

# Evidence for the Existence of God

Noted agnostic Carl Sagan (1934-1996), an American astronomer and author stated in his 1980 book *Cosmos*, "The Cosmos is all there is, all there was, and all there will ever be."<sup>1</sup>

People have wrestled with the existence of God for thousands of years. Can it be proven? What evidence do we have that a God exists? How we answer this question is important since it determines whether our lives have ultimate meaning, value and purpose with eternal benefits or in the end nothing really matters and we might as well "eat, drink and be merry for tomorrow we die" with no consequences for our actions.

American writer and theologian Frederick Buechner once stated that "It is as impossible for man to demonstrate the existence of God as it would be for even Sherlock Holmes to demonstrate the existence of Arthur Conan Doyle."<sup>2</sup>

Author and atheist Christopher Hitchens wrote "What can be asserted without evidence can also be dismissed without evidence."<sup>3</sup>

British Author and evolutionary biologist Richard Dawkins stated, "Faith is the great cop-out, the great excuse to evade the need to think and evaluate evidence. Faith is belief in spite of, even perhaps because of, the lack of evidence."<sup>4</sup>

Science fiction author Isaac Asimov (1920-1992) wrote, "Emotionally, I am an atheist. I don't have the evidence to prove that God doesn't exist, but I so strongly suspect he doesn't that I don't want to waste my time."<sup>5</sup>

Mr. Asimov claimed to be an atheist but what exactly is an atheist? *Atheism* comes from two Greek words. The word *a* meaning "not or no" and *theos* meaning "god" and thus *atheism* means "no God."

It's the belief that God does not exist in any shape or form and that it's impossible to know anything that cannot be proven scientifically.

The view that God cannot be proven scientifically is the essence of what atheism believes because the atheist says that nothing exists outside of the known physical universe.

Similarly, agnosticism also comes from two Greek words. Again, a meaning "not or no" and gnosis meaning "knowledge or known" and thus agnostic means "no knowledge."

Agnosticism was coined by T.H. Huxley (1825-1895) to represent his belief that nothing can be known about the existence of God, spirits, or the supernatural...He said:

"It is wrong for man to say that he is certain of the objective truth of any proposition unless he can produce evidence which logically justifies that certainty. This is what agnosticism is about."<sup>6</sup>

Strong agnosticism asserts that definite knowledge about God is unattainable because we "*cannot know*" that God exists while soft agnosticism, asserting that "no one can really know anything for sure about God for we *do not know* if God exists," is also a definitive statement regarding what one knows about God.

The lastly we have skepticism from Gk. skeptikos meaning in its extended sense "one with a doubting attitude."<sup>7</sup>

A skeptic is an individual who tentative, hesitant, doubtful and unsure of their beliefs, neither denying nor affirming their belief in the existence of God.

The skeptic would say that even if there was a God, we could neither know that He exists nor know Him.

Of course, taken to its final conclusion, skeptics are obviously not skeptical of their own worldview and so their worldview falls outside the boundaries of even his own skepticism and thus, he lives an inconsistent life of belief.

Several questions arise when delving deeper into evidence for the existence of God. First, what difference does it make if God exists or not?

Dr. William Craig points out the absurdity of life without God and says that "when I use the word God... I mean an all-powerful, perfectly good Creator of the world who offers us eternal life. If such a God does not exist, then life is absurd. That is to say, life has no ultimate meaning, value, or purpose."<sup>8</sup>

Life would be meaningless since once we die, that would be the end. What would it really matter if we ever existed at all? Everything we were, everything we did, everything we knew would be gone, extinguished and lost forever. Anything we do here and would not matter and anything we pursued that we appear meaningful would be no more important than straightening the deck chairs on the Titanic.

Life would be valueless since ultimately, how we live now makes no difference to our future state and if that is indeed the case, we should only live moral lives if there is a "pay off." If there is no "pay off," we should live for pleasure in whatever way that is to us. If life is valueless, there is only the bare existence of a life for the here and now; we should do whatever we please for as long as we can.

Life would also be purposeless since at the end of our lives, whatever we did would ultimately be pointless, lost to us for eternity. Our destiny would be the grave and as the author of Ecclesiastes says "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity." There would be no purpose; the purposeless life living in a purposeless universe that would end in a purposeless death.

