

I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist

Session 2

1. Chapter 2 – Why Believe Anything at All?

- a. Categories of Belief (what causes our beliefs?) (pg. 51).
 - i. Sociological (parents, friends, society, culture).
 - ii. Psychological (comfort, peace of mind, meaning, purpose, hope, identity).
 - iii. Religious (Scripture, pastor, guru, rabbi, imam, church).
 - iv. Philosophical (consistency, coherence, best explanation).
- b. Apologist – one who can show good reason and evidence to support or contradict a particular belief (pg. 53).
 - i. A teaching is only worth trusting if it points to the truth.
 - ii. Apathy about truth can be dangerous in this life and for eternal life.
 - iii. Many (most) beliefs people hold cannot be supported by evidence.
 - iv. Conversely, truth is not a matter of subjective preference, but is a matter of objective fact.
 - v. Facts are best discovered through logic, evidence and science.
 - vi. Truth is truth no matter where you come from or what you believe.
- c. Rules of logic (pg. 56).
 - i. Either/or (alive vs. dead, pregnant vs. not, married vs. not).
 - ii. Law of Noncontradiction is self-evident (needs no validation).
 - iii. The opposite of true is false.
 - iv. Extreme example from Avicenna: “anyone who denies the law of non contradiction should be beaten and burned until they confess that not being beaten or burned is not the same as being beaten and burned.”
- d. David Hume & Immanuel Kant.
 - i. Hume (pg. 57) – according to the theory ...
 1. “All meaningful ideas are true by definition or based on senses.”
 2. “Anything beyond the physical should not be believed.”
 - a. Verifiable abstract reasoning (math).
 - b. Empirically verifiable through the senses.
 3. Anything that does not fit Hume’s system should be burned for it “surely contains nothing but sophistry and illusion.”
 4. Empirical Verifiability (A. J. Ayer) – true by definition or empirically verifiable (pg. 58).
 - a. Dr. Geisler’s Roadrunner response is excellent (pg. 59)
 - i. The principle of empirical verifiability states that there are only two kinds of meaningful propositions:
 1. Those that are true by definition.
 2. Those that are empirically verifiable.

- ii. “Since the principle of empirical verifiability itself is neither true by definition nor empirically verifiable, it cannot be meaningful!”
 - 5. Response – the claim that “something can only be meaningful if it is empirically verifiable or true by definition” excludes itself and, by extension, excludes many other knowable truths about reality and our existence (pg. 59).
- ii. Kant
 - 1. If Kant’s philosophy is right, then there is no way to know *anything* about the real world, even empirically verifiable things (pg. 59-60). According to Kant ...
 - a. Our mind forms the image (e.g. a tree) rather than the image imprinting on our mind based on its inherent or objective attributes.
 - b. You can only “know” anything based on how your mind interprets what it perceives (and the mind cannot be trusted to know what it perceives so you can’t know anything).
 - c. There is an unbridgeable gap between the real world and the mind. Thus, there are no truths about the real world.
 - d. But are Kant’s views true?
 - 2. Nothing-but fallacy
 - a. Nothing but implies “more than” knowledge.
 - b. Kant “knows” the data his brain receives is *nothing but* “phenomena.”
 - c. But in order to know this, he would have to see more than the phenomena itself (pg. 60).
 - d. In order to distinguish between the real world and what his mind perceives, he would have to be able to see both, thus the real world must be knowable. But this is exactly what he claims cannot be done!
 - e. Because this approach makes no sense, it is self-defeating, and uses logical fallacy.
 - f. Kant’s philosophy is necessarily rejected.
 - g. Instead, it is much more logical to acknowledge that what we see and perceive is an accurate representation of reality.
 - h. That’s what happens when a beautiful theory meets a brutal gang of facts (pg. 61).
- e. How is truth known?
 - i. Truth exists and is absolute and undeniable (Hume and Kant are wrong).
 - ii. To say that the truth cannot be known is a self-defeating claim.
 - iii. Discovering truths:
 - 1. Self-evident laws of logic – First Principles.

