

"Everything I have said and done in these last years is relativism by intuition.... If relativism signifies contempt for fixed categories and men who claim to be bearers of an objective, immortal truth... then there is nothing more relativistic than fascistic attitudes and activity.... From the fact that all ideologies are of equal value, that all ideologies are mere fictions, the modern relativist infers that everybody has the right to create for himself his own ideology and to attempt to enforce it with all the energy of which he is capable." -- Mussolini¹

Defining Terms, Sorta'

Before we start, I wish to briefly list the five different strains of relativism listed in J.P. Moreland's (professor of *philosophy of religion* at Biola University) book, *Scaling the Secular City*, the reason for this is merely to show the breadth of this philosophical position:

1. Cultural or Descriptive Relativism
2. Normative Relativism or Conventionalism
3. Metaethical or Conceptual Relativism
4. Ethical Skepticism
5. The Principle of Tolerance²

Although I wish not to get into an integrated discussion and refutation of each of the above, I will simplify the matter at hand as best as is allowed in this short dissertation that I am attempting to put forward:

"Is Truth Correspondent or Coherent?"

These are the two most basic views of truth. If a person states that something is true (see footnote # 3 for instance) if it corresponds to reality, the other, that that something is true if it coheres or holds together as an internally consistent set of statements (e.g., is there one big truth or are there many little truths). Simply put, Truth is "*telling it like it is*," in the former; in the latter it is "*whatever works*." The latter compares truth to a web hanging in space so that its own network of connections upholds it. Like a chain, each link is dependent on the others to hold it together. The former has a referent that is its "*first principle*," so-to-speak.

Saying that there are degrees of truth, as the coherentist does, and that all truths are dependant on others is just another way of saying that "*all truth is relative*."³ If all statements are dependent (contingent) on the system, then no truth can be absolute. Even the system as a whole is not absolute, because it depends on the coherence of all of its contingent parts. If one statement can be *more* or *less* true than another statement, isn't that the same as saying that "*its truth is relative to the truth of the other?*"

The *Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy* defines relativism as, "*the denial that there are certain kinds of universal truths*" (p. 790). It goes on to quote Richard Rorty (a "*neo-pragmatist*," or so-called⁴) as

¹ Mussolini, *Diuturna* pp. 374-77, quoted in *A Refutation of Moral Relativism: Interviews with an Absolutist* (Ignatius Press; 1999), by Peter Kreeft, p. 18.

² J. P. Moreland, *Scaling the Secular City: A Defense of Christianity* (Baker Books; 1987), p. 274; "*relativism*."

³ "...any theory of knowledge, truth, morality, etc,..." *Random House Webster's College Dictionary* (Random House; 1995), under "*relativism*."

⁴ Christopher Norris, *Against Relativism: Philosophy of Science, Deconstruction and Critical Theory* (Blackwell; 1997), p. 3.

saying, “*objective truth’ is no more and no less than the best idea we currently have about how to explain what is going on.*”⁵

I wish to state that I somewhat understand the “*space – time*” aspects of truth as well, but this is all pomp and circumstance. Lets see where it all leads in its base philosophy. Every philosophical theory of *what truth is* has its origins in our origins.

Foundations

If evolutionary theories are correct, then *truth statements* in areas of knowledge, and morality are nothing more than the selfish tools of survival, which appear in our minds at a certain – but not final – evolutionary stage. Consequently, there is no ultimate objective basis for morality (or, truth); humans create their own standards. Since the only objective reality that exists is the natural world, and it is in constant evolutionary flux (space-time), our ideas about right and wrong are constantly changing as well. Or what we perceive as true today may not be in our evolutionary future. The result? Relativism!

The influential legal theorist, Oliver Wendell Holmes, an avowed Darwinist, taught that laws are merely a codification of political policies judged to be socially and economically advantageous. Law is reduced to a managerial skill used in the service of social engineering then. Another key influential figure, who was an avowed Darwinian as well, was John Dewey who said:

“There is no God and no soul. Hence, there are no needs for the props or traditional religion. With dogma and creed excluded, then immutable [unchangeable] truth is also dead and buried. There is no room for fixed natural law or permanent moral absolutes.”⁶

If human beings are part of nature and nothing more, he reasoned, then the mind is simply an organ that has evolved from lower forms in the struggle for existence – just as wings and claws evolved – and *its value* depends on whether it works (is coherent?), whether it enables the organism to survive. Dewey, the father of modern educational philosophy, rejected the traditional belief that an idea is an insight into objective reality, to be judged by whether it is true or false.

