all human knowledge should be self-consciously subordinated to that plan.¹⁹

Let us explain what Van Til and Bahnsen mean. To get at his point you should recall the record of the temptation and fall in Eden (again, we must turn to Scripture!). God sovereignly and unambiguously commanded that Adam and Eve *not* eat of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. But Satan challenged God's direct command and told Eve the decision was hers to make. Eve took it upon herself to weigh the two options before her: "Shall I follow Satan who sees no wrong in this? Or shall I follow God who simply declared it wrong without any justifying reasons?"

This is the same method the unbeliever chooses: He asserts for himself *the right to determine proper method*. And he does so without reference to God. Or, as Van Til puts it, the

¹⁹Van Til, *Introduction to Systematic Theology*, 19. Cited in Bahnsen, *Van Til's Apologetic*, 63.

“natural man” assumes “the ultimacy of the human mind.” His *method* is to operate in the world in a way that “reduces all reality to one level and denies the counsel of God as determinative of the possible and the impossible.” Van Til was famous for illustrating the Christian view by a larger and smaller circle representing God and the Universe. The unbeliever’s method does not bow to the absolute authority of the Creator but claims all authority to reason on his own terms without reference to God.

The Christian position, however, holds that foundational to all reality is the personal, self-existent, sovereign God who creates and providentially sustains the Universe by his plan thereby making knowledge possible. As Dr. Bahnsen explains:

there are only two fundamental outlooks: the Christian and the non-Christian. “Every method, the supposedly neutral one no less than any other, presupposes either the truth or the falsity of Christian theism.” One either has “the mind of Christ” (1 Cor. 2:16) or is an “enemy in your mind” (Col. 1:21) One either begins his thinking with the triune God who has clearly revealed Himself as the one who created and providentially controls all things, and who graciously saves His people by the redemptive work of the incarnate Son applied by the Holy Spirit—or one does not begin one’s thinking with this presupposition. Middle ground is excluded. At base, there are only two options. Of course, there are numerous variations and “family squabbles” within the two fundamental positions. . . . Those whose starting point is not the Christian worldview revealed in Scripture, while sharing this attitude with each other, differ from one another on other points. . . . Unbelieving positions are simply a series of illustrations of

the same underlying position that rejects Christianity as its presupposition. . . .

“He who is not with me is against me” (Matt. 12:30).²⁰

The unbeliever’s dismissal of our sovereign God is anything but neutral.

2. Metaphysics is necessary to epistemology. Here you should recall a recurring theme in Dr. Bahnsen’s lectures: Worldviews are *systems* of *inter-locking* presuppositions. As systems they include metaphysics *and* epistemology *and* ethics all bound up together in a mutually self-supporting system. Worldviews are not one-issue or single-fact constructs. Consequently, you cannot dismiss metaphysics in deference to epistemology.

As Van Til perceptively notes “our theory of knowledge is what it is because our theory of being is what it is We cannot ask *how* we know without at the same time asking *what* we know.”²¹ How can epistemology be divorced from metaphysics, in that metaphysics “studies such questions or issues as the nature of existence, the sorts of things that exist, the classes of existent things, limits of possibility, the ultimate scheme of things, reality versus appearance, and the comprehensive conceptual framework used to make sense of the world as a whole”²²? These issues *necessarily* impact epistemology.

Your theory of knowledge is just *one* aspect of your *entire* worldview, one feature of your interpretive outlook on all of human experience and thought. You cannot jerk it out of its inter-locking setting in your worldview and let it stand on its own. It would have nothing to stand on; it would be suspended in air. It is necessarily and unavoidably linked with your theory of reality and your theory of ethics: To have a way of knowing (epistemology) requires certain

²⁰Bahnsen, *Van Til’s Apologetic*, 277, 278.

²¹Cornelius Van Til, *The Defense of the Faith* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1955), 126.

