

THE TRINITY REVIEW

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh, for the weapons of our warfare [are] not fleshly but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And they will be ready to punish all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled. (2 Corinthians 10:3-6)

Number 373 Copyright 2023 The Trinity Foundation Post Office Box 68, Unicoi, Tennessee 37692 May, June 2023
Email: tjtrinityfound@aol.com Website: www.trinityfoundation.org Telephone: 423.743.0199 Fax: 423.743.2005

“The Grand Old Doc” or “Gordon Clark: A Presbyterian Philosopher and His Influence on American Evangelicals”

By Douglas J. Douma

Editor's Note: The Trinity Foundation will be publishing a new book by Douglas J. Douma – The Grand Old Doc: Articles on the Thought of Gordon H. Clark later this summer. This is the opening article and was first presented at the Presbyterian Scholars Conference, Wheaton College, October 22, 2019. Also included is Article 9 “Gordon Clark’s Apologetic Methodology.”

In the numerous extant letters from Edward J. Carnell to Gordon H. Clark the address is always the same; when Carnell wrote to Clark his letters were simply addressed, “Dear Doc.” Carnell is a name that should be familiar to many American Evangelicals. He was a graduate of Wheaton College, class of 1939, and later President of Fuller Seminary. But even in reaching such heights he was always the student; Clark, his former Wheaton College philosophy professor, always the Doc. When Carnell published a book of his own and sent a copy to Clark he signed his name on the first page and wrote “To the grand old ‘Doc’”

Carnell was by no means the only American Evangelical to put Clark in such a place of honor in his mind. While doing research for *The Presbyterian Philosopher, The Authorized Biography of Gordon H. Clark* I flipped through the pages of many of Dr. Clark’s books in his personal library, now housed at Sangre de Cristo Seminary

outside of Westcliffe, Colorado. In one of these books, I found a letter to Clark from Kenneth Kantzer; another name that should be familiar to many American evangelicals. Kenneth Kantzer taught theology here at Wheaton College from 1946 until 1963 and had a long connection also with Trinity Evangelical Divinity School.¹ What is particularly notable in the letter I found—the only one in fact that I’ve found between the two men—is a comment in the postscript where Kantzer writes to Clark:

As always I enjoyed greatly our short time together at E.T.S. [The Evangelical Theological Society] In a way you are the grand patriarch of us all, but I have never heard of such a young and spritely patriarch as you. On second thought “leader” is much the better word.

These designations then—from Carnell and Kantzer—set the stage for us to consider Gordon Clark’s influence on American Evangelicals. He was for them a father-figure, the grand patriarch, the grand old Doc.

¹ Todd Hertz, “Influential Teacher and Leader Kenneth Kantzer Dies,” *Christianity Today*, June 1, 2002 <https://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2002/juneweb-only/6-24-31.0.html>.

Part I – Clark’s Influence as a Professor

Clark’s influence on American Evangelicals came through his books, articles, speeches, and work in such organizations as the Evangelical Theological Society where at its inaugural meeting he helped craft its belief statement: “The Bible alone, and the Bible in its entirety, is the Word of God written and is therefore inerrant in its autographs.” But perhaps in no greater way was he influential than in his work as a professor, influencing many students in a career of sixty years teaching in the classroom (1924-1984).

Clark’s classroom influence is most notable here at Wheaton College a few generations ago. Two chapters in my *The Presbyterian Philosopher* are particularly relevant to this discussion. Chapter 4 “Gordon Clark at Wheaton College” focuses considerably on Clark’s struggles with the Wheaton College administration but also brings into view the impact that he had on his students. Clark, with the backing for a time of President J. Oliver Buswell, was instrumental in filling the ranks of Westminster Theological Seminary with graduates from Wheaton College. By the year Clark left Wheaton, thirteen of its graduates were enrolled at Westminster, constituting approximately one quarter of the seminary’s student body. I trace Clark’s influence on some of these students in Chapter 11 titled “Clark’s Boys”—a title I was inspired to choose from correspondence I had with a nonagenarian who referred to her own brother (and former Wheaton College student) affectionately as one of “Clark’s boys.”