Holmes went so far as to say that our laws are mere feelings, “*but since no one else’s ([feelings] no matter how numerous) are any better, I’ll impose mine and not theirs.*”⁷ Our thirteenth president, Calvin Coolidge, disagrees with the two before mentioned figures. He knew that absolutes existed when he said:

“*Men do not make laws. They do but discover them. Laws... must rest on the eternal foundation of righteousness.*”⁸

A popular textbook commented on this when it took the moral position that, “*We must recognize that judgments about good and bad, moral and immoral, depend very much on who is doing the judging [those in power]; there is no universal standard to appeal to.*”⁹

⁵ Edited by Robert Audi, *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy* (Cambridge Univ; 1999), p. 790.

⁶ Gary Kah, *En Route to Global Occupation* (Huntington House; 1991), p. 60.

⁷ Edited by Robert P. George, *Natural Law Theory* (Oxford Univ; 1992), p. 230.

⁸ Charles Colson & Nancy Pearcey, *How Now Shall We Live?* (Tyndale; 1999), p. 93.

Justice Without Absolutes?

The French Revolution was fueled by rhetoric about the “*rights of man.*” Yet without a foundation in the Judeo-Christian teaching of creation, there is no way to say what human nature is. **Who defines it? Who says how it ought to be treated?** As a result, life is valued only as much as those in power choose to value it. Small wonder that the French Revolution – with its slogan, “*Neither God Nor Master,*” quickly led to tyranny accompanied by the guillotine. The American Revolution had its slogan as well, and it goes to show how different the understanding of human nature was in these two revolutions. The end result of our freedom also goes to show the validity in “*the eternal foundation of righteousness*”¹⁰ in which they were set. (Tellingly, the Revolutionary slogan of the U. S. was, “*No King But King Jesus!*”¹¹)

According to C. S. Lewis (professor of medieval and Renaissance literature at Oxford and Cambridge universities, and a philosopher in his own right) one source of the “*poison of subjectivism,*” as he called it, is the belief that man is the product of blind evolutionary process:

“After studying his environment man has begun to study himself. Up to that point, he had assumed his own reason and through it seen all other things. Now, his own reason has become the object: it is as if we took out our eyes to look at them. Thus studied, his own reason appears to him as the epiphenomenon which accompanies chemical or electrical events in a cortex which is itself the by-product of a blind evolutionary process. His own logic, hitherto the king whom events in all possible worlds must obey, becomes merely subjective. There is no reason for supposing that it yields truth.”

¹²

Self Refuting (Alvin Plantinga’s “Tar Baby”)

Again, relativism claims that all *so-called* truth is relative, that there really is no absolute truth, but that different things (whatever they may be) may be true for me but not for you. This is at times called *perspectivalism*.

Statement: There is no such thing as absolute truth; [or alternatively, there are many truths.]

Is this philosophy of relativism making the statement that this is the ultimate, absolute truth about truth? In that case, **it actually asserts what it denies**, and so is self-deleting, simply logically incoherent as a philosophical position¹³ and in violation of the *Law of non-contradiction* (LNC), one of the most important laws of logical thought.¹⁴ I will show some common – *everyday* – rebukes that show how people contradict themselves, thus undermining what in fact they are trying to assert.

⁹ Ian Robertson, *Sociology* (Worth; 1981), p. 68. < from: <http://www.discovery.org/w3/discovery.org/views/lewismat.html>

¹⁰ See footnote #8.

¹¹ http://homeschool.crosswalk.com/partner/Article_Display_Page/0,,PTID74453%7CCCHID194888%7CCIID512704,00.html

¹² C. S. Lewis, “*The Poison of Subjectivism,*” *Christian Reflections* (Eerdmans; 1967), p. 72.

¹³ Tom Morris, *Philosophy for Dummies* (IDG Books; 1999), p. 46

¹⁴ “...is considered the foundation of logical reasoning,” Manuel Velasquez, *Philosophy: A Text with Readings* (Wadsworth; 2001), p. 51. “*A theory in which this law fails...is an inconsistent theory*”, edited by Ted Honderich, *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, (Oxford Univ; 1995), p. 625.