²²Bahnsen, *Always Ready*, 181.

assumptions about the nature of reality (metaphysics). How can knowledge operate apart from the real world as it exists? It is impossible for it to be otherwise. Our theory of knowing is adopted as one that comports with our view of reality so that we can distinguish the true from the false. As per Van Til, “it appears how intimately one’s theory of being and one’s theory of method are interrelated.”²³

Bahnsen expresses this clearly: “We could not think or make sense of anything without some coherent view of the general nature and structure of reality.”²⁴ Elsewhere he writes: “One’s convictions about metaphysics (the nature of reality) will influence one’s position on epistemology (the proper method for knowing things), even as one’s epistemology will influence one’s metaphysical beliefs. A person’s metaphysic and epistemology will be coordinated with each other, constituting a specific world-and-life view set over against other world-and-life views (each with its own interdependent views of reality and the method of knowing).”²⁵

Thus, you see that *epistemology necessarily presupposes metaphysics*. Remember the epistemological method of science: “Whatever the aim of their work, scientists use the same underlying steps to organize their research: (1) they make detailed observations about objects or processes, either as they occur in nature or as they take place during experiments; (2) they collect and analyze the information observed; and (3) they formulate a hypothesis that explains the behavior of the phenomena observed.”²⁶ Note carefully that scientific method involves

²³Van Til, *Systematic Theology*, 18. Cited in Bahnsen, *Van Til’s Apologetic*, 63.

²⁴Bahnsen, *Always Ready*, 179.

²⁵Bahnsen, *Van Til’s Apologetic*, 63 note 55. Although this is not our focus at this point, you should note that our theory of knowing has an obligatory (ethical) character in that it is deemed to match with reality so that it becomes the proper way of knowing. Therefore, ethics is also involved in our worldview.

²⁶“Science,” *Encarta* (http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761557105/Science.html#s2)

“observations about objects” and “the behavior of the phenomena observed.” These are metaphysical issues.

Clearly then, your method of knowing depends on the nature of reality (one feature of reality is the question of God). Interestingly, the Bible itself opens with a metaphysical assertion: “In the beginning God.” It is naive to think you can choose an epistemology while remaining neutral toward metaphysics.

Dr. Bahnsen illustrates this by drawing from an agricultural example: Say that you have an apple orchard and that you must separate nice, healthy-sized good apples from deficient, stunted, bad apples before they are shipped off to market. You will need a device that will sort good and bad apples into separate bins. You want to drop apples in the sorter and let it distribute them into the proper good or bad apple bin. The sorter illustrates your epistemology, your method of knowing; the apples illustrate your metaphysics, your reality.

You cannot devise such a sorting machine, however, if you do not *know in advance* what an apple is, and what is the difference between a good apple and a bad apple. Likewise, if you do not know something about the universe to begin with, you cannot devise a method for separating truth and error (good apples and bad apples). Everyone begins with an *integrated worldview* involving metaphysics *and* epistemology. The contemporary anti-metaphysical bias is unreasonable.

3. Anti-metaphysical arguments are uncritical. Whether those who oppose metaphysics like it or not, whether they think about it or not, things exist and are related somehow—and *these are metaphysical realities*. To dismiss metaphysics is a highly naive way of thinking.

Dr. Bahnsen points out the irony in all of this: *The unbeliever who discounts metaphysics does so on the basis of his own hidden metaphysical program*. He is operating on naturalistic, materialistic assumptions which he deems the final determiners of reality (as we mentioned in Point 1 above). The unbeliever therefore shoots himself in the foot when he attacks metaphysics. “What is glaringly obvious, then, is that the unbeliever rests upon and appeals to a metaphysical position in order to prove that there can no metaphysical position known to be true!”²⁷

And this is not simply a knee-jerk Christian response to the matter. *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* notes this problem:

Opposition to metaphysics has come from both within philosophy and outside it. . . . This hostility is paralleled in the popular writings of many scientists, who seem to think that any legitimate issues once embraced by metaphysics now belong exclusively to the province of empirical science—issues such as the nature of space and time, and the mind-body problem. *Such writers are often blithely unaware of the uncritical metaphysical assumptions pervading their works and the philosophical naïvety of many of their arguments*. But it is ironic that the deference shown by many philosophers to the latest scientific theories is not reciprocated by the popularizing scientists, who do not conceal their contempt for philosophy in general as well as metaphysics in particular.²⁸

²⁷Bahnsen, *Always Ready*, 190.

²⁸*Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, 559. Emphasis mine.

4. Metaphysical presuppositions are necessary to reasoning. Our earlier lesson on presuppositions explained their necessity in human thought and experience. We may view presuppositions metaphorically as a “foundation” and as a “framework.” That is, we can say that they are both “foundations” to and a “framework” for worldviews. They both give a sure base to human experience and provide a guiding framework for human reasoning in the world.