Second, what are the implications of not believing that God exists? How we view the world has a massive impact on how we live. Our worldview determines how we act, what we do and how we live our lives daily.

For example, the atheistic view of human beings is that we are nothing special. We are just an "accidental by-product of nature that have evolved relatively recently on an infinitesimal speck of dust called the planet earth, lost somewhere in a hostile and mindless universe, and which we are doomed to perish individually and collectively in relatively short time."<sup>9</sup>

Pastor Richard Wurmbrand understands this all too well when he talks about his torturers in the atheistic Soviet prisons:

The cruelty of atheism is hard to believe when man has no faith in the reward of good or the punishment of evil. There is no reason to be human. There is no restraint from the depths of evil which is in man. The Communist torturers often said, "There is no God, no hereafter, no punishment for evil. We can do what we wish." I have heard one torturer even say, "I thank God, in whom I don't believe, that I have lived to this hour when I can express all the evil in my heart." He expressed it in unbelievable brutality and torture inflicted on prisoners.<sup>10</sup>

Christian author Dinesh D'Souza, in his book *What's So Great About Christianity* says,

Taken together, the Crusades, the Inquisition, and the witch burnings killed approximately 200,000 people. Adjusting for the increase in population, that's the equivalent of one million deaths today. Even so, these deaths caused by Christian rulers over a five-hundred-year period amount to only 1 percent of the deaths caused by Stalin, Hitler, and Mao in the space of a few decades.<sup>11</sup>

Again, what we believe matters. What we believe in regards to where we came from does impact the way we live and for what we live for.

What we will be using tonight are arguments or reasons given to compelling evidence for the existence of God.

The word *argument* comes from the Latin *argumentum* and according to Merriam-Webster's dictionary means "a reason given in proof or rebuttal;

discourse intended to persuade; a coherent series of statements leading from a premise to a conclusion.”

The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy defines an argument as “a connected series of statements or propositions, some of which are intended to provide support, justification or evidence for the truth of another statement or proposition. Arguments consist of one or more *premises* and a *conclusion*. The premises are those statements that are taken to provide the support or evidence; the conclusion is that which the premises allegedly support.”<sup>12</sup>

When we speak of an argument or logical a logical series of statements,” we’re not saying that we’re going start and argument with someone but we’re “making a case as in a court case” or “as in arguing a court case before a judge.”

In other words, by laying out logical and well reasoned case or argument for the existence of God, we hope to provide evidence and sway the jury in our favor.

But, even though we may lay down an airtight, compelling, well thought out and articulated argument, ultimately disbelief is based on a person’s free-will.

The atheist Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) wrote, “If one were to prove this God of the Christians to us, we should be even less able to believe in him” and “It is our preference that decides against Christianity, not arguments.”<sup>13</sup>

There are many compelling arguments for the existence of God (e.g., *Ontological Argument, Consciousness Argument, Experiential Argument, Argument from Beauty*, etc. but tonight, we’ll be looking at five areas that theists believe make a compelling argument for the existence of God. These are not only theological in nature but philosophical as well.

1. *Cosmological Argument* – This is the argument of how the universe began and why there is something rather than nothing.

2. *Teleological Argument* – Also known as the *Intelligent Design (ID) Argument*. The argument that great design and order is built into nature.
3. *Complexity Argument* – Argues that the more we learn about the most basic living organisms, the more we see how highly complex life is.
4. *Moral Argument* – Argues that if there is no God, than objective moral values do not exist.
5. *Historical Argument* – Argues from the point of the historical Jesus, His life and His bodily resurrection from the grave.

Individually, these arguments are strong and convincing but, taken as a whole these arguments make a compelling case for the existence of God.

## 1. Cosmological Argument

The word *cosmology* uses the Greek words *cosmos* meaning “universe” and *logy* meaning “the study of” so the *cosmological argument* is the argument from the study of the beginning of the universe.

Dictionary.com defines *cosmology* as: 1) The branch of philosophy dealing with the origin and general structure of the universe, with its parts, elements, and laws, and esp. with such of its characteristics as space, time, causality, and freedom. 2) The branch of astronomy that deals with the general structure and evolution of the universe.

The argument can be summed up in two premises and one conclusion.

1. Whatever begins to exist has a cause.
2. The universe began to exist.
3. Thus, the universe had a cause.

Let’s look at the first premise: ***Whatever begins to exist has a cause.***

The first premise is pretty obvious. Things don't just appear for no reason and pop into existence without any cause whatsoever and in fact, that there was a beginning only implies that there was a Beginner.