YOU SHOULDN'T FORCE YOUR MORALITY ON ME!¹⁵

First Person: "You shouldn't force your morality on me."

Second Person: "Why not?"

First Person: "Because I don't believe in forcing morality."

Second Person: "If you don't believe in it, then by all means, don't do it. Especially don't force that moral view of yours on me."

First Person: "You shouldn't push your morality on me."

Second Person: "I'm not entirely sure what you mean by that statement. Do you mean I have no right to an opinion?"

First Person: "You have a right to your opinion, but you have no right to force it on anyone."

Second Person: "Is that your opinion?"

First Person: "Yes."

Second Person: "Then why are you forcing it on me?"

First Person: "But your saying your view is right."

Second Person: "Am I wrong?"

First Person: "Yes."

Second Person: "Then your saying only your view is right, which is the very thing you objected to me saying."

First Person: "You shouldn't push your morality on me."

Second Person: "Correct me if I'm misunderstanding you here, but it sounds to me like your telling me I'm wrong."

First Person: "You are."

Second Person: "Well, you seem to be saying my personal moral view shouldn't apply to other people, but that sounds suspiciously like you are applying your moral view to me. Why are you forcing your morality on me?"

SELF-DEFEATING

- "Most of the problems with our culture can be summed up in one phrase: 'Who are you to say?'" – Dennis Prager.

So let's unpack this phrase and see how it is self-refuting, or as Tom Morris¹⁶ put it, self-deleting.

When someone says, "Who are you to say?" answer with, "Who are you to say 'Who are you to say?'"¹⁷

This person is challenging your right to correct another, yet she is correcting you. Your response to her amounts to "Who are you to correct my correction, if correcting in itself is wrong?" or "If I don't have

¹⁵ Francis Beckwith & Gregory Koukl, *Relativism: Feet Planted in Mid-Air* (Baker Books; 1998), p. 144-146.

¹⁶ Tom Morris, *Philosophy for Dummies* (IDG Books; 1999), p. 46

¹⁷ Francis Beckwith & Gregory Koukl, *Relativism: Feet Planted in Mid-Air* (Baker Books; 1998), p. 144-146.

the right to challenge your view, then why do you have the right to challenge mine?" Her objection is self-refuting; you're just pointing it out.

The "*Who are you to say?*" challenge fails on another account. Taken at face value, the question challenges one's authority to judge another's conduct. It says, in effect, "*What authorizes you to make a rule for others? Are you in charge?*" This challenge miscasts my position. I don't expect others to obey me simply because I say so. I'm appealing to reason, not asserting my authority. It's one thing to force beliefs; it's quite another to state those beliefs and make an appeal for them.

The "*Who are you to say?*" complaint is a cheap shot. At **best** it's self-defeating. It's an attempt to challenge the legitimacy of your moral judgments, but the statement itself implies a moral judgment. At **worst**, it legitimizes anarchy!

MORAL DUTY

Our language is another key that reveals what we really believe. It's virtually impossible for someone who believes in the truthfulness of relativism to communicate in a way that is consistent with his or her beliefs. The words we use for speech testify to our deepest intuitions about the surrounding world we live in.

In speaking with said person, you can usually show them to be inconsistent in only a few minutes when moral words like *should* or *ought* creep into the conversation. When these words appear, you should show the relativist how they are undermining their own stated position. You see, morality is in our nature, it is built in. Human beings have an innate capacity to reason in moral categories and to make moral judgments. Instead of arguing *for* morality, we simply ask a question or make a comment that gets the person in touch with his or her own moral intuition. We *then* ask her to make sense out of her response in light of her relativism. Most will recognize this as the Socratic method.

A CHALLENGE IN THE CLASSROOM¹⁸

TEACHER: "Welcome, students. This is the first day of class, and so I want to lay down some ground rules. First, since no one person has the truth, you should be **open-minded** to the **opinions** of your fellow students. Second... Elizabeth, do you have a question?"

ELIZABETH: "Yes I do. If nobody has the truth, isn't that a good reason for me not to listen to my fellow students? After all, if nobody has the truth, why should I waste my time listening to other people and their opinions? What's the point? Only if somebody has the truth does it make sense to be open-minded. Don't you agree?"