Presuppositions are necessary to reasoning. Every system of thought has some starting point, some standard of authority by which truth and error are evaluated, the real and the unreal are recognized, and the possible and impossible are determined. You must challenge a person’s basic assumptions supporting his worldview, to uncover his ultimate commitment. You must press the unbeliever to provide you with his standard of evaluation for his outlook. When he offers it, you must challenge it by pressing him: “How do you know *that* is the right standard?” The respondent has one of four options available: (1) He can admit that his standard of evaluation in his worldview has no justification (thus rendering his position arbitrary and irrational). (2) He can argue that his standard is established by some standard outside of itself (thus admitting that a new standard becomes more ultimate, thereby destroying his previously determined “ultimate” standard). (3) He can then keep seeking a more ultimate standard, becoming trapped in an infinite regress²⁹ argument, thereby rendering his standard unknown and unknowable. Or (4) he can point to a truly ultimate, self verifying standard that explains all else, in that it is the ultimate standard beyond which no appeal can be made, as in the Christian worldview which points to God (Heb. 6:13).

²⁹Infinite regress is an argument procedure which occurs when a suggested explanation or purported standard is challenged. The challenge causes the argument to point back further to a more basic commitment that sustains the explanation. Then that commitment is challenged, pointing to an even more basic commitment, on and on *ad infinitum*.

Unbelieving systems should be pressed to show that they must have an ultimate authority upon which to rest if they are to objectively and intelligibly evaluate anything. Evaluation requires a standard. When *any* system gets around to verifying its *ultimate* authority, it will have to *presuppose* that authority. Let us explain how this is so.

We all must begin with some form of authority. The unbeliever begins with his own authority to weigh, evaluate, and determine options. The Christian begins with the Creator's authority. When one's epistemic authority is challenged, he must rationally account for it in some manner. Since we cannot finalize an argument engaged in infinite regress, we must stop at some self-validating, self-attesting authority. The unbeliever has none.

The Christian system has a self-attesting authority. Your epistemology is grounded in the all-interpreting presupposition of the personal, infinite, eternal, self-contained, self-revealing Creator of all facts and laws. By the very nature of the case, God is your ultimate reference point and he alone is self-validating. How could the absolute, all-creating God of Scripture appeal to some authority greater than his own? Remember that Scripture recognizes this phenomenon when it declares in Hebrews: "For when God made the promise to Abraham, since He could swear by no one greater, He swore by Himself" (Heb. 6:13).

By definition, God must be absolute authority. He needs no "counsel" to guide him (Isa. 40:13; Rom. 11:34–35; 1 Cor. 2:16; cp. Job 35:11; 41:11). Indeed, Paul declares: "Let God be true, though every man be found a liar" (Rom. 3:4). In our next lesson we will demonstrate how to employ this presuppositional worldview argument effectively.

We see this self-attesting authority in various places in Scripture. In Matthew 7:29 the people were amazed when Jesus taught "as one having authority, and not as their scribes." The scribes appealed to renowned rabbis to validate their teaching: "you have heard that the ancients

were told” (Matt. 5:21, 33). But Jesus’ authority was self-attesting. He declares that his word is like a rock which provides absolute stability for one’s life (Matt. 7:24–27). In fact, he teaches that his word will be the standard of judgment of all men at the Final Judgment (John 12:48).

The believer’s authority, then, rests in the eternal foundation of God Almighty speaking in his objective, self-revelation to man (the Bible). This provides a sure foundation to reason and experience. The unbeliever’s authority is subjective depending upon his own self-assertion. This leads to subjectivism which destroys reason.

Before moving to our next response against the anti-metaphysical bias, you should be aware of a possible response that the unbeliever will bring against you. He will complain that you are engaging in circular reasoning³⁰ or the informal logical fallacy of begging the question.³¹ That is, since we assert that God is self-verifying, we are assuming God in order to prove God. However, we should note in response to this objection:

(1) We are not engaged in special pleading for the Christian worldview. We are simply asking which system makes human experience intelligible. For sake of argument, we will grant the unbeliever his system with whatever foundations he adopts in order to see if it can justify its truth claims. But then he will have to grant us ours (for sake of argument) to see if we can justify our truth claims. By the very nature of our God as the self-existing, eternal Creator, our worldview self-justifies its starting point. (Our next Lesson will explain this two-step procedure of worldview critique.)

³⁰Circular reasoning (technically known by the Latin phrase *circulus in probando*) occurs when one assumes something in order to prove that very thing. Circular reasoning is often very subtle and hard to detect.