Among these “boys” were Edward Carnell, Carl F. H. Henry, Paul Jewett, and Edmund Clowney. These Wheaton students and many others were greatly influenced by Gordon Clark and remained in correspondence with him for years after their Wheaton College days. In the biography of Edward Carnell, *The Making and Unmaking of an Evangelical Mind* by Rudolph Nelson there is a telling recollection from a Wheaton classmate of a scene from their college days. In this we see Clark as a leader. It reads:

I recall on one occasion, following a particularly lively session with Clark, that we trooped out together across the campus. Clark (who, I suppose, was about five feet

seven inches in height) was in the lead. Ed, who may have been five-ten or eleven, fell in behind Clark, walking in his footsteps with Paul Jewett next in step, *etc.* The order may not have been just so, but at least there were four or five of us imitating Clark’s gait and manner like goslings following their mother goose.²

It was not only at the college that Clark interacted with his students. Wheaton student Charles Svendsen boarded in the Clark house for a time, and Clark became, according to Svendsen’s son John, “the theological father that he never had.” Clark led the Creed Club that discussed and memorized the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, he led the chess club, and on occasion was seen at the French Club. At Wheaton as well as at Butler University—students would regularly come to Clark’s house for discussion, usually to discuss philosophy but at least once to view a slideshow of pictures that the Doc took of his beloved American Southwest. Interactions with Dr. Clark made imprints on the minds of his students such that even many years later a man I interviewed was able to say that he recalled that his own father (and former Clark student) would “regale” him with stories of the Doc.

These Wheaton students became some of the most prominent American Evangelicals. Carnell was president at Fuller, Clowney president at Westminster, Henry—perhaps the most influential of all—became editor of *Christianity Today*. When Henry, the “dean of American Evangelicals” later wrote his 6-volume mega-magnum opus *God, Revelation, and Authority*, he would say:

To no contemporary do I owe a profounder debt than to Gordon Clark. Since the thirties when he taught me medieval and modern philosophy at Wheaton, I have considered him the peer of evangelical philosophers in identifying the logical inconsistencies that beset nonevangelical

² Rudolph Nelson, *The Making and Unmaking of an Evangelical Mind*, 1988, 37.

alternatives and in exhibiting the intellectual superiority of Christian theism.³

While Clark would never have such an influence as a professor at other schools as he did at Wheaton, he had in those places substantial influence nonetheless. The late David Clyde Jones wrote to me a few years ago about this mid-twentieth century period saying, “To those of my generation—college undergraduates, 1955–1959—Dr. Clark was the philosopher-hero of the post-fundamentalism Evangelical Renaissance.” At Butler University he was the favored professor of D. Clair Davis who would go on to teach church history for almost forty years at Westminster Theological Seminary. At Winona Lake School of Theology in the summers Clark had an impact on later pastor of Moody Bible Church, Erwin Lutzer. Finally, in Clark’s later years at Covenant College he would influence the path of a number of budding theologians and pastors including Dr. Kenneth Talbot, the founder of Whitefield Theological Seminary.

Part II – Clark’s Influence as a Writer

Naturally though in the age of printed media a person’s influence can be felt far beyond their local circle. So it was—and is—that Clark’s published writings have impacted countless individuals in wider circles of both place and time. Clark dedicated a large percentage of his life to writing, and the results of that effort are noticeable. For one, Professor Allan MacRae (of Bible Presbyterian fame) wrote to Clark in 1976 praising him for doing so well to get his work out to the public. MacRae wrote,

It is a pleasure to look back on our contacts through the years. You showed yourself to be much wiser than I, by getting material into print instead of giving all your time to teaching and administration. Now the burden of extensive research carried out through the years and never written up in final form presses heavily on me. (MacRae to Clark, February 12, 1958)

Producing the corpus he did was much of the benefit of Clark having a quiet position at Butler University. There the secularists left him alone more than the Christians at other institutions ever did! And Clark’s writing really took off in those Butler years—1945 to 1973. His books at first found their way to print among well-known, even secular publishers like F. S. Crofts and Houghton Mifflin. Then several of his books were picked up by the Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company. But while Clark’s influence expanded with these books, his writing legacy remains today much because of the work of John Robbins and his publishing of Clark’s books through the Trinity Foundation starting in the year 1980.

In addition to books, Clark wrote many published articles. So far, I’ve found 352 of them! These articles may have found some influence in their time, but I suspect many of them were forgotten over the years. Now, with all of our modern search capability, more and more of them are becoming accessible.