TEACHER: "No, I don't. Are you claiming to know the truth? Isn't that a bit arrogant and dogmatic?"

ELIZABETH: "Not at all. Rather I think it's dogmatic, as well as arrogant, to assert that no single person on earth knows the truth. After all, have you met every single person in the world and quizzed him or her exhaustively? If not, how can you make such a claim? Also, I believe it is actually the opposite of arrogance to say that I will alter my opinions to fit the truth whenever and wherever I find

¹⁸ Francis Beckwith & Gregory Koukl, *Relativism: Feet Planted in Mid-Air* (Baker Book House; 1998), p. 74. This quote is referenced to Allan Bloom, and, I am assuming to his book *The Closing of the American Mind* (Simon & Schuster; 1987). Although I have read this book, quite some time ago, I can't recall if I came across such a conversation.

it. Moreover, if I happen to think that I have good reason to believe I do know truth and would like to share it with you, why wouldn't you listen to me? Why would you automatically discredit my opinion before it is even uttered? I thought we were supposed to listen to everyone's opinion."

Politics & The Modern Liberal Contradiction

ARBITRARY VALUES / RELATIVISM

In many cases, "modern liberal" positions are based on the idea of tolerance, the freedom of the individual to do as he or she pleases. This in turn is based on *moral relativism*, the idea that morality is relative to the individual and the situation (which distinguishes it from "classical liberalism"). Again, what is right or wrong for you may not be right or wrong for others. As a result, you cannot tell others **not** to have an abortion, **not** to look at or publish pornography, or **not** to live by an "alternative lifestyle." Educational environments must be "value free," there must be no restrictions on sexual and artistic freedom, and according to some, even activities such as recreational drug use should be decriminalized. Because there are no absolute values, each person must discover his own morality, a process taught in our schools as "values clarification."

The liberal contradiction lies in the fact that every liberal position claims to be morally correct and objectively true. It is right to allow abortions and wrong to oppose them. Tolerance (in its modern definition) is good, intolerance is bad. Children should be allowed to grow up in a value-free environment; parents should not impose their own values. Modern liberalism takes a moral stance on **every** issue, but it undermines its own foundation by claiming that there is no moral absolute or guide to adhere to.

To put it into simple terms, yet once more, when a liberal tells you that you cannot tell other people what to do, he or she is contradicting himself by telling you what to do! And there is another side to the liberal contradiction. While many liberal positions are based on tolerance and complete individual freedom, other liberal positions are based on strict authoritarianism.

According to contemporary liberalism, the common good (what Rousseau called "the general will") necessitates the suppression of individual rights when it comes to "saving" the environment, creating a more "equitable distribution" of wealth, achieving "equality" between races and sexes in all walks of life, and enforcing a strict separation of church and state. Paradoxically, that same "common good" takes a back seat to individual freedoms when it comes to the detrimental effects of: pornography and sexual freedom, reduced police power and criminal punishment, or drug use, or firearm mandates, etc..

Let me hasten to add that I too am for tolerance, equal rights, and ending unjust discrimination. I too am for freedom of speech, artistic freedom, academic freedom, and the separation of church and state. I too am for protecting the environment and helping the underprivileged. But I am for these things because I believe in the tenants of the Judeo-Christian moral tradition, not because I reject these absolutes.

If I were to reject the idea of moral truths, *what possible motivation* (moral duty) could I have to champion these or any other causes? More important, *on what basis* could I hope to persuade others of the importance of these causes? It is inconsistent to claim to be concerned about rights while rejecting the moral foundation from which rights are derived.

The rejection of one's own moral foundation leads one to be not only immoral, but also illogical. It leads to positions that are inconsistent with themselves and each other (self-deleting). It leads to outcomes that directly counter one's original intention and that threaten one's own goals. It is unfortunate for the liberal agenda, but the liberal contradiction poses just such a threat. And it is not a threat from "conservatives" or from any outside source – it is a threat from within. Because of the rejection of the moral foundation for liberalism, liberalism is failing to protect the rights it claims to cherish. "What is is?" Please Mr. President!