³¹Begging the question (technically known by the Latin phrase *petitio principii*) is a fallacious manner of reasoning wherein your premise includes the claim that your conclusion is true, that is, your argument assumes the very point to be proven.

(2) All systems must ultimately involve some circularity in reasoning. For instance, when you argue for the legitimacy of the laws of logic, you must employ the laws of logic. How else can you justify laws of logic? This is a transcendental³² issue, an issue that lies outside of the temporal, changing realm of sense experience. Laws of logic do not change: they are universal, invariant, abstract principles.

In the Christian worldview, however, the Christian apologetic is *not* engaged in *viciously* circular argument, a circular argument *on the same plane*. We appeal above and beyond the temporal realm. God's self-revelation in nature and in Scripture informs us of the two-level Universe: God is not a fact like other facts in the world. He is the creator and establisher of all else. His existence alone makes the Universe, reason, and human experience possible.

(4) As Dr. Bahnsen points out "Circularity" in one's philosophical system is just another name for 'consistency' in outlook throughout one's system. That is, one's starting point and final conclusion cohere with each other."³³ He explains more fully:

"The 'circularity' of a transcendental argument is not at all the same as the fallacious 'circularity' of an argument in which the conclusion is a restatement (in one form or another) of one of its premises. Rather, it is the circularity involved in a coherent theory (where all the parts are consistent with or assume each other)

³²Transcendental reasoning "is concerned to discover what general conditions must be fulfilled for any particular instance of knowledge to be possible; it has been central to the philosophies of thinkers such as Aristotle and Kant, and it has become a matter of inquiry in contemporary, analytically minded philosophy. Van Til asks what view of man, mind, truth, language, and the world is necessarily presupposed by our conception of knowledge and our methods of pursuing it. For him, the transcendental answer is supplied at the very first step of man's reasoning—not by autonomous philosophical speculation, but by transcendent revelation from God." (Bahnsen, *Van Til's Apologetic*, 5–6, note 10).

³³Bahnsen, *Van Til's Apologetic*, 170 note 42.

and which is required when one reasons about a precondition for reasoning, its ‘circles’ are destructive of human thought—i.e., ‘vicious’ and futile endeavors.”³⁴

(5) The unbeliever has no defensible standard whereby he can judge the Christian position. His argument either ends up in infinite regress (making it impossible to prove), has no justification (rendering it subjective), or engages in an unjustifiable same-plane circularity (causing it to be fallacious). Without a self-verifying standard, he has no epistemological way out. And only the Christian worldview has such a self-verifying standard.

5. Anti-metaphysical arguments are mistaken. In *Always Ready*, Dr. Bahnsen shows that the arguments against metaphysics ultimately reduce to two complaints. (1) The opponent of metaphysics will not allow inferring from the realm of sense experience anything that lies outside of that realm. (2) The opponent of metaphysics will not allow any source of knowledge about reality which is non-empirical (non-observational, without sense experience).³⁵ We will focus on the first objection at this point, the other in Point 6 below.

First, this contradicts the scientific method itself. Remember that Dr. Bahnsen explains the implications of the presuppositional features of a worldview that are non-material (see Lesson 4). These are absolutely essential to science even though they cannot be shown under the microscope, dissected in the lab, measured by caliper, or demonstrated by the methods of scientific investigation. Such things as the reality of an objective external world as over against a world of illusion (which allows for objective scientific investigation), the reliability of memory (so necessary to scientific experimentation), continuing personal identity over time (so that the

³⁴Bahnsen, *Van Til's Apologetic*, 518 note 122.

³⁵Bahnsen, *Always Ready*, 185.

scientist's experience of past realities can be related to the present and expected in the future), the reality of cause-and-effect relations (the very essence of experimental predictability), and so forth. Remember, metaphysics “studies such questions or issues as the nature of existence, the sorts of things that exist, the classes of existent things, *limits of possibility*, *the ultimate scheme of things*, *reality versus appearance*, and the *comprehensive conceptual framework used to make sense of the world as a whole*”³⁶?

Second, scientists constantly deal with unseen realities, such as subatomic particles, gravity, magnetism, radiation, barometric pressure, elasticity, radioactivity, natural laws, names, numbers, past events, categories, future contingencies, laws of thought, individual identity over time, causation, and so forth. For instance, the whole theory of evolution which controls modern scientific inquiry, is a non-sensory theoretical projection back into time which is held by many to be indisputable fact. Yet no scientist was there to witness it. They have not seen any other Universe created or one kind of life evolve into another of a different kind.