The quip "Nothing comes from nothing, nothing ever could" is an apt saying that rings true in everyday life.

When we use the word *nothing*, we mean absence of everything. If you imagine nothing as black, you're imagining something. If you imagine nothing as complete whiteness, again, you're imagining something.

Nothingness is nothing. No molecules, no energy, no times, no physicality - nothing.

Whatever we see, albeit a table, a shoe, a book, a car, a chair, etc. came from a cause. That cause was an intelligent mind that thought up a blueprint and created the object.

Likewise, all matter that we see had to come from someplace; it had to come into existence at some point in time because the Law of Causality.

The Law of Causality basically states that "Causality is the relationship between an event (the *cause*) and a second event (the *effect*), where the second event is a consequence of the first."<sup>14</sup>

What started the first event – the Christians worldview is that God was the *uncaused first cause*.

What other possibilities do we have?

1. *The universe has always existed.* This is impossibility since *actual infinities* are not possible. *Potential infinities* are possible, but not *actual infinities*. *Infinite regresses* are another philosophical impossibility.

2. *The universe created itself.* In order for the universe to have created itself, it would have had to already existed. A logical absurdity.
3. *It happened without a cause, out of the blue.* Again, it's a philosophically powerful argument and statement that "Nothing comes from nothing, nothing ever could."
4. *A powerful agent (first cause), caused matter to come into existence.*

To deny the Law of Causality is to deny rationality. The very process of rational thinking requires us to put together thoughts (the causes) that result in conclusions (the effects). So if anyone ever tells you he doesn't believe in the Law of Causality, simply ask that person, "What *caused* you to come to that conclusion?"<sup>15</sup>

Let's look at the second premise: ***The universe began to exist.***

Scientists point to several evidences that the universe began to exist at a specific point in time.

First scientific argument: *The Universe is expanding.* Scientists, including Albert Einstein recognized that the universe is in constant movement.

Theories arose by Einstein and independent models were created in the 1920's but in 1929, Edwin Hubble made an extraordinary discovery, verifying the theories and models created earlier in the century.

Hubble noted, through astronomical study, that the light from distant galaxies was shifted to the red side of the color spectrum.

This phenomenon became known as the *red shift* and the explanation also applies to the term used for sound waves as the *Doppler Effect*.

The *Doppler Effect* says that if sound is emitted from an object moving toward you, the sound waves are compressed or shortened.<sup>16</sup>

Of course, since the universe is expanding, and drawing upon the logical conclusion - it must have had a point of origin to expand from.

Scientists Stephen Hawking and Roger Penrose admit "...almost everyone now believes that the universe, and time itself, had a beginning at the big bang."<sup>17</sup>

Second scientific argument: *The Second Law of Thermodynamics*. This law states that unless energy is being fed into a system, overtime, differences in temperature, pressure and chemical potential tend to move towards equilibrium.

This means that given enough time, the universe would have died a "heat death," trillions upon trillions upon exponential trillions of eons ago.

Dr. Ron Rhodes states that "Based on the first [in a physical system, energy can neither be created nor destroyed; it just changes forms] and second laws of thermodynamics, we must conclude that our universe is headed toward ultimate "heat death" in which there will be no more energy conversions. The amount of usable energy will eventually deplete. Our universe is decaying. It is eroding. It is moving from order to disorder. The universe - and everything in it, including the sun, our bodies, and the machine we build - is running down."<sup>18</sup>

And finally, the conclusion: ***Thus, the universe had a cause.***

The theist's conclusion is that that cause is a transcendent being who lives outside our space/time continuum.

One thing we learn from modern philosophy, astronomy and astrophysics is that the universe had a beginning. The Bible teaches the following:

- Hebrews 11:3 that "By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen were not made of things which are visible"

Scholars believe that the Bible tells us that God created "Ex nihilo", Latin for "from nothing."

- Genesis 1:1 says, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

The word *created* [Hebrew: *bara*] means "to create out of nothing or of something new."

Prior to the moment of creation, there was nothing. God spoke into existence all time, energy and matter from nothing.