MULTICULTURALISM

Dennis Prager has two examples of deleterious effects of "multiculturalism" as a way of pushing relativism on young mind's as a coherent whole... until moral issues are discussed. Then the "man" behind the wall¹⁹ – the moral conscience of every individual placed there by God – comes alive.²⁰

In the secular university in the United States there is a massive movement toward what is called multiculturalism. In theory, it means the celebration of many cultures, which obviously, I am for, since I'm a member of a minority culture. I obviously want people to celebrate their cultures. But that's not what multiculturalism is about. Multiculturalism is, at its essence, an onslaught against the belief that any culture's values are better than any other culture's values.

It is ultimately an argument against the Judea-Christian tradition, which held that its values were superior. To those who hold this Judea-Christian view, however, as either (a) purely arrogant, or (b) pointless, I have a question that the late Professor Allen Bloom used to ask his students at the University of Chicago.

Bloom writes that he would enter the sophomore class where he taught, and he knew at the outset exactly what they believed – that culture determines morality. Remember, if there is no God, morality is a matter of what a culture says it is. So he would ask them the following question: Imagine that you were in the British Imperial Government in India in the 19th Century. You had complete control as Governor over the area of your jurisdiction and you were informed that the Hindus in your area were about to engage in Satee. Satee is the Hindu practice of burning a widow with her husband's corpse. Would you or would you not stop it?

Why does he ask the question? It should be obvious. If you say that you would not stop it, then you are implicitly admitting that culture entirely determines morality. Though you think widow burning is wrong, many Hindus thought it was right, and who are you to say it's wrong and stop it? But if you

¹⁹ **ROMANS 1:19; 2:14-15:** because that which is known about God is evident within them; for God made it evident to them. [...] For when Gentiles who do not have the Law do instinctively the things of the Law, these, not having the Law, are a law to themselves, in that they show the work of the Law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness and their thoughts alternately accusing or else defending them | **PROVERBS 20:27:** The spirit of man is the lamp of the Lord, Searching all the innermost parts of his being. | **Genesis 42:21:** Then they said to one another, "In truth we are guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the distress of his soul, when he begged us and we did not listen. That is why this distress has come upon us."

²⁰ [Can We Be Good Without God?](#) A written debate published by the *Catholic League*. See also Prager University's video by Paul Copan titled: "True for You but Not for Me"

would stop it, then you don't hold that all cultural values are morally equal; you really do believe in a universal morality, and that morality is not merely a matter of culture, and you would therefore impose your morality on those Hindus.

So, what did the students answer, having been given this great cognitive dissonance? "The British didn't belong in India," which is somewhat of a non-sequitur.

I would stop Satee because I believe in a God who says, "Thou shalt not murder," and it doesn't have an asterisk denoting "except for widows." Therefore, I would, with great respect to Hindu tradition, say, "You are wrong. So long as I have power here, you will not burn widows."

CONCLUSION

I will conclude with some words by some great thinkers of our time. These quotes are to show the importance of our foundations for our worldview and how *that* belief affects the environment we live in.

Schaeffer: "People have presuppositions, and they will live more consistently on the basis of these presuppositions than even they themselves may realize. By 'presuppositions' we mean the basic way an individual looks at life, his basic worldview, the grid through which he sees the world. Presuppositions rest upon that which a person considers to be the truth of what exists. People's presuppositions lay a grid for all they bring forth into the external world. Their presuppositions also provide the basis for their values and therefore the basis for their decisions. 'As a man thinketh, so he is,' is really profound. An individual is not just the product of the forces around him. He has a mind, an inner world. Then, having thought, a person can bring forth actions into the external world and thus influence it. People are apt to look at the outer theater of action, forgetting the actor who 'lives in the mind' and who therefore is the true actor in the external world. The inner thought world determines the outward action. Most people catch their presuppositions from their family and surrounding society the way a child catches measles. But people with more understanding realize that their presuppositions should be chosen after a careful consideration of what worldview is true. **When all is done, when all the alternatives have been explored, 'not many men are in the room' – that is, although worldviews have many variations, there are not many basic worldviews or presuppositions."**²¹

Once someone has a good idea of what worldview (Weltanschauung) is true, whether by a) *investigation*; or by b) *bias*, they then live out their lives according to those principles presupposed. John Stott explains, somewhat, the power of that worldview in the bringing forth "*of actions into the external world*" and influencing it.

