

# Introduction to Apologetics-Part III

---

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, and that every person needs to answer four basic questions about their humanity. This class will begin the journey into discovering how we can know that the theistic God exists and, based on overwhelming balance of probability, this truth is knowable.

## Science and Theology: Separated for Life?

The idea that science and Christianity have always been at odds and are, therefore, not compatible is **false**. This fact cannot be overemphasized. However, the notion that they need to be separated has been the catalyst for promotion of an atheistic worldview. Consider what Andrew Dickson White, founder of Cornell University, wrote in his two-volume book, "The History of the Warfare Between Science and Theology in Christendom":

Plain as it had become to scholars, they hesitated to declare it to the world at large [that the world was round]...But in 1519 science gains a crushing victory. Magellan makes his famous voyage. He proves that the earth to be round, for his expedition circumnavigates it...Yet even this does not end the war. Many conscientious [religious] men oppose the doctrine for two hundred years longer (White, cited by Stark, 121).

The so-called war between the church and science with regards to a flat or round earth has been proven to be false. White himself admitted that he wrote his book to get even with Christian critics of his plans for Cornell (Stark, 123). The rise of scientific pursuits did not originate during the Enlightenment period, as Christians skeptics are want to propagate, but many fields of science were grounded in the church, begun with the concept of discovering how God's creation is put together and functions.

## Fact or Fiction?

The "Dark Ages" was a period of intellectual stagnation, primarily due to Christianity's stifling of scientific study. \_\_\_\_\_

The "Scientific Revolution" began when Copernicus, in spite of the church's attempt to quell his discoveries, proved that the earth moved around the sun and not vice versa. \_\_\_\_\_

The Protestants saved the concept of a heliocentric solar system from demise at the hand of the Catholics. \_\_\_\_\_

Human dissection was not permitted by Islam, nor by the Chinese, Romans, or Greeks, but performed primarily at Christian universities. \_\_\_\_\_

Only Christianity contains a built-in reason to perpetuate the various fields of science: to discover God's handiwork in all aspects of creation. Science continually points to an intelligent designer, one that Christian theism has always supported.

## Don't Make a Monkey Out of Me!

Charles Darwin's book, *The Origin of Species*, was debated by Bishop Samuel Wilberforce and Darwin's henchman, Thomas Henry Huxley, in 1860 in Oxford. The most well-known account of this debate portrays Wilberforce as "naïve and pompous" and a man who was a slave to "fundamentalist creationist" (Stark, 188). The truth is, Wilberforce handled Darwinism vis a vis Huxley quite adeptly; so much so, that Darwin made several modifications to *Origins* in a later version of the book (Stark, 189). However, the altered version is the one that is continually cited as fact, because...

...of the big battle in the United States over creationism and evolutionism being taught as the primary theory of origin in public schools.

### **Where it All Went Wrong**

Fundamentalist Movement

---

---

Thomas Scopes

---

---

Clarence Darrow

---

---

William Jennings Bryan

---

---

The Scopes Monkey Trial is the single most damaging event in this country in the argument for maintaining harmony between science and theology.

How would you present your case for creationism in the courtroom today?

### **Crash, Boom, Bang**

We have seen the struggle that has been going on for the past two hundred plus years to separate science and Christianity. However, we have seen that the two do not necessarily need to be mutually exclusive. Take, for example, the origins of the universe. Where did it come from? Does it have a beginning?

The Kalam Cosmological Argument:

1. Everything that had a \_\_\_\_\_, had a \_\_\_\_\_.
2. The universe had a \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Therefore, the universe had a \_\_\_\_\_.

How do we prove the premises?

1. Premise One is true because of the Law of \_\_\_\_\_...even David Hume says so!
2. Premise Two is true because of the \_\_\_\_\_.
3. The \_\_\_\_\_ is true because of SURGE.

## **SURGE**

Five evidences for the Big Bang causality of the universe:

1. Second Law of Thermodynamics
2. Universe is Expanding
3. Radiation from the Big Bang
4. Great Galaxy Seeds
5. Einstein's Theory of Relativity

Opposing Theories to Big Bang causality:

1. The Cosmic Rebound Theory-the universe perpetually expands and collapses.  
Do you see a flaw in this theory?
2. Quantum Uncertainty-since we cannot know both the precise location and speed of subatomic particles (the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle), these particles aren't dependent on causality and therefore may have come into existence without a cause (Geisler, 63).  
Do you see a flaw in this theory?

Even if the Big Bang theory is disproven, something caused the universe to exist.

### **Then Who Created God?**

How do you answer this question? (Hint: think of what the universe possesses)

### **How Old is All of This Stuff?**

Young Earth Creationism

---

---

Old Earth Creationism

---

---

Theistic Evolutionism

---

---

The Young Earth Creationist (YEC) viewpoint is predominantly held in the United States and has been embraced by Biblical literalists in this country. The Christian who will be encountering atheistic skepticism will be best served, regardless of their personal origin viewpoint, of knowing the Old Earth

stance since it aligns best with current scientific findings. As we will see in future classes, the evolutionism theory, both theistic and atheistic, has serious problems as shown through scientific research.

### **The Three Cosmological Arguments for God**

#### **I. Kalam**

- A. Everything that had a \_\_\_\_\_, had a \_\_\_\_\_.
- B. The universe had a \_\_\_\_\_.
- C. Therefore, the universe had a \_\_\_\_\_.

#### **II. Thomist**

- A. What we observe in this universe is \_\_\_\_\_ (i.e. dependent, or conditional).
- B. A sequence of causally related contingent things cannot be \_\_\_\_\_.
- C. The sequence of causally dependent contingent things must be \_\_\_\_\_.
- D. Conclusion: There must be a \_\_\_\_\_ in the sequence of contingent cause.

#### **III. Leibniz**

- A. Every contingent fact has \_\_\_\_\_.
- B. There is a contingent fact that includes all other contingent facts.
- C. Therefore, there is an explanation of this fact.
- D. This explanation must involve a \_\_\_\_\_.
- E. This \_\_\_\_\_ is \_\_\_\_\_.