- a. Law of Noncontradiction.
 - b. Law of the excluded middle – something is (exists) or it is not (does not exist). There is no compromised, middle position between existence and nonexistence.
 - i. Either you received a raise, or you didn't.
 - ii. Either a person is alive or dead.
 - iii. Either a theistic God exists, or He doesn't.
 - c. Without these First Principles of logic, discovering any truth would be impossible.
 - d. Simple logical argument example (pg. 63).
 - i. All men are mortal (premise).
 - ii. Spenser is a man (premise).
 - iii. Therefore, Spenser is mortal (logical conclusion).
 - e. The logical conclusion follows from the two premises.
 - f. Logic does not address the truth claims of the first two statements, but the conclusion is valid and leaves no other logical option to consider.
 - g. The premises of statements i and ii must be evaluated from observation and drawing general conclusions beyond a reasonable doubt. This is known as inductive reasoning (pg.63).
 - h. A conclusion (all men are mortal) cannot be perfect since no person can observe the mortality of every person who has ever lived. Perhaps we can be 99%+ certain though. The remaining <1% requires faith. Regardless, this level of certainty is beyond a “reasonable doubt” threshold.
- f. How are truths about God known?
- i. Observation and induction, just as with all other truth-claims (pg. 65).
 - ii. We must observe the effects and come to a rational and reasoned conclusion about the presumed cause that produce the resulting effect.
 - iii. Example: Books are written by someone.
 - 1. All books have at least one author (premise based on inductive investigation).
 - 2. *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist* is a book (premise based on observation).
 - 3. Therefore, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist* had at least one author (logical conclusion).
 - iv. The big question ... “Are there any observable effects that seem to require some kind of preexisting supernatural intelligence?” Yes! The universe is an effect that requires a preexisting supernatural intelligence.
- 2. Chapter 3: In the beginning there was a great SURGE**
- a. Einstein's General Theory of Relativity, now proven correct to five decimal places of accuracy, helped to discover the truth that the universe had a beginning.

- i. In the beginning, there was nothing. Space, time, matter and energy did not exist. There was literally nothing (no fundamental particles, no quarks, no empty space, no energy source). Nothing means nothing.
 - ii. Suddenly space, time, matter and energy simultaneously came to be, out of the nothingness that preceded them.
 - iii. The Cosmological Argument (pg. 75).
 - 1. Everything that had a beginning had a cause.
 - 2. The universe had a beginning.
 - 3. Therefore, the universe had a cause.
 - iv. Law of causality affirms premise 1 (Everything that had a beginning had a cause).
 - 1. This is the fundamental principle of science; without it, science and scientific discovery would be impossible.
 - 2. Science is a search for causes.
 - 3. To deny the Law of Causality is to deny rationality.
 - v. The universe had a beginning based on five lines of scientific evidence:

SURGE

 - 1. **S** Second Law of Thermodynamics
 - 2. **U** Universe is Expanding
 - 3. **R** Radiation (cosmic background).
 - 4. **G** Galaxy Seeds
 - 5. **E** Einstein's Theory of Relativity
 - 6. The conclusion of a finite universe is no longer in question. The implication of this truth has spawned a great deal of atheistic speculation to avoid the obvious implications. However, no atheistic theory adequately refutes the conclusion that the universe was caused to exist by a preexistent, supernatural being (pg. 88).
 - 7. Scientists, philosophers and other noted thinkers who reject the truth that the universe had to come into existence as the result of a supernatural being creating it are doing so as an act of their will, not of their objective mind. The evidence is objective; it is the disbelieving scientists who are not being objective (pg. 89).
- b. Our timeline is undeniably finite
 - i. Objectively there could not have been an infinite number of days before today; today would never come if time were infinite.
 - ii. If something, like a new day, can be added, then what came before could not have been infinite.
 - iii. The fact that tomorrow will add another day to the history if the universe is substantial proof that the universe cannot be eternal or infinite.
 - c. **Conclusion:** The Cosmological argument is true because both the premises are true: everything that comes to be must have a cause. The universe came to be so it must have a beginning; therefore, it must also have had a Beginner!