Of the published articles Clark’s greatest influence was through the pages of *Christianity Today*. When Billy Graham and J. Nelson Bell started the newspaper and hired former Clark student Carl Henry to be the first editor, Clark was sure to play a part. In 1955 he was notified by letter from J. Nelson Bell about the proposed new magazine, and he responded noting that there had already been another paper of the same title back in the days of the Presbyterian Conflict, and that Bell should check if that paper does not still exist. (GHC to L. Nelson Bell, February 12, 1955) Ultimately, with Henry regularly asking Clark to write for the paper, Clark contributed, by my count, ninety-four articles and book reviews. This would make him one of the most frequent contributors to one of the largest Christian publications of its time.

Part III – Ways in Which Clark Failed to Influence Evangelicals

But while Gordon Clark’s influence on American evangelicals was significant through his work as a professor and as an author, his overall project in certain ways must be considered a failure. This might be for you a surprising thing to hear stated from Clark’s own biographer, especially

³ Carl F. H. Henry, *God, Revelation, and Authority*, Volume 1, 1976, 10.

considering the recent published comments of one strange man who contends I have written a hagiography.

Clark failed to influence evangelicals in three ways. First, Clark failed to influence evangelicals to become Presbyterians. Then, Clark failed to influence Presbyterians as much as he might have otherwise, for lack of an influential teaching post. And finally, Clark failed to have his overall philosophy adopted by his students.

1. Clark failed to influence evangelicals to become Presbyterians.

It is important to understand that Gordon Clark was always first and foremost a Presbyterian, a Reformed thinker. While like his mentor J. Gresham Machen he would accept the term “fundamentalist,” and while he would accept the term “evangelical” in its historical sense, he never embraced the term “neo-evangelical” carried by some of his own students. This is a mistake I regularly see repeated—calling Clark a neo-evangelical. Clark was a Presbyterian and desired to influence his students and readers also in that direction—the Reformed faith. In this objective, however, he largely failed.

To consider a concrete example, it is worth noting that almost none of “Clark’s boys” at Wheaton, who came there as Baptists, ever accepted the paedobaptism of Reformed theology. Henry, Carnell, Jewett, and Harold Lindsell accepted the Doctrines of Grace under Clark’s teaching but remained credobaptists. Under Clark’s leadership his students would often for the first time embrace Calvinist soteriology but then return to their Baptist or non-denominational roots without embracing the rest of the Reformed system. This it seems was never a big focus for Clark. Only in a few places in his writings does he spend time arguing for covenant baptism over “believer’s” or, what is more properly termed, professor’s baptism.

Among Clark’s Wheaton students, the notable Presbyterian is Edmund Clowney. But Clowney does not provide a strong counterexample to the trend because he came to Wheaton already with Presbyterian leanings. According to Clowney’s son David, “To the best of my recollection, he [Edmund] attended a Presbyterian church with my

grandparents. The church, I think, was more generally evangelical and dispensationalist than anything else, though my grandfather was a Calvinist. Dad, if I remember what he told me, felt comfortable with what he was getting from that church until he studied with Clark.”⁴

Through Clark’s life Presbyterianism was on hard times. In response to a compliment on his book *What Do Presbyterians Believe?* Clark wrote back in a letter saying, “Thank you...only there are hardly any Presbyterians.” (GHC to John Robbins, February 1, 1982) And while the lack of Presbyterians certainly cannot be solely attributed to Clark’s failure of influence, the fact that he would make such a comment indicates how small interest in the *Westminster Confession* had become. Clark had seen the demise of the great and powerful PCUSA of his early years and was left unable to find confessional Presbyterianism but in a few remnant denominations.

2. Clark failed to influence Presbyterians as much as he might have otherwise, for lack of an influential teaching post.

I’ve noted this point a few times to individuals who have asked me why the apologetics of Cornelius Van Til are better known than those of Gordon Clark. While Clark had great influence at Wheaton College, he then spent twenty-eight years at Butler University where he had few students seeking places of influence in the Christian world. Compare this to Cornelius Van Til who for over fifty years at Westminster Theological Seminary taught future Christian pastors, professors, and authors. All the while Clark was quietly working away at Butler, influencing Christianity more through his books and articles than his lectures. Only in the last ten years of Clark’s life when he was hired to teach at Covenant College did he again have a leading influence on Christian students and future leaders.

All of this might have been entirely different if not for the failure of a proposed Reformed Christian University in the 1940s. There Clark had been pegged to be its philosophy professor where he would seek to press a more academic stance for fundamentalists. I follow the saga of the Christian University Association in its efforts to found a

⁴ David Clowney, e-mail to the author, 8 April 2014.

