

worthy of the name ought to be able to put past and future events into a unifying historical perspective, plotting the significance of past events to their future outcomes. That, after all, is what Isaiah's prophecy is all about: the final hope of Israel (as well as that of the nations) is vested in the future suffering and life of an amazing individual described in Isaiah 53!

Moreover, any deity worthy of the name ought to be able to exert awesome power among men. And that too is a part of the legacy of Israel's God. By the starkest of contrasts the "gods" of the heathen have no prophetic story to tell, and they exercise no power whatsoever (except, perhaps, a sham theatrics contributed by Satan). Hence, actually to *choose* such "gods" over Israel's Yahweh is morally condemned in the strongest language—"He who chooses you is detestable!"

So the God of Christian theism throws down the gauntlet: "*Present your case!*" But false gods have no case to present. On the other hand, the case the Christian believer in Yahweh is invited to present trades crucially on a vital epistemic competence: the ability to discern the evidential salience of prophecy against the "*background noise*" of mundane historical happenings, as well as the ability to discern the occasional display of the awesome power of God against the "*background noise*" of routine, everyday cause and effect. Because Van Til's presuppositionalism has, in effect, *confused learning with presupposing*, it has ignored the only cognitive link humans have to the relevant data: the working of our created epistemic competence. By *epistemic competence* I mean the set of sentient and rational abilities that are facilitated by the human brain and nervous system.

Later in the *Peanuts* narrative I will document the rationalistic expedient the Van Tillians piously intone to overcome their failure at not having an account of *learning* about God from data (evidence). Here it will suffice to say that Isaiah's Principle manifestly *requires* a human competence to discern *degrees* of evidential salience in those data that are supposed to authenticate deity. Van Tillians like Thom Notaro, however, follow their teacher in utterly "democratizing" all data as *equally* evident with respect to the truth of Christian theism—thus trivializing miracle! The point, however, is that the domain of data does not constitute a democracy with *each* datum laden with *equally perspicuous implications* for the God of Christian theism.

That each datum *cannot* have an equally compelling "vote" for