

HERE IS THE TEXT OF THE WRITTEN RESPONSES BETWEEN DR. WHITE AND MYSELF. DR. WHITE IS IN BLUE, I AM IN BLACK

Greetings:

It's the AJ here ("arrogant jerk"). How are you? I was directed to your recent podcast by someone who seemingly has been engaging someone relating to part of my critique of WLC, specifically, relating to his very shallow and very poor representation of the compatibilist position. I have to wonder why it is so few folks are offended by Craig's comments about Calvinists (the only "false" group he could think of in his debate with Christopher Hitchens—coming to his mind before Roman Catholics or Jehovah's Witnesses or Mormons, I guess) but, if someone dare point out that WLC is promoting an old (and now abandoned) Romanist philosophy that turns God into something far less than the personal and sovereign Yahweh of the Bible, well, we are baaaad.

In any case, I wanted to provide DeeDee Warren with a little bit of info that she might wish to take into consideration in possibly withdrawing what seemed to be her primary objection to my comments. First, please note that when one searches for the book being discussed, the first one you come across is this:

<http://www.amazon.com/Divine-Foreknowledge-James-K-Beilby/dp/0830826521>

Now, if you will listen carefully to what I actually said (not what you ASSUMED I said), you will note that I said "David Hunt," not "Dave Hunt." Just an oddity on my part? No. Look at the authors of the book. One is David, not Dave, Hunt. As the description says, "David Hunt of Whittier College weighs in on the simple-foreknowledge view." Notice I mentioned the simple foreknowledge view as well. Why? Because, of course, there is more than one David/Dave Hunt in the world, and I well know the difference between David Hunt, who teaches philosophy at Whittier College (he is currently on leave) and Dave Hunt, the elderly sage of the Berean Call. I well know Dave Hunt would never be able, by simple lack of training and background, to engage in such a discussion, and I can't imagine any publisher asking him to do so. So, the reality is, all this "do you really think WLC is so "retarded" as to think Dave Hunt is a Calvinist?" stuff was, of course...completely off mark. I properly identified the person I was talking about, and, unfortunately, you jumped to the wrong conclusion. The David Hunt I was referring to was, in fact, one of the four contributors to the 2001 book, and yes, I assumed that was the book referred to in the webcast. I had good reason to: half of the authors were the same between the two books! WLC and Gregory Boyd contributed to both volumes. And, btw, if you wish to fault me for turning the podcast off once it got into the closing comments, adverts, etc., well, what can I say?

Now, I am sure I could gather together a whole lot more to say if I wanted to put aside my current projects and go back and visit an old WLC podcast, and one of my own. But I have no interest. The above is more than sufficient to explain that sometimes, just sometimes, we all hear things badly.

James White

Evidently, as I was writing my above, TF posted similar information. Let me add another item:

You seem very focused on my comment that Craig identified two of his fellow authors as Calvinists. Are you seriously going to defend Craig's accuracy in identifying Reformed beliefs? Have you listened to the quote I provide from him in the opening of Radio Free Geneva? Wherein he explicitly states that he doesn't know what the difference between a Calvinist and a hyper-Calvinist is, and that he thinks Calvin was a hyper-Calvinist? Join this with his Hitchens comments, and the many misrepresentations we documented a few years ago on the DL when we went through his entire presentation on soteriology, and you would have more than sufficient ground to understand the statement. BTW, in looking at those very authors, one is clearly Reformed. The other, however, holds a view that one would have to strain a bit at to fit into a meaningful or historical Reformed moniker.

In any case, all I can say is I hope your listeners will be more generous in listening to you than you have been in listening to me on this particular subject.

James White

Hello Dr. White, I am disappointed by your defensive response. First, I didn't call you an arrogant jerk in toto. I said that you can at times come off as one.... and in the same breath said that I can as well. Playing the martyr isn't becoming.

I would like to clarify one thing here you said before responding further:

nd, btw, if you wish to fault me for turning the podcast off once it got into the closing comments, adverts, etc., well, what can I say?

Are you claiming you listened to the whole podcast except for the closing comments and adverts? If that is not what you are claiming, what is the point of that statement?

This is precisely the kind of statement you would expect Caner to answer. I do hope you answer it. I would like your answer before commenting further

because it certainly seems to me that IS what you are claiming, but I want to ask you if it is.

Dee Dee Warren

And please see my response to TF vis a vis Dave Hunt. My criticism, albeit a toned down version, remains just as valid.

