June 4, 1982

Stephen D. Rook 3023 Woodsong Drive Midlothian, Virginia 23113

Dr. John Warwick Montgomery 2530 Shadow Ridge Lane Orange, California 92667

Dear Dr. Montgomery,

Enclosed are some questions and points I would very much like to discuss with you as part of my research of your apologetic method.

In an effort to make this as convenient as possible for you may I offer some suggestions? First, call me <u>collect</u> at your convenience. My telephone number is (804) 744-9041. Second, if possible send me a note indicating the day and approximate time of your call. Third, with your permission I would like to record our telephone conversation.

Of course, if you prefer you may respond by letter but I know you are very busy and your time is extremely valuable and I would be happy for you to call me <u>collect</u>.

I look forward to hearing from you soon. Thank you very much.

Sincerely. us Rook

Stephen D. Rook



QUESTIONS re Stephen Rook's M.A. thesis, "Historical Objectivism: The Apologetic Methodology of John Warwick Montgomery."

- 1. What person do you feel has had the greatest influence on your aplogetic method?
- 2. How has your approach changed over the years, if at all?
- 3. Van Til has described his philosophy of history as Augustinian. Who or what do you feel has had the greatest influence on your historiography?
- 4. In view of such passages as Acts 2:22-36; 1 John 1:1ff.; Acts 1:1ff., et al., wouldn't it seem that men can gain certain knowledge from empirical observation?
- 5. Do you see the analytical method (verification-falsification) as the only way to prove or explain things? Is a "sound" argument (Where the premises are true and the argument is valid) a possible means of arriving at truth.
- 6. Discuss: If a proposition is logically necessary then it is a purely formal one, and this does not explain anything.
- 7. As you know a major criticism of the verifiability principle is that since it is neither analytic nor synthetic it must be nonsensical, thus it is self-contradictory. In a footnote in <u>The Suicide of Christian Theology</u>, p. 352, you said this objection has been effectively met by Ayer, who argues that the Principle is a definition and Hempel, who argues that it is a linguistic proposal which is itself neither true nor false. Could you elaborate please?
- 8. In your "Sensible Christianity" lectures you say Copleston's argument from contingency is "as sound as can be." Does this imply certain knowledge of God?
- 9. In <u>Faith Founded on Fact</u>, p. 97. you say, "No religion is deducible from self-evident a prioris." Would you agree that God is deducible from empirical facts? For example, given the creation (universe, earth, humankind) may one deduce the existence of God (Not, of course, an entire system of religion but the existence of a Supreme Being)? Is God deducible from self-evident truths such as for example the law of thought?

neoniolis resplantant sone is ... treate. " interies! Objectivient: neoniologicity hetroad ver of some activity materials."

- . hat nerson no you sel has havene greatest in luence on your a
  - All ta it years and even subserves the years, in any week.
- . so fit has deadribed die milosons of bistory as usustinien. Motorrynde do rot feel has nad the greatest influence on your disboriorrathy:
- . The jew of such hisdeges is acts at 24 b; 1 John 1:1 \* ; acts (thre,; et al., youldn't is seen that wer can air contain know-

5. Do vou see the melytical method (vorification-falselication) so the only wive to prove or explain things: 18 a "sound" argue work ( here the inclused are the off the transmittic visit) a mossible terms of surving of think.

. La son know a salor eriticias of the verification mineritle is that dince it is meither contradictory of another monoer ical, thus it is sale-contradictory. In a fortote is the cuicide of Obristian (bestlow, 1. 5%, you said init objection is been erestively act by rev, who are use that the mineritle is operiation and memori, who are not it is a linguistic sector of the cuicide of soliter the true new rites.

. In faith Rotader > faul. 2. 1. you day. "No well ion is decue: Anow self-evident a trioris." soul you gree the test is denucible from envirical forts' for eranale. Fiven the restion (not reple, earth, musukind) hav one doduce the existence of for (.st, of source, as estire evotem of religion but the existence of a supreme Rain.) is on the ucible from self-evident truchs

durate to wal and alimpica not thought