Reformed Christian University on pages 138-146 of *The Presbyterian Philosopher*. There, men in a number of denominations but led by the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, set out to create a “great center of Christian learning” somewhat like the Free University in Amsterdam. Like the other men involved in the project, Clark saw the need for such a university. He wrote in *The Presbyterian Guardian*:

Practically everything that appears in print is in the broad sense humanistic. Such a situation shows clearly what is needed. A center of Christian learning must be established in which investigation in all fields of study will be pursued. A Christian college is not sufficient. Several Christian colleges exist at the present time. Some do respectable work; some are rather incompetent. A list of the faculty’s publications is the criterion. And there is enough room in the country for other Christian colleges, if they are to be competent. But the great need is the need of a university. This includes a law school...it must include a graduate school for the granting of the doctorate, and it must be administered by a faculty which through research, mutual criticism, and publication will develop the philosophy to coordinate Christian thought and action.⁵

But the whole project fell apart amidst various other troubles brewing in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. Thus, Clark found work at a secular school—Butler University—and even contemplated focusing his efforts not on Christian philosophy but settling down to a life as a “mediocre Plotinian.”

He looked for a short period at teaching at Reformed Episcopal Seminary but opted against it. He had taught there part time in 1931-1936 and again in 1944. While Clark influenced the Rudolphs—both father and son—in a Reformed direction, the Reformed Episcopal Church veered away from that direction as the twentieth century progressed. By the 1980s Clark’s own son-in-law

Dr. Dwight Zeller would have his break from that denomination which was more and more promoting baptismal regeneration.

3. Clark failed to have his overall philosophy adopted by his students.

While some students who studied under Clark accepted and adopted much of what he taught, few ever took up the mantle of his particular (or peculiar) epistemology of fully rejecting empiricism and all non-revelational philosophies of knowledge acquisition. Carnell sounded decidedly Clarkian in his *Introduction to Christian Apologetics*, and Cornelius Van Til said as much in one of his letters. But Carnell would later move away from Clark’s views and even have a break in their friendship over various matters. Carl Henry, while remaining a Baptist, might have been the most “Clarkian” philosophically as evidenced by his *God, Revelation, and Authority*. Friendly critics Robert Reymond and Ronald Nash, though not students of Clark’s in the classroom, took up some, but definitely not all, of Clark’s system. Only in perhaps Henry and Clark’s publisher John W. Robbins can one find more or less full philosophic disciples.

IV. Ways in Which Clark Did Well to Influence Evangelicals

Failure is depressing, so let’s talk about some successes.

1. In his push for fundamentalists to also be academics

First, we can see one of Clark’s influences as being his push for fundamentalists to also be academics. Where perhaps some Presbyterians would teach only in Presbyterian schools, Clark went to more fundamentalist places in Wheaton College and Winona Lake. He even came to consider himself a historic premillennialist with at least some persuasion from J. Oliver Buswell.

When the Orthodox Presbyterian Church was founded—and Clark was a founding member—he hoped that the denomination would lead (academically) the American fundamentalists. In order to do so, they would need to clamp down on the drinking at Westminster Theological Seminary.

⁵ Gordon Clark, “The Next War,” *The Presbyterian Guardian* 13, no. 5 (1944) 71-72.

Dr. Clark considered a motion in 1942 to propose at the OPC's General Assembly that abstinence from alcohol be the rule Westminster Theological Seminary. This did not go over well with some of the professors there. Dr. Clark ultimately refrained from making the proposal, but likely forever damaged his relationship with the seminary. Yet this episode shows Clark's dedication to improving fundamentalism academically.

2. Christian philosophy and theology today – the grand old Doc.

Then, second, a successful influence Clark has had on evangelicals is in the role of Christian philosophy and theology today.