Such a theoretical projection as demanded by evolutionary theory depends upon metaphysical presuppositions regarding reality (but, of course, we believe evolution to be *mistaken* in their metaphysical surmises). For instance, the National Academy of Sciences published an authoritative guide for public school science teachers titled *Teaching About Evolution and the Nature of Science*. That guide defined science as “a particular way of looking at the world. In science, explanations are restricted to those that can be inferred from [experimental] data that can be substantiated by other scientists,” noting that “anything that can be observed or measured is amenable to scientific investigation. Explanations that cannot be

³⁶Bahnsen, *Always Ready*, 181. Emphases added.

based on empirical evidence are not part of science.”³⁷ Yet, some of our greatest discoveries in the Twentieth Century were in the atomic and sub-atomic worlds which were unseen and depend upon unseen metaphysical principles.

Third, this complaint is irrelevant to *biblical* metaphysics. Christian metaphysics is not an arbitrary, groping in the dark effort that blindly leaps from sense experience to the supra-sensical world.³⁸ The Christian metaphysic is God-revealed, being drawn from the divinely inscripturated, objective revelation of the Creator in the Bible. Therefore, any anti-metaphysical argument is established on anti-theistic presuppositions which deny the existence of God. Such an unproved assumption shuts the door on supra-sensical knowledge drawn from God’s own self revelation in Scripture, which is the very point at issue in our debate with the unbeliever. The unbeliever is therefore simply loudly asserting his disbelief in God as his foundational assumption.

Thus, the believing worldview operates on the presupposition of the infallible revelation of the Creator. Knowledge of basic metaphysical realities do not cause problems within the Christian worldview because the personal, eternal, omniscient, omnipotent Creator who governs all things has sovereignly declared them—metaphysical realities such as God’s existence, his governing by a rational plan, and his revealing to us the basics of our metaphysical environment.³⁹

³⁷*Teaching About Evolution and the Nature of Science* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1998), chapter 3 available on-line: <http://www.nap.edu/readingroom/books/evolution98/evol3.html>.

³⁸The stinging (and unbelieving) wit of Ambrose Bierce in his *The Devil’s Dictionary* captures this anti-metaphysical bias when he defines “religion”: “Religion, n. A daughter of Hope and Fear, explaining to Ignorance the nature of the Unknowable.”

³⁹Bahnsen, *Always Ready*, 189.

6. Anti-metaphysical claims are destructive. Regarding the claim that all knowledge must derive from our senses you should point out to the anti-metaphysical objector that:

First, the anti-metaphysical claim is self-contradictory. How can we know that “all knowledge must derive from our senses?” This claim is not found in the objective world of sense experience. Have you ever sensed it in the real world? It is a non-material, mental construct. This sort of self-refuting argument illustrates Paul’s statement “they became futile in their speculations” (Rom. 1:21).

Second, the anti-metaphysical claim is presuppositional in nature. The claim does not allow for any empirical verification since it deals with the totality of reality in that it asserts that “*all* knowledge must derive from our senses” (yet no man can comprehend all of reality) and is *necessarily* so in that it requires that “all knowledge *must* derive from our senses” (therefore it is not a truth dependent on the changing circumstances of the sense experience world of science). In the final analysis, this claim is a dogmatic assertion rather than an empirical conclusion.

Third, the anti-metaphysical claim destroys the very possibility of science. As we will explain in more detail in our next lesson, science absolutely depends upon the uniformity of nature (so that experiments under controlled conditions can produce predictable results everywhere) and the assurance that the future will be like the past (so that experiments can predict future results). These two *metaphysical* claims allow scientists to generalize and project. Consequently, any anti-metaphysical complaint undermines science itself.

Fourth, the anti-metaphysical claim destroys reason. Empirical learning and reasoning would be impossible without these and other metaphysical assumptions. As we noted earlier, epistemology depends upon metaphysics. To evaluate arguments requires that we employ

propositions, logical relations, and so forth. And these are not discovered through the senses, even though they are necessary to reason itself.⁴⁰

7. Anti-metaphysical bias is anti-Christian. As a Christian you instinctively recognize that by the very nature of the anti-metaphysics position, the Christian worldview is *precluded* at the outset. Christianity is built upon the supra-sensical, invisible, eternal, self-contained Triune Creator of the Universe (Col. 1:15; 1 Tim. 1:17). Those opposed to metaphysical inquiry are necessarily set against the Christian worldview.