- d. Who Made God (pg. 92-93)?
 - i. Is a question that confirms our commitment to the Law of Causality
 - ii. Is God caused or uncaused? There are no other options.
 - iii. God is eternal and requires no precedent cause (or He would not be God).
 - iv. If the universe is not eternal (and SURGE demonstrates that it is not), then by necessity, something outside of the universe **must be** eternal.
 - v. Science, logic and reason (without relying on claims from Scripture) demand the First Cause to be:
 - 1. Self-existent, timeless, nonspatial, and immaterial. The First Cause must be without limits (infinite).
 - 2. Unimaginably powerful to create the universe out of nothing.
 - 3. Supremely intelligent to design the universe with incredible precision (more on this topic later).
 - 4. Personal – a distinct being with a volition or will – not an impersonal, unintelligent force (like dark matter). The First Cause has a will and created what we observe: space, time, matter and energy (impersonal forces do not make choices).
 - e. The most reasonable conclusion to the evidence that the universe had a beginning is that God exists. No other explanation is rational and all attempts by atheists to assert that the uncaused, first cause is not God are futile; they have no facts or evidence to explain away the existence of God.
- 3. Fatal flaws of materialism, secular humanism and Darwinian Evolution.
 - a. The Universe began at a single instant in time.
 - i. Validates the Biblical View.
 - ii. A beginning requires a Beginner/Creator.
 - iii. A beginning also implies a certain end is coming.
 - b. time≠infinity
 - i. Statistics and probability cannot assure victory (i.e., Scopes monkey trial).
 - ii. Evolutionary process requires long periods of time and endless supplies of matter and energy, which are available to the atheist.
 - iii. Long time periods are both required for and devastating to the Theory.
- 4. Required miracles of evolution.
 - a. Out of nothing matter, space, energy & time all emerged without aide.
 - b. Matter in an infinitely small ball at the center of the Universe exploded and expanded without an outside energy source.
 - c. Requires a violation of the First Law of Thermodynamics – Conservation.
 - d. Requires a violation of the Second Law of Thermodynamics – Entropy.
 - e. Oxygen free early Earth atmosphere – Must have.
 - f. Oxygen free early Earth atmosphere – Cannot have.
 - g. Ammonia rich early Earth atmosphere.
 - h. Methane rich early Earth atmosphere.
 - i. Hydrogen availability in early Earth's atmosphere.

- j. DNA & Protein.
 - Cannot produce protein without DNA.
 - DNA is made up of protein.
- k. Violation of the Law of Mass Action.
- l. Violation of Chemical Equilibrium.
- m. Amino Acid chains forming in a watery environment.
- n. Chirality of Amino Acids & Nucleotides – Equal amounts of right and left-handed.
 - Only left-handed amino acids in living systems.
 - Only right-handed nucleotides in living systems.
- o. Non-performance of biochemical reaction.
- p. Infinity not available for probabilities.
- q. Each and every “link” in the evolutionary “chain” of life
 - Requires a statistical miracle
 - Not a single piece of evidence exists to support theory – total conjecture
 - Innumerable miracles: multiplied times the millions of species of both plants and animals.
- r. The Miracle of Life (Reproduction).
- s. Atomic stability – force outside Universe.
- t. Every multi-component organ in living systems
 - i. Eye – Visual System
 - ii. Digestive System
 - iii. Brain (ant brain versus mainframe computer)
 - iv. Nervous System
 - v. Circulatory System
 - vi. Respiratory System
 - vii. Reproductive System
 - viii. Male & Female compatibility
 - ix. Sonar System (Bats & Dolphins)
- u. Anthropic principle: an expertly fine-tuned universe for human life.
 - i. Strong nuclear force.
 - ii. Weak nuclear force.
 - iii. Electromagnetic coupling constant.
 - iv. Proton to electron mass ratio.
 - v. Stability of the proton.
 - vi. Size of the sun.
 - vii. Color of the sun.
 - viii. Age of the sun.
 - ix. Mass of the sun.
 - x. Distance of the earth from the sun.
 - xi. Surface gravity of earth.
 - xii. Thickness of earth’s crust.
 - xiii. Rotation period of earth (24 hours).
 - xiv. Gravitational interaction between earth and moon.

- xv. Magnetic field of earth.
- xvi. Axial tilt of earth.
- xvii. Albedo (reflectivity of earth).
- xviii. Oxygen to nitrogen ratio of earth's atmosphere.
- xix. Carbon dioxide and water vapor levels.
- xx. Entropy levels.
- xxi. Mass of universe.
- xxii. Number of stars in the universe.
- xxiii. Ozone layer.
- v. Chicken and egg problems for materialistic atheists.
 - i. Which came first?
 - ii. The hypothesized primordial goo pond needed oxygen for life, but oxygen would destroy the building blocks of life before they began.
 - iii. Did DNA precede protein which it is made of, or did protein precede DNA which is the only known source for making proteins?
 - iv. Long period of time are required, but long periods of time are also fatal to the functions that supposedly allow for evolution to occur.