I recently polled the Gordon Clark discussion group I'm active in, asking them about Clark's influence on their own thought. Their responses were typical of what I've found elsewhere. For them, the areas in which Clark was an influence on their thought included: epistemology, logic, science, and growing in confidence that the Bible alone is the Word of God. Perhaps surprising was that numerous individuals noted having left Arminianism and even Pentecostalism for Calvinism after reading Clark. Others noted having switched their views on apologetics. (For any "outsiders" it should be noted that there has been for decades an ongoing and often acrimonious debate between those who hold to the apologetics of Gordon Clark and those who hold to the apologetics of Cornelius Van Til.) I want to note one particular comment on this topic of apologetics and Clark's influence. This person writes,

[Clark] pulled me away from Van Til's analogical knowledge and paradox theology when I was beginning to become entrenched in it. It was an interesting experience for me. Reading the likes of Van Til, Frame, Bahnsen in some detail, and thinking to myself "this is the top of the mountain, this is peak Christianity." Only to one day see Clark peering down from an even higher peak. I couldn't help but climb further, and I am forever grateful for Clark's influence on my life.

In writing Clark's biography and interviewing many individuals who knew him and speaking with many people today who read his books, I've regularly heard similarly enthusiastic responses as to what they've learned in studying Clark. After publishing the biography, I received many letters thanking me for making known the history of the man himself who so impressed their minds. And impressing minds continues as Clark's legacy.

V. The Grand Old Doc

Clark seems to have always been the grand old Doc. He was a man in some ways born old. The son of an old-school Presbyterian minister, studious, anything but athletic, he gravitated towards reading books. He thought college was for studying. That was what he did and that is what he expected from his students.

Clark is the grand old Doc because, for one, he predates many of the evangelical figures of the 20th century. He was never one of them; he was always the teacher of them. He was from another era—born in 1902. He jokes in one lecture that he used to be surprised when his students didn't remember World War One, but now his students don't even remember World War Two!

Clark is the grand old Doc because there is always something to learn from him. His writings tend to penetrate the question at hand more deeply and to be more satisfyingly conclusive than other writers.

There are many who have influenced American Evangelicals more than Clark. The modern resurgence of Reformed Theology might be better traced to other sources: the work of Reformed Theological Seminary, of R. C. Sproul and Ligonier, and of J. I. Packer and Francis Schaeffer, *etc.* But when a student gets there and studies the difficult questions, and then looks up to the next level on the shelf, he might just find the grand old Doc.

9. Gordon Clark's Apologetic Methodology

As the biographer of the noted presbyterian philosopher Gordon H. Clark, a number of students of Christian apologetics have asked me to explain his apologetic methodology.

In recent decades, buoyed by the great number of internet forums for endless argumentation and debate, the topic of apologetics seems to have overtaken in popularity the study of such Christian disciplines as evangelism, discipleship, and holiness. The demand for resources on apologetics is considerable.

Riding the wave of this demand, the school of apologetics of Cornelius Van Til and his followers has found great popularity. While the case could be made that its popularity has declined some in recent years, no doubt it has been the most influential school of apologetics in Reformed circles in our time. Far lesser known is the work of Gordon Clark. And when Clark's work is cited it is often done so merely in the context of the ecclesiastical controversy he had with Van Til. The student might assume that because Van Til was most interested in apologetics that Clark must have been likewise. This is to miss something of the bigger picture.

That is, the primary subject of Gordon Clark's work was not apologetics so much as epistemology. This is not to say that Clark had no particular views on defending the faith, but merely to say that his apologetic methodology flowed from his theory of knowledge.

The Van Til school, in contrast, seems to have jumped over the subject of epistemology and gone straight into apologetics. There is little developed epistemology in Van Til or his followers. For Clark the Bible itself is the Word of God and therefore all of its propositions are true. God reveals knowledge not through the senses which cannot produce propositions, but directly to man's mind ordinarily upon the reading or hearing of Scripture. Key to Clark's view is the rejection of non-Biblical theories of knowledge, particularly empiricism. Lacking a specified theory of knowledge Van Til and his followers have never fully jettisoned that worldly philosophy. Take for example R. J. Rushdoony who accepted empiricism for himself

(and everyone else!) when he wrote, "All agree that the immediate starting point must be that of our everyday experience and the 'facts' that are most close at hand."⁶ Van Til himself accepted the empirical Cosmological Argument.

The empiricism in the Van Til school is juxtaposed with Greg Bahnsen's fervent opposition to "autonomy" in all things. While in Clark's epistemology God is as sovereign in knowledge as He is in (Calvinistic) salvation, the philosophy of empiricism gives autonomy to man. Here one is supposed to come to knowledge without any role of the Logos nor of the illuminating Holy Spirit.