- Psalm 102:25 says, "Of old You laid the foundation of the earth, And the heavens are the work of Your hands."
- John 1:3 says, "All things were made through Him, and without Him nothing was made that was made."
- Colossians 1:16, 17 says, "For by Him all things were created that are in heaven and that are on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers. All things were created through Him and for Him. And He is before all things, and in Him all things consist."

Creation cannot exist separate from God but God can and does exist separate from creation. In order to create, God had to exist prior to creation or else God would have created Himself which is an illogical absurdity.

And so, we concur with Dr. William Lane Craig when he says that "the most plausible answer to the question of why something exists rather than nothing is that God exists."

## 2. Teleological Argument

The word *teleology* uses the Greek words *telos* meaning “purpose or end” and *logy* meaning “the study of” so the *teleological argument* is the argument from the study of the purpose of directive principle of the universe and nature.

You’ve probably heard of it by its more popular or common name, *Intelligent Design Theory* or *ID*.

Dictionary.com defines *teleology* as 1) The study of evidences of design in nature. 2) The fact or character attributed to nature or natural processes of being directed toward an end or shaped by a purpose. 3) The use of design or purpose as an explanation of natural phenomena.

The argument can be summed up in two premises and one conclusion.

1. All designs imply a designer.
2. The universe exhibits great design.
3. Thus, there must be a Great Designer of the universe.

Let’s look at the first premise: ***All designs imply a designer.***

When we look at a painting of the Mona Lisa, the architecture of a skyscraper, a highway or a glass vase, we see that it took intelligence to design and then produce the object.

Likewise, if we to drive up to South Dakota and we see Mount Rushmore, we understand that it took an intelligence to create it and that it didn’t happen over millions of years unlike the wind, rain and water that created the Grand Canyon.

By use of analogy, the watchmaker argument, which was first put forth by William Paley (1743-1805), is the teleological argument that if you were to run across a watch lying in a field, you would assume that an intelligent designer had created the watch.

"In crossing a heath [grassland or pasture], suppose I pitched my foot against a stone, and were asked how the stone came to be there; I might possibly answer, that, for anything I knew to the contrary, it had lain there forever...But suppose I found a watch on the ground, and it should be inquired how the watch happened to be in that place...The inference, we think, is inevitable – the watch must have had a maker: that there must have existed, at some time, and at some place or other, an artificer [craftsman] or artificers, who formed it for the purpose which we find it actually to answer; who comprehend its construction, and designed its use."<sup>19</sup>

The point here is this, just as evidence shows crime scene investigators, archaeologists, cryptographers, and copyright offices that an intelligent being was involved, so the universe gives us evidence of an intelligent being.

Let's look at the second premise: ***The universe exhibits great design.***

From the molecular level, to the planet and ecosystem level, the solar system, the Milky Way galaxy, to the universe as a whole and everything in between, great design is seen in all aspects of the natural sciences.

Due to time and space constraints, we will be looking specifically at one part of the Intelligent Design debate, namely, is the universe fine-tuned for life?

When we observe that our fragile tiny blue planet exists in a very hostile universe and environment of space, scientists and physicists understand that there are certain environment conditions, called "anthropic constants" that keep mounting supporting the conclusion that the universe is fine-tuned for human life.

Dr. William Lane Craig, Christian apologist, theologian, and philosopher explains that "by 'fine-tuning' one means that small deviations from the actual values of the constants and quantities in question would render the universe life-prohibiting or, alternatively, that the range of life-permitting

vales is exquisitely narrow in comparison with the range of assumable values.”<sup>20</sup>

Physicist P.C.W. Davies explains that when changes in just one of the four fundamental forces of nature, either the  $\alpha_G$  (gravitation) or  $\alpha_W$  (the weak force); of only one part  $10^{100}$  would have prevented a life-permitting universe.  
21

In some sense, it's as if the universe knew we'd be coming.

There are two major segments that define fine-tuning features in the universe if life is to exist.

First, for there to be life in the universe, there are to date 140 features of the cosmos as a whole (including the laws of physics) that must fall within certain narrow ranges to allow for the possibility of physical life's existence.<sup>22</sup> For example:<sup>23</sup>

- Donald Page, of Princeton's Institute for Advanced Study, calculates that the odds against our universe randomly taking a form suitable for life as we know it are 1 on  $10^{124}$ .
- If the magnitude of the explosion (the Big Bang) were weaker by only a factor of 1 in  $10^{60}$ , the universe would have collapsed back in on itself.
- If the gravitational constant varied by as little as 1 in  $10^{40}$ , life-sustaining stars would not have formed.