Obviously the Christian cannot adopt the anti-metaphysic for himself and still be a Christian, nor can the scientist who professes faith in Christ. In our next lesson based on the second part of this lecture, though, we will show how you *can* stand on the unbeliever's assumptions and adopt an anti-metaphysical worldview *for sake of argument in order to show its impossibility*.

8. Anti-metaphysical bias is sinfully motivated. In the final analysis and given *your* worldview, you must understand that lurking below this anti-metaphysic is sinful rebellion against God. Dr. Bahnsen provides spiritual insights into this rejection of metaphysics (and therefore the very possibility of God): "Men will, as it were, build a roof over their heads in hopes of keeping out any distressing revelation from a transcendent God. The anti-metaphysical perspective of the modern age functions as just such a protective ideological roof for the unbeliever."⁴¹

We have already noted in our introduction to this lesson that this is precisely what Paul teaches in Romans 1: The unbeliever "suppresses the truth *in unrighteousness*" (Rom. 1:18b) so

⁴⁰Bahnsen, *Always Ready*, 188.

⁴¹Bahnsen, *Always Ready*, 183.

that they become “futile in their speculations” (Rom. 1:21b). Though man is created in the image of God to know and serve the Lord, he actively suppresses the truth to shield himself from the ensuing guilt before his Maker and Judge, just as Adam attempted to hide his nakedness and himself from God when he sinned against him (Gen. 3:7, 10; cp. Job 31:33).

Opposition to metaphysics is often associated with anti-religious sentiment. For instance, consider the following admissions by secularists:

Chauncey Wright [1830–1875] was an American philosopher of science of the second half of the nineteenth century and an early proponent of Darwinism in the United States. Sometimes cited as a founder of pragmatism, he is more appropriately remembered as an incisive and original philosophical thinker in the tradition of British empiricism. Because of his empiricism and positivist spirit, he exercised a great influence at a crucial time in American cultural life—in the 1860s and 70s, when the influence of religious piety and Transcendentalism was waning. Wright was a tireless critic of metaphysics and the natural theology he believed it served.⁴²

* * * * *

Even non-believing philosophers suspect improper motives in the outright rejection of metaphysics. Philosopher W. H. Walsh wrote: “It must be allowed that the reaction against [metaphysics] has been . . . so violent indeed as to

⁴²“Chauncey Wright,” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/wright>).

suggest that the issues involved in the controversy must be something more than academic.”⁴³

Conclusion

The modern bias against metaphysics is to be expected, given your Christian worldview. The doctrine of sin anticipates it; the express revelation of God asserts it. You must be prepared to respond to the anti-metaphysical outlook, showing its self-destructive character. Dr. Bahnsen is equipping you for just such an endeavor.

II. Exegetical Observations

The problem we are confronting in this lesson is the modern bias against metaphysics. In our last point analyzing the bias, we noted that ultimately this attitude is a sinful effort to escape God’s judgment. In Psalm 139 we see a poetic portrayal of David’s attempt to escape the all-seeing eye of God. If this characterizes the believer (i.e., David) in his relationship to God, how much more does it portray the unbeliever’s stronger motivation to avoid accountability before God? A quick survey of Psalm 139 highlights the matter for us.

The metaphysical reality of the one True God known to man in both general and special revelation confronts man at all times and in every place (Ps. 19:1, 4). Man knows the all-seeing, all-evaluating eye of the all-creating, everywhere-present God is always watching him (Rom. 1:19–21). David poetically considers various means of escape from God’s penetrating analysis, all of which are futile in that God is his Creator and perfectly knows him.

⁴³W. H. Walsh, *Metaphysics* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1963), 12. Cited in *Always Ready*, 182.

David opens with a statement regarding God's omniscience. He admits that "thou has searched me and known me" (Ps. 139:1). The verb tense "has searched" in Hebrew really expresses a *continual* searching. The Hebrew word itself literally means "to dig," as in digging for gold (Job 28:3). But here it is used metaphorically to express deep moral contemplation and evaluation by means of a full investigation. This is the same God of whom another psalmist asks: "Would not God find this out? For He knows the secrets of the heart" (Ps. 44:21; cp. Job 13:9; Jer. 12:3; 17:10; Acts 15:8; 1 Jn. 3:20). The result of such a penetrating analysis is that God knows him fully.