Stott: "Every powerful movement has had its philosophy which has gripped the mind, fired the imagination and captured the devotion of its adherents. One has only to think of the Fascist and the Communist manifestos of this century, of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* on the one hand and Marx's *Das Kapital* and *The Thoughts of Chairman Mao* on the other."²² [I would include the Humanist Manifesto's I, II, and 2000 as well.]

²¹ Francis A. Schaeffer, *How Should We Then Live? The Rise and Decline of Western Thought and Culture* (Crossway Books; 1976), pp. 19-20.

²² From a radio sermon

In this world of ideas, one **cannot** logically discern what truth is without a worldview founded on a principle (dare I say “*Principle*”) that both defines *who* and *what* we are as volitional beings. The only worldview that offers a *non-self-refuting* outlook on life, purpose, and truth is the theistic one.²³ This is the only view in which one can enjoy the absolutes of morality that best hold a free society together.²⁴ Any other view is tyranny by the majority (or the few). Which has, in every sequence of world history, ended with the “*guillotine*,” so-to-speak. Unfortunately, our path here in America is one that is replacing our “*inalienable rights*” – rights that exist independent of man or government – with those rights that the ever-increasing government sees fit to define and bestow, oh so graciously, upon us. The worldview [absolutes] that the Founding Fathers used to write the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution is now in the minority, thus inhibiting our freedoms that we so dearly fought for not so long ago.

This is most evident in the fact that Americans today must obey thirty times as many laws as their great-grandfathers had to obey at the turn of the century. Federal agencies publish an average of over 200 pages of new rulings, regulations, and proposals in the *Federal Register* each business day. That growth of the federal statute book is one of the clearest measures of the increase of the government control of the citizenry...²⁵ and it’s all rooted in a worldview that has rejected moral absolutes in favor of relativism. Fyodor Dostoyevsky’s maxim rings just as true today as it did in his day, “*If God does not exist, all things are permissible*,” a statement which Sartre called the starting point of existentialism.²⁶

This age is an age of religious cacophony, as was the Roman Empire of Christ's time. From agnosticism to Hegelianism, from devil-worship to scientific rationalism, from theosophical cults to philosophies of process, virtually any worldview conceivable is offered to modern man in the **pluralistic/relativistic** marketplace of ideas. Our age is indeed in ideological and societal agony, grasping at anything and everything that can conceivably offer the ecstasy of a cosmic relationship or of a comprehensive Weltanschauung [worldview].

...What is your worldview? Moreover, is it logically “*coherent*” and defensible in all its applications?

²³ For further reading: Ronald H. Nash, *Faith & Reason: Searching for a Rational Faith* (Zondervan; 1988); Alvin Plantinga, *God and Other Minds: A Study of the Rational Justification of Belief in God* (Cornell Univ; 1967); Richard Swinburn, *The Coherence of Theism* (Oxford; 1977); Jerome I. Gellman, *Experience of God and the Rationality of Theistic Belief* (Cornell Univ; 1997); edited by Michael Beaty - Carlton Fisher - Mark Nelson, *Christian Theism and Moral Philosophy* (Mercer Univ; 1998); William Lane Craig & Quentin Smith, *Theism, Atheism and Big Bang Cosmology* (Oxford Univ; 1993); edited by Daniel Howard-Syder, *The Evidential Argument from Evil* (Indiana University; 1996); C. S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity* (Simon & Schuster; 1996); J. P. Moreland, *Love Your God With All Your Mind: The Role of Reason in the Life of the Soul* (Navpress; 1997); Alvin Plantinga and Nicholas Wolterstorff, *Faith and Rationality: Reason and Belief in God* (Notre Dame Univ; 1983).

²⁴ See, for example: Francis Canavan, *The Pluralist Game: Pluralism, Liberalism, and the Moral Conscience* (Rowman & Littlefield; 1995); Robert P. George, *Natural Law, Liberalism, and Morality* (Oxford Univ; 1996); Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (Simon & Schuster; 1987).

²⁵ James Bovard, *Lost Rights: The Destruction of American Liberty* (St. Martins Griffen; 1994), p. 1.

²⁶ Jean-Paul Sartre, *Existentialism and Humanism*, trans. Philip Mairet, pp. 32-33. Quoted in *Does God Believe in Atheists?* (Evangelical Press; 2000), p. 123.