I was able to admit my misunderstanding, why can't you admit you critiqued a podcast you didn't listen to in full? And when I say in full, I am not including the closing comments and adverts. Let's exclude those. You didn't listen to the whole thing minus the closing comments and adverts. Why can't you admit that?

PS: If you think I am being irresponsible and sinning against you, contact me privately at idrankthekoolaid@mac.com, and I will put you in touch with the elders of my Church. I spoke to an elder before doing this podcast.

While I have your attention, how far back do you keep your chat room transcripts? Something happened a while back (you were not directly involved) that I want to see if my memory is correct. Can you do a search for deedeewarren and send me the transcripts for my last two visits?

If you are wondering if you know me in any other way, you might remember I transcribed the Son of God, Lord of Glory tape (it was tapes at that time) for you. That is one of the best tapes I have ever heard.

Dee Dee Warren

Dr. White, it is apparent you haven't listened to my podcast either before critiquing it. You are not dealing at all with the substance.

Yes, I do have confidence that Craig would know the view of someone who was a co-author with him on a collaborative project. I am well aware of his other deficiencies. Are you accusing him of being so bad that he would think the David Hunt in that book is a Calvinist? Seriously?

And Dr. White, admit it, you didn't listen to the podcast you critiqued by WLC. Why is that so hard to admit?

Dee Dee Warren

Dr. White, I want to be clear to you and everyone here:

The David Hunt I was referring to was, in fact, one of the four contributors to the 2001 book, and yes, I assumed that was the book referred to in the

webcast. I had good reason to: half of the authors were the same between the two books! WLC and Gregory Boyd contributed to both volumes. And, btw, if you wish to fault me for turning the podcast off once it got into the closing comments, adverts, etc., well, what can I say?

This paragraph appears to be saying that since you didn't listen to the closing comments and adverts that it is understandable that you confused the books as two of the authors are the same. Is my understanding of what you are intending to communicate correct? If it is not correct, what are those several sentences intending to communicate?

Dee Dee Warren

1) I just took the time to listen to what I said about Craig on the 10/26/2010 DL. I focused not upon what you did, but upon the key themes I have focused upon for many years in responding to WLC. I specifically noted examples of misrepresentation/shallow representation in my comments. The material you started your webcast with was all background material prior to my playing Craig's comments. I think it is fair to say your criticisms regarding Dave Hunt (taken to some real extremes in your written comments on this page), which have been shown to be based upon your ignorance as to the actual identity of the author in the 2001 work, were unfair and inaccurate.

2) Yes, I listened to the entire podcast. What evidence do you have that I did not? It is only 24 minutes in length, but, I had the entirety of it right in front of me as I played the materials. I even noted during the show comments that were yet to be heard. How could I know that if I had not listened to it? I seem to recall that I had listened to it on a 55 mile bike ride prior to the webcast. I have the GPS readout of the ride, if you need that.

3) Clearly, I did not catch that the book was GOING to come out, I assumed it was a book that was already available, and then I took the time to look up the title, found one which included both WLC and Gregory Boyd. I have subscribed to the RSS feed of the program for quite some time. I do not listen to every single episode, but I normally do.

4) The issues I focused upon in this webcast were IDENTICAL to the concerns I had raised for years, and IDENTICAL to the issues I raised publicly at the presentation I made at Trinity Reformed Baptist Church, less than a mile off the campus of Talbot/Biola (<http://youtu.be/6SNtuo7kGro>) a full year earlier.

I am sorry you did not like the presentation. I am sorry I did not realize a new book was coming out, and assumed the 2001 book, with two of the same authors, was the one being discussed. I do believe Dr. Craig extends little to no effort in accurately representing the Reformed view, and I documented that at

least five times in this very webcast by playing his very own comments. However, I contend that:

A) the materials I played on the DL accurately represented Craig's views, and his comments about Reformed theology;

B) the criticisms I leveled at his presentation of Molinism were accurate, both biblically, as well as accurate to the sources I cited, including his own published works.

Therefore, I would ask you:

1) Was the focus of the program on the key issues relating to divine sovereignty and the nature of God's relationship to time?

2) Did I misrepresent Craig's teachings on Molinism? If so, where?

3) Are these issues not central to the topic of how one does apologetics, and is that not a recurrent theme of my program, and my ministry?

I stand by my criticism of the WLC podcast and the philosophy/theology he presented therein.

James White

Dr. White, I thank you for the much more appropriate response (i.e. not a defensive reaction). I will respond in full. I have terminal turtle syndrome when it comes to writing, AND very few of my listeners read the blog, so I will respond in audio.