Second, for there to be Intelligent Physical Life, to date there are 402 quantifiable characteristics of a planetary system and its galaxy that must fall within narrow ranges to allow for the possibility of advanced life's existence.<sup>24</sup>

- If the inclination of the earth's orbit were too great, temperature differences on the planet would be too extreme.
- If the earth's axial tilt were greater or lesser than it is, the surface temperatures would be too harsh to support life as we know it.

- If the surface gravity on the earth were stronger, the atmosphere would retain too much ammonia and methane, which is poisonous. But if the gravity were less, the atmosphere would lose too much water.
- If the distance of the earth to our sun were greater, the earth would be too cool for a stable water cycle. But if we were closer, the earth would be too warm for a stable water cycle.
- If the sun's distance to a spiral arm was too large, exposure to harmful radiation from the galactic core would be too great.
- If the length of the day were longer, the temperature differences would be too great to sustain life. But if the day were shorter the atmospheric wind velocities would be too great to survive.
- If the thickness of the earth's crust were greater, too much oxygen would be transferred from the atmosphere to the crust. But if the crust were thinner, there would be too much volcanic and tectonic activity.

Hugh Ross, astronomer and astrophysicist notes that the "degree of fine-tuning is so great that it's as if right after the universe's beginning someone could have destroyed the possibility of life within it by subtracting a single dime's mass from the whole of the observable universe or adding a single dime's mass to it."<sup>25</sup>

And finally, the conclusion: ***Thus, there must be a Great Designer of the universe.***

The Bible speaks of being able to know that God exists by looking at His creation – at what He has designed.

- Isaiah 45:18 says, "For thus says the LORD, Who created the heavens, Who is God, Who formed the earth and made it, Who has established it, Who did not create it in vain, *Who formed it to be inhabited*: "I am the LORD, and there is no other." (emphasis mine)
- Romans 1:20 says, "For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are

made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse..."

The Bible says to "look to the heavens" if you want to know just how big the Creator God is.

- Psalm 19: 1-4 says, "The heavens declare the glory of God; And the firmament shows His handiwork. Day unto day utters speech, And night unto night reveals knowledge. There is no speech nor language Where their voice is not heard. Their line has gone out through all the earth, And their words to the end of the world."

And a few centuries later, the prophet Isaiah wrote down what God had spoken regarding the vastness of space and even it not being His equal:

- Isaiah 40:25, 26 "'To whom then will you liken Me, Or to whom shall I be equal?' says the Holy One. Lift up your eyes on high, And see who has created these things, Who brings out their host by number; He calls them all by name, By the greatness of His might And the strength of His power; Not one is missing."

When we look around at the setting sun and the colors produced, a rainbow, the night sky, observe the universe through the powerful telescopes and technology that we have, which by the way would not be possible if we were not located at such a place in our Milky Way galaxy – all these and more point to a Creator God.

Sir Fred Hoyle (1915 – 2001), an English astronomer and mathematician noted that "A common sense interpretation of the facts suggests that a super intellect has 'monkeyed' with physics, as well as with chemistry and biology, and that there are no blind forces worth speaking about in nature. The numbers one calculates from the facts seem to me so overwhelming as to put this conclusion almost beyond question."<sup>26</sup>

So, it's quite reasonable and plausible to believe that not only did a Divine Creator cause the existence of our universe since we know that "nothing comes from nothing and nothing ever could," but also that He designed it so that this little planet we live on could support life as we know it.

### 3. Complexity Argument

Similar, but different to the Teleological argument is the Complexity argument.

The basic premise behind the specified complexity theory or argument is that it's the fingerprint of design.

For something to exhibit specified complexity it must be difficult to reproduce by chance (complex) and it must match an independently given pattern (specified).<sup>27</sup>

There are two kinds of complexity *ordered complexity* and *specified complexity*.

Ordered complexity although still complex structurally, has little information such as a snowflake or a crystal and is a result of natural process while specified complexity contains complex information and demonstrates design, for example a novel.

Complexity is the opposite of simplicity. In the example below, the letters are specified by a pattern i.e., order redundancy, but not complex – they're simple.

NOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNO  
TNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTNOTN  
OT

In the next example, the letters are merely complex but not specified.

