Introduction to Apologetics-Part IV

Course modeled after Frank Turek and Norman Geisler's *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist* curriculum, with additional materials from William Lane Craig, J.P. Moreland, Hugh Ross, Stephen Meyers, John Lennox, Douglas Groothuis, N.T. Wright, Ravi Zacharias, Andy Bannister, Paul Copan, and Rodney Stark.

Course Outline:

- I. The Four Questions Everybody Needs to Ask of Their Belief System
- II. Can You Handle the Truth?
- III. The Big Bang of Science and Theology
- IV. Watchmaker, Watchmaker, Make Me a Watch
- V. The Herd and the Gut
- VI. All We Need is a Miracle
- VII. Can Somebody Give Me a Testimony?
- VIII. Books of Myth or Books of Truth?
- IX. Who is This Jesus Guy?
- X. The One Answer to the Four Questions

Can You Handle the Truth?

- 1. Truth about reality is knowable. ✓
- 2. The opposite of true is false. ✓
- 3. It is true that the theistic God exists.
- 4. If God exists, then miracles are possible.
- 5. Miracles can be used to confirm a message from God.
- 6. The New Testament is historically reliable.
- 7. The New Testament says Jesus claimed to be God.
- 8. Jesus' claim to be God was miraculously confirmed by His fulfillment of prophecies, His sinless life and miraculous deeds, and His prediction and accomplishment of His resurrection.
- 9. Therefore, Jesus is God.
- 10. Whatever Jesus (who is God) teaches is true.
- 11. Jesus taught that the Bible is the Word of God.
- 12. Therefore, it is true that the Bible is the Word of God (and anything opposed to it is false).

Everything in this 12-step argument is built on knowable truth. By this point, you should be able to discern self-defeating statements, establish that truth is knowable, explain that absolute truths do exist, the four basic questions every person needs to ask about their humanity, and basic cosmological arguments for the existence of God. This class will begin the journey into discovering how we can know that the theistic God exists based on the design of the universe and all that is in it.

The Teleological Argument

	ogical argument is the argument for divine design, or more commonly called "intelligent design" ne word "teleological" is derived from the Greek word telos, which means
1	
Paley's	Watch
"Let's s	say you're walking around and you find a watch on the ground. As you examine it, you marvel at
	ricately complex interweaving of its parts, a means to an end. Surely you wouldn't think this
	would have come about by itself. The watch must have a maker. Just as the watch has such
•	ex means to an end, so does nature to a much greater extent. Just look at the complexity of the
numan	eye. Thus, we must conclude that nature has a maker, too!" William Paley
1.	The Infinite Monkey Theorem
2.	Richard Dawkins' Blind Watchmaker METHINKS IT IS LIKE A WEASEL
	nber: Only Christianity contains a built-in reason to perpetuate the various fields of science: to er God's handiwork in all aspects of creation. Science continually points to an intelligent designer,
	at Christian theism has always supported.
Isaac N	lewton: Theistic or Atheistic Hero?
Isaac N	ewton was heralded, and continues to be heralded, as one of the greatest scientists ever to have
lived. T	he Enlightenment leaders declared that Newton had discovered the natural physical causes that
_	the universe. Future scholars and academicians would declare that Newton proved beyond any
	that there were forces, not divine hands, which put things into motion in our world. However,
mere e	exists something that undermines these conclusions: the Bentley Letters.

All Atheists to the Principle's Office! (Yes, I intentionally misspelled it)

The Anthropic Principle is one of the strongest evidences that point to an Intelligent Designer. It is the principle that the universe is precisely tuned to support life on Earth. Any small variation in any of a number of factors could alter the delicate balance and cause the end of life on our planet.

1.	Anthropic Constant #1
2.	Anthropic Constant #2
3.	Anthropic Constant #3
4.	Anthropic Constant #4
5.	Anthropic Constant #5
Many the unineither	times, Christians are accused of using the "God of the Gaps" fallacy when describing the origins of everse and the intelligent design behind life. This accusation is without merit because there is a natural cause for the universe (nature did not exist before the universe) nor a natural cause for netic code that exists in the life we see on this planet (or any other planet, for that matter, since
	po, would need a natural cause prior to nature existing). The cause for both points strongly to a ss, spaceless, immaterial, vastly intelligent being.
Contra	rian Arguments Against Intelligent Design
1.	Panspermia-Theory posited by Fred Hoyle that suggests deposited the first life seeds on earth.
2.	Reductionism-The false idea that you can reduce life and everything else to its The example a reductionist would give is a book being reduced to and But, like DNA, a book points to an intelligence beyond its parts.
3.	Time and Chance- Given enough time, life will eventually evolve from nonliving chemicals (also known as monkeys typing Shakespeare). Problem is that natural laws tend to bring everything

into _____ rather than _____ (Second Law of Thermodynamics).

The most basic life-form requires about 200	, each
consisting of 100	Problem is, there is not enough
or	in our entire galaxy to produce even ONE
protein by chance.	

The Powerball Design Theory of Evolution (Neo-Darwinism)

This is further delving into the Time and Chance argument touched on above. "Neo-Darwinists have long assumed that biological evolution works something like matching one number in Powerball. In their view, natural selection acts to reward or preserve small but relatively probable changes in gene sequences-like winning the small but more likely \$ prize in Powerball over and over again" (Meyer, Darwin's Doubt, 244).

Powerball Odds (two drums: one with 59 white balls numbered 1-59; another with 35 red balls numbered 1-35)

# of balls matched	odds of winning	payout
1 (red)	1 in 55.41	\$4
3 (all white)	1 in 360.41	\$7
4 (all white)	1 in 19,087.53	\$100
5 (4 white, 1 red)	1 in 648,975.96	\$10,000
5 (all white)	1 in 5,153,632.65	\$1,000,000
6 (5 white, 1 red)	1 in 175,223,510.00	JACKPOT!

Michael Behe (biochemist, Lehigh University) and David Snoke (physicist, University of Pittsburgh) coauthored a paper which demonstrated the astronomical odds of generating new gene-sequencing through biological evolution. Meyer writes, "[Behe and Snoke] found that even if building a new gene required just two coordinated mutations, the neo-Darwinian mechanism would likely either require huge population sizes or extremely long waiting times" (Meyer, 245). The problem is the that neither the length of time needed nor the number of living organisms comes close to providing the sufficient resources to satisfy the odds.

So, how would you respond to these statements?

- 1. You believe in Intelligent Design because you want the Bible to be true.
- 2. Intelligent Design is not scientific.
- 3. You can't believe in Intelligent Design because the "designs" are not perfect.
- 4. You're just plugging in God wherever you don't have a good answer.