I am not trying here to be pedantic, but I truly want to represent you correctly... am I correct in understanding that you are indeed affirming that you listened to the podcast, minus the closing comments and adverts, PRIOR to your webcast, most likely while riding on one of your exercise bike rides?

The GPS is not necessary, but some of the energy it takes to do that would be most welcome. I am getting fatter than my doxie, and my doxie is mistaken for a pot-bellied pig.

I am a paralegal as my primary occupation and during the week often work ten to twelve hour days. I will try to post a response as timely as I can.

Thank you for taking the time to respond.

I must protest here in brief and will expound in full that although I was indeed mistaken as to Dave Hunt v David Hunt, that only soften the extreme of which you accused Craig, it does not by any stretch absolve it. You still accused Craig of being so daft that he didn't even know that a co-author wasn't a Calvinist...

come on Dr. White, seriously..... I will expound upon that in my audio. I will shoot you an email when I have posted it.

You are focusing on issues (and you and I agree on many issues, I am Reformed) but I am answering your challenge that you often issue when people criticize your tactics. Expounding about how you addressed issues you always address is a red herring. We don't disagree on most of the issues. It is how they are done. And no matter how much hay is made about my admitted mistake on David Hunt/Dave Hunt, the fact remains you accused WLC of something more than stupid, and you never apologized for it. I apologized here just in this thread three times each time a mistake of mine was discovered. Why can't you apologize for that accusation? That really bothers me. It seems proud IMHO.

Dee Dee Warren

I am not trying here to be pedantic, but I truly want to represent you correctly... am I correct in understanding that you are indeed affirming that you listened to the podcast, minus the closing comments and adverts, PRIOR to your webcast, most likely while riding on one of your exercise bike rides?

I do not know why you are asking this. I affirmed it, and, obviously, since I noted, repeatedly, "later on Craig will say this..." etc., it is obvious I listened to it. When I got back from my ride, I looked up the book, found the 2001, and given the presence of both WLC and Boyd, assumed that was the book. Again, a very minor and completely understandable error which was corrected rather quickly thanks to the chat channel.

I must protest here in brief and will expound in full that although I was indeed mistaken as to Dave Hunt v David Hunt, that only soften the extreme of which you accused Craig, it does not by any stretch absolve it. You still accused Craig of being so daft that he didn't even know that a co-author wasn't a Calvinist... come on Dr. White, seriously..... I will expound upon that in my audio. I will shoot you an email when I have posted it.

I repeat what I have said a few times now: Dr. Craig is not accurate in his identification of Reformed theology. Seriously, if he can say "Calvin was a hyper-Calvinist," is it really that difficult to understand my concern? I knew what David Hunt's views are (simple foreknowledge), and so my comment made perfect sense. But may I add that since you listened to the Reasonable Faith podcast yourself, did you catch Craig saying that the two Reformed authors actually ended up saying the same things? Yet, if you look at their respective positions, they are not the same at all. Craig puts them in the same camp even though they clearly have different views. He even ends up saying Boyd takes a compatibilist perspective (something impossible for an Open Theist, of course). So yes, I am quite comfortable questioning the accuracy of

Craig's identification of "Calvinists" even though I was wrong in this specific instance: he was not referring to David Hunt, whom I knew not to be Reformed (not Dave Hunt).

Expounding about how you addressed issues you always address is a red herring. We don't disagree on most of the issues. It is how they are done.

An honest and fair appraisal of the hour long program would indicate that, of course, it was focused upon 1) playing a large portion of Craig's own comments, 2) reading from his own book on the relevant issues, and 3) critiquing Molinism for the highly problematic and simply false system it is. Likewise, the direct attacks upon Reformed theology launched by Craig, and his host, were noted and responded to.

I am sorry you do not like my "tone." I am sorry you attribute to me arrogance, etc. There is nothing I can do about that. You interpret my passion about these issues wrongly. I hope and pray your audience extends you more grace. But with this, I have invested far, far more time than I should have.

James White

Dr. White, I will respond via audio. I will email you when I do, and you can do with that what you will. I asked several times because the fact that you did listen to it is worse. It would have been more understandable if you just wrongly decided to shoot from the hip. By acknowledging you did listen, you show you did exactly what you accuse Craig of doing, and that was the main thrust of my criticism. That saddens me.

I too am very busy, so this is my last post on this until I post my response. thank you for the time you have given and for your work in Islam, it is a light in a very dark place in the world