The Psalmist illustrates this from several angles, each of which reflects the omniscience of God. Though the Lord created the entire enormous universe (Gen. 1:1; Ex. 20:11), though he calls all the innumerable stars by their names (Isa. 40:26), he knows even this one puny man's action in life: "thou dost know when I set down and when I rise up" (Ps. 139:2a; 2 Kings 19:27). That is, every time David is at rest, and every time he is in motion, God knows it full well. God knows him in every circumstance of his human experience. This is just as we would expect in our presuppositional metaphysic wherein God is the necessary foundation to human experience.

What is more, "thou dost understand my thought from afar" (v. 2b; cp. Psa. 94:11). This does not mean simply that God knows each successive thought that David has, but that he knows everything about his every thought: its origin, motivation, moral character, and tendency. God knows absolutely *everything* about David's every thought. Though men can only know things about you when near to you, by hearing you speak, or watching you act, God knows your very internal thoughts "from afar." This is remarkable in that "God [is] in the height of heaven, look also at the distant stars, how high they are!" (Job 22:12).

David returns to God's full knowledge of his motion in the earth: "Thou dost scrutinize my path and my lying down, and art intimately acquainted with all my ways" (Psa. 139:3; cp. Job 31:4; 28:24; 34:21; Prov. 5:21). Once again, God knows when he is in motion (on the "path") and at rest ("lying down"). He knows both the active and passive situations of life for he is "intimately acquainted with all my ways."

He returns once again to God's knowledge of his inner-most thoughts: "Even before there is a word on my tongue, behold, O Lord, Thou dost know it all" (Ps. 139:4). As noted in verse 2 God knows his very thoughts, so he knows what word is about to come out of his mouth at any moment.

Now he transitions from God's omniscience to his omnipresence: "Thou hast enclosed me behind and before, and laid Thy hand upon me" (Ps. 139:5; cp. 34:7; 125:2). God surrounds him on all sides, in front and behind. The idea of God's surrounding him from *above* is hinted at in the fact that God's hand is "upon" me.

With all of this awareness of God's omniscience and omnipresence, David is overwhelmed: "Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is too high, I cannot attain to it" (Ps. 139:6). This signifies his understanding that God's knowledge is beyond comprehension. As a creature he knows he cannot attain such knowledge himself. He is acknowledging the Creator/creature distinction so essential to the believing worldview: two levels of reality exist, God and all else. As such, God's knowledge is beyond attainment for the creature. The finite creature cannot fully comprehend the knowledge of the infinite, eternal Creator (Job 11:7-8; Isa. 55:9; Rom. 11:33).

What is he to do then? He knows he is a sinner. But there is nothing he can do, for he cannot escape the all-seeing, everywhere-present God: "Where can I go from Thy Spirit? Or

where can I flee from Thy presence? If I ascend to heaven, Thou art there; If I make my bed in Sheol, behold, Thou art there” (Ps. 139:7–8; cp. 1 Kgs. 8:27; 2 Chron. 2:6; Jer. 23:24). This presents us with a *desire* to escape judgment, and reminds us of God’s declaration through his prophet Amos where he warns sinful nations that they cannot hide from God: “Though they dig into Sheol, from there shall My hand take them; and though they ascend to heaven, from there will I bring them down” (Amos 9:2–4; cp. Job 26:6; Prov. 15:11).

He cannot escape by fleeing to the place where the sun dawns or the where it sets over the sea, for God is there also: “If I take the wings of the dawn, if I dwell in the remotest part of the sea, even there Thy hand will lead me, and Thy right hand will lay hold of me” (Ps. 139:9–10). Nor does darkness hide Him, for to God darkness is as the brightest day: all is easily visible to him: “If I say, ‘Surely the darkness will overwhelm me, and the light around me will be night,’ even the darkness is not dark to Thee, and the night is as bright as the day. Darkness and light are alike to Thee” (139:11–12; cp. Job 22:13).

Not only does God know all because he is omniscient and omnipresent, but because he even created David. God formed his “inward parts” and “didst weave” him in his “mother’s womb” (Ps. 139:13), he structured David’s skeletal “form” (139:15; cp. Job 10:8–10; Eccl 11:5) even creating him as an embryo (“unformed substance”) (139:16). This comports well with the fact that man has an inner awareness of God (Rom. 1:19a), in that God intimately created him from the inside out. David has even poetically thought that he might perhaps flee back to his mother’s womb, hoping to hide from God there. But God was involved in the very formation of his body and spirit therein.