JDJFDSIOHFNNFDKJLJKAVCZDXWYUKMKMNFKLDNLNLHIURIUG  
GHJSAFHKNMGMNJIGDUYAKLKQOAPORHCNZVACDSLOPDIJBDGHJ  
SKJJF

In the final example, the letters are not only complex, but they demonstrate specificity and thus, marks of an intelligent agent.

WHEN YOU HAVE ELIMINATED THE IMPOSSIBLE WHATEVER  
REMAINS NO MATTER HOWEVER IMPROBABLE MUST BE THE  
TRUTH

Using the argument of two premises to support a conclusion, we see that:

1. Specified complexity and information arise from intelligent agents.
2. Biological processes contain information and specified complexity.
3. Therefore, biological processes arose from an intelligent agent.

Let's look at the first premise: ***Specified complexity and information arise from intelligent agents.***

So how do we know the marks of design by intelligent agents or intelligent activity?

Dr. William A. Dembski, mathematician, researcher and author explains:

"Whenever we infer design, we must establish three things: *contingency, complexity* and *specification*. Contingency ensures that the object in question is not the result of an automatic and therefore unintelligent process that had no choice in its production [crystals and snowflakes are an example as the result of natural law]. Complexity ensures that the object is not so simple that it can readily be explained by chance. Finally, specification ensures that the object exhibits the type of pattern characteristic of intelligence."<sup>28</sup>

Based on these three characteristics, it's more readily possible to determine whether an object has been designed by an intelligent agent.

For example, the movie *Contact*, written by Carl Sagan and starring Jody Foster and Matthew McConaughey, tells the story of the SETI (Search of Extraterrestrial Intelligence) program that comes across a radio signal from space that is both complex and specified. The signal is a sequence of prime

numbers from 2 to 101 (prime numbers are numbers that can only be divided by themselves and 1, e.g., 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, etc.)

First, as Dr. Dembski explains, the patterns of 1's and 0's that form the sequence for the prime numbers is irreducible to the law of physics that govern the transmission of radio signals therefore, we regard the sequence as contingent.

Second, the sequence of prime numbers is very complex to reproduce in a natural setting and is thus improbable that it was produced by natural means.

And finally, it's specified in that it's not a random, simple mathematical pattern, but complex numbers.

The scientists in the *Contact* recognized that the signal could not have arisen from natural causes but from an intelligent agent.

Let's go back to the Mount Rushmore example. A mountain with rocks, boulders, trees, rivers, ravens, plants and animals will definitely have a complex ecosystem but it's not specified.

There are no natural laws that dictated that natural processes carved the faces of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and Roosevelt over a period of time and chance and is thus contingent.

Mount Rushmore is not only complex but it also demonstrates specified complexity in the information it conveys.

Let's look at the second premise: ***Biological processes contain information and specified complexity.***

The greater the complexity of an object, the smaller the probability of its occurrence of happening by chance.

French Mathematician Emile Borel (1871-1956) wrote the following:

"Events whose probabilities are extremely small never occur..We may be led to set at 1 to the 50<sup>th</sup> power the value of negligible probabilities on the cosmic scale."<sup>29</sup>

Numbers this large can be hard to comprehend and visualize so let's consider these word pictures:

"1 in 10<sup>50</sup> would be the same likelihood that every person on the planet would win the Powerball Grand Prize once per second not for the rest of their lives but for the next 1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 years!"<sup>30</sup>

"If we were to take 10<sup>21</sup> silver dollars and lay them on the face of the earth; they would cover the entire land surface to a depth of 120 feet."<sup>31</sup>

When we look at complex structures at the cellular level, DNA reveals that the information and complexity it contains is amazing.

The "rungs" of the DNA are made up of base-pairs of four nucleotides that create a specific language so rich in information that a human single cell contains enough information to fill one thousand encyclopedias and if a DNA strand within that cell could be unwound, it would be almost ten feet in length.

Charles B. Thaxton is an intelligent design author and Fellow of the Discovery Institute's Center for Science and Culture elaborates:

"The DNA code is a genetic 'language' that communicates information to the cell. The cell is very complicated, using many DNA instructions to control its every function. The amount of information in the DNA of even the single-celled bacterium, E. coli, is vast indeed. It is greater than the information contained

in all the books in any of the world's largest libraries. The DNA molecule is exquisitely complex, and extremely precise: the 'letters' must be in a very exact sequence. If they are out of order, it is like a typing error in a message. The instructions that it gives the cell are garbled. This is what a mutation is."<sup>32</sup>

The human body contains so much DNA that if strung together, would reach from the Earth to the Sun almost seventy times.

