

11/26/62 No. 9 (Cont'd)

Now then, here comes somebody with a lot of historical ideas. He says this book of Isaiah ^{n't} was written then, and ~~it's~~ ^{was} written ~~then~~ by Daniel in the Middle Ages. Well, we get busy, and we investigate/ and find that it was long before then that it was available. We can retake tax upon it, and we objectively examine them to find the answers, and I believe that the Lord has given us a definite material with which to answer a sufficient number of these problems, ^{to} help us in knowing that none of them are sufficient to destroy our faith in the Scripture. I don't think he has given us evidences that we can answer every objection that an un-believer can make, but we can find clear evidences on enough of them to give a good indication of which way the wind blows in that regard. But to say ^{now} here we just make a theory, accepted theory, we presuppose an absolute doctrine on the basis of ~~the~~ ~~fact~~ the fact that everything falls in line. ~~xxxx~~ I wonder why we presuppose Christianity, and why not presuppose Buddhism ~~or~~ ~~or~~ or Mohammedanism or something else? I don't see any basis for it. It's a step, it's a leap _____ (9.25). in regard(?) If all that you have ^{to do is to leap} in the dark, what's the point ~~of~~ of philosophy in this? You leap in the dark into something, and then ~~if~~ you say when you get here, you find all things fit together so wonderfully, ~~if~~ we integrated that ~~if~~ it gives evidences that it is true. If you can take that leap, and ^{then} find that evidence, then you can examine the evidences before you can take that step, but I don't think we can on the basis of human speculation. I don't think we can prove ~~anything~~ to any body that Christianity is true, but I think that we can logically remove false objections/ ^{to Christianity} which have been given. We can show them the fallacy of the arguments against us, but when we have done that, it's a matter of their realizing their sin and need of Saviour, and their coming to the Lord, not a matter of their accepting ^{a pre-} supposition or realizing that philosophical ~~arguments~~ ^a is unanswered. Yes, Mr. Gregory.