The disagreements between Clark and Van Til were largely epistemological. There is indeed no reference at all to apologetics in their 1944-1948 controversy. What later disagreements they had in apologetics stemmed from more basic concerns like epistemology and the doctrine of Scripture. For instance, Clark viewed the Scriptures as perspicuous, agreeing with the *Westminster Confession of Faith* which says "when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it must be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly" (1:9), but Van Til's view of Scripture was built on a rather neo-orthodox theory of paradox that opposed the confessional position.⁷

But to suspend the discussion of these more basic concerns and answer the question about Gordon Clark's apologetic methodology I shall move on. Or, let's say, I shall mostly move on, for again Clark's apologetics depends on his epistemology. In his Wheaton Lectures (published as *An Introduction to Christian Philosophy*) Clark defends some apologetic points. First is the necessity of a starting point. In order to prevent an infinite regress some truth must be assumed. The empiricist assumes sensory perception, the Christian (according to Clark) must assume the truth of God's revelation in the Holy Bible. To ask one to prove the truth of the Scriptures is to miss the point. To prove the Bible in such a fashion would be to

⁶ Rousas J. Rushdoony, *Van Til and the Limits of Reason*, 1960, 44.

⁷ See Douglas J. Douma, "Gordon Clark and Other Reformed Critics of Karl Barth," *The Trinity Review*, October-December 2018.

assume something else as more trustworthy, and that is an affront to God.

For Clark, the Christian need not know any particular argument for belief in God or His Word in order to be a Christian. It is the Holy Spirit that makes one believe in Jesus Christ. Yet, while arguments are not necessary, they can be used by God as secondary means for the Holy Spirit to work upon the mind for faith. And good arguments for the Christian position can be made. In the Wheaton Lectures Clark provides a couple of such as he argues for Christianity based on (1) the internal consistency of the Christian worldview against the internal inconsistency of various non-Christian worldviews, and (2) the greater explanatory power of the Christian worldview over all others known.

An important distinction then can be made in looking at Clark's work. That is, the answer to the question "Why do you believe in Jesus Christ" is always "because of the work of the Holy Spirit causing me to believe," but the answer to the question "Are there good reasons to believe in Jesus Christ" is a most certain "Yes." The arguments may be more or less persuasive but are not "proofs." And because no demonstrable proof is available to rationally force belief, each person must choose for or against faith in Jesus Christ. Clark writes elsewhere, "Still it remains true that no demonstration of God is possible; our belief is a voluntary choice; but if one must choose without a strict proof, none the less it is possible to have sane reasons of some sort to justify the choice. Certainly, there are sane reasons for rejecting some choices. One most important factor is the principle of consistency."⁸

As Clark denied the validity of Thomistic and VanTillian "proofs" for God's existence, he has been labeled as a "fideist." This is a term he was in some ways willing to embrace.⁹ But when he provided arguments (rather than attempted proofs) for the Christian faith, some of the same critics labeled him a "rationalist." Neither of these labels fit Clark's thought. While a choice must be made, it is not without arguments. And while logic is

necessary in showing the consistency of a worldview, it is the Holy Spirit that causes belief rather than any demonstrable "proof."

In his books Clark frequently cleared the way for the Christian presentation by critiquing alternative worldviews. His critique was not a sweeping Transcendental argument, but a one-by-one demonstration of the inconsistencies of non-Christian views. He did the hard work to understand the main alternatives and to see where they lead. Those alternatives were as much philosophical ones as religious. Clark expertly dissected the ancient Greeks and major Western philosophers as well as religious philosophies such as those of Aquinas and Barth. And it was in his book on Barth that Clark most clearly explained his own apologetic methodology:

The process of the reductio must be explained to him. There are two parts to the process. First the apologete must show that the axioms of secularism result in self-contradiction.... Then, second, the apologete must exhibit the internal consistency of the Christian system. When these two points have been made clear, the Christian will urge the unbeliever to repudiate the axioms of secularism and accept God's revelation. That is, the unbeliever will be asked to change his mind completely, to repent. This type of apologetic argument...[does not] deny that in fact repentance comes only as a gift from God.¹⁰

The Scriptures do not seek to prove God's existence, but always assume that He IS. And from this basis comes the command "Repent and believe in the gospel."

⁸ Gordon H. Clark, *A Christian Philosophy of Education*, [1988] 2000, 35.

⁹ See Gordon H. Clark, *Three Types of Religious Philosophy*, 7.

¹⁰ Gordon H. Clark, *Karl Barth's Theological Method*, [1963] 1997, 110.