In a nutshell, DNA provides the design specifications for the cellular components; molecules known as messenger RNA copy a specific segment of the assembly instructions; transfer RNA then translates the information coded in the DNA into the specific sequence of amino acids; and finally ribosomal RNA assembles the amino acids into the proper sequence to form the specified protein molecule.<sup>33</sup>

Now, a protein is not even close to a living cell and the odds of assembling amino acids by chance into the correct order and sequence required producing a functioning single small protein is conservatively 1 in  $10^{130}$ .

This number exceeds the  $1/10^{50}$  universal probability limitation set by Emile Borel but if that probability wasn't enough to convince you, two well known scientists calculated the odds of life forming by natural processes. Here's what they said:

"No matter how large the environment one considers, life cannot have had a random beginning...There are about two thousand enzymes, and the chance of obtaining them all in a random trial is only one part in  $(10^{20})^{2000} = 10^{40,000}$ , an outrageously small probability that could not be faced if the whole universe consisted of organic soup."<sup>34</sup>

And finally, the conclusion: ***Therefore, biological processes arose from an intelligent agent.***

As we have seen, the chances of life arising from non-life are so “extremely small to ever occur” that the more plausible and reasonable belief is that the Creator God designed the process and is the intelligent agent behind all things.

- Psalm 139:13, 14 says, “You made all the delicate, inner parts of my body and knit me together in my mother’s womb. Thank you for making me so wonderfully complex! Your workmanship is marvelous—how well I know it.” (NLT)
- John 1:3 says that “All things were made through Him, and without Him nothing was made that was made.”

The NASB words John 1:3 this way “All things came into being through Him, and apart from Him nothing came into being that has come into being.”

The words *came into being* or *has come into being* [Greek: *ginomai*] means to “to become, i.e. to come into existence, begin to be, receive being.”

- Hebrews 3:4 says “For every house is built by someone, but He who built all things is God.”
- Colossians 1:16 says, “For by [Jesus] all things were created that are in heaven and that are on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers. All things were created through Him and for Him.”

The writers of the Bible claim that the natural world in what displays the power and knowledge of the Creator God.

- Psalm 19:1-2 says that, “The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament shows His handiwork. Day unto day utters speech, and night unto night reveals knowledge.
- Romans 1:20-21 says that, “For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse, because, although they knew God, they did not glorify

Him as God, nor were thankful, but became futile in their thoughts, and their foolish hearts were darkened.”

The worldview known as naturalism sees the universe as a closed system and that all phenomena within can be completely explained in terms of natural causes and laws and by purely material causes.

Since biological processes contain information and specified complexity, to the theist it's quite reasonable and plausible to believe that these biological processes arose from an intelligent.

## 4. Moral Argument

The fourth argument for *Evidence for the Existence of God* is the argument from morality and values also called the *axiology* argument from the Greek *axios* meaning “judgment, worth or value.”

It's the argument that shows that moral values must be objective in nature in order for the universe to make sense.

The atheist would claim that since God does not exist, absolute, transcendent morals do not exist either. They would say that morals are relative in natural and personal to one's own culture or perspective. Although there are some widely accepted moral values, perhaps they arose in humans as a survival technique somewhere along the line.

To the atheistic naturalist or the person who holds the naturalistic world view, human beings behavior is explained by the natural world, there are no divine purposes, only human motivations and conduct that's determined by the organic structure of the human species and everything is reduced to a material, physical state.

Then question comes up, where did human beings get moral values? How does naturalism explain that by natural processes, human beings, who are no different from the animals, come up with morally right and wrong beliefs?

If the universe was guided by chance, time and impersonal naturalistic forces, how did a personal morality arise in personal human beings?

Personal cannot arise from the impersonal.

The argument can be summed up in two premises and one conclusion.<sup>35</sup>

1. If God does not exist, objective moral values and duties do not exist.
2. Objective moral values and duties do exist.
3. Therefore, God exists.

Let's look at the first premise: ***If God does not exist, objective moral values and duties do not exist.***

When we speak of *moral values*, we're speaking