As a true believer, David must ultimately give praise to God for all of this: “I will give thanks to Thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; wonderful are Thy works, and my soul

knows it very well” (Ps. 139:14). God’s metaphysical reality is such that he controls all the days of David’s life—from even before he was born: “Thine eyes have seen my unformed substance; and in Thy book they were all written, the days that were ordained for me, when as yet there was not one of them” (139:16).

In the final analysis, the true believer realizes the glory and necessity of God’s almighty being, for it gives meaning, significance, and value to his entire life and experience: “How precious also are Thy thoughts to me, O God! How vast is the sum of them! If I should count them, they would outnumber the sand. When I awake, I am still with Thee” (Ps. 139:17–18; cp. 40:5). Though the believer may be “anxious” at God’s searching, he knows it is for his ethical good: “Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me and know my anxious thoughts; and see if there be any hurtful way in me, and lead me in the everlasting way” (vv. 23–24).

Rather than the unbeliever actually having autonomy⁴⁴ (being a law unto himself), he is fully known and governed by God. The believer ultimately finds comfort in this; the unbeliever suppresses this truth because he, too, knows God’s ethical evaluation. He seeks to flee it, since he has no Redeemer to shield him from God’s wrath: “For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness” (Rom 1:18).

III. Questions Raised

1. What is the modern mind’s pre-disposition toward metaphysics? When did this begin?

⁴⁴Autonomy derives from two Greek words: *auto* (“self”) and *nomos* (“law”). It effectively means “self law,” or “self rule.” Human autonomy asserts that man’s reasoning is the ultimate criterion of knowledge.

2. Among those who tolerate metaphysics, which do they deem more basic, metaphysics or epistemology? Why?
3. State five of the seven responses we provide against the anti-metaphysical bias of today.
4. Explain why Dr. Bahnsen claims that epistemology is not neutral. What are the two basic epistemological methodologies available to man?
5. How does the record of Adam and Eve help us see that epistemology is non-neutral?
6. In the Christian worldview, what are the two levels of reality? Explain why the “two levels of reality” are important.
7. Why is metaphysics necessary to epistemology so that our scientific method itself must involve a basic metaphysic?
8. In what way is anti-metaphysical hostility considered to be “uncritical” and naive?
9. Given the Christian’s starting point with God, explain how we can avoid the charge of circular reasoning.

IV. Practical Application

1. Survey the letters to the editor and editorials in your daily paper and cut out those that give evidence of an anti-metaphysical bias. Read them at a Christian Bible study and lead a discussion regarding the anti-metaphysical mind set hidden in our thought patterns today.
2. Go on-line or consult a science text book and read about ten pages of the opening material. Jot down evidences of anti-metaphysical bias. Analyze the offending statements in their contexts to see if you can discern the “uncritical” nature of the evidence therein.
3. Discuss with a Christian friend as to whether or not setting aside the question of metaphysics is sinful.

4. Read and discuss with a non-Christian friend the news article on the problem of teaching “Intelligent Design” in the public schools. Discuss the metaphysical implications of this contemporary debate. (www.csmonitor.com/2004/1123/p11s02-legn.html)
5. Search the Internet and compile a list of Christian apologetics sites that discuss the issue of metaphysics and science. Save these in a file for your future research.
6. Write a paper for a college science class on the necessity of metaphysics to science.
7. Read and study Psalm 139, using the brief study above. Lead a Bible study where you bring out some of the apologetical implications of the passage.

V. Recommended Reading

Alston, William P., “What is Naturalism, that we Should be Mindful of It?”:

www.leaderu.com/aip/docs/alston-naturalism.html

“Are Evolutionists the One’s with Closed Minds?”: www.answersingenesis.org/docs/506.asp

Bahnsen, Greg L. *Always Ready*, chapter 31.

“How Can You Believe in Creation When There is No God?”:

www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v9/i4/atheists.asp

Jones, Doug, “The Futility of Non-Christian Thought”: www.reformed.org/apologetics/martin-jones/jones_martin1.html

Safari, John, “If God Created the Universe, then Who Created God?”:

www.answersingenesis.org/tj/v12/i1/universe.asp

Scott, Ian, “Anti-God Philosophies of Science”:

www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v3/i4/anti_god.asp

“So You’re Doing a Report on Creation vs. Evolution?”:

www.answersingenesis.org/cec/docs/CvE_report.asp

Unfred, David, “Evolution as Philosophy”:

www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v4/i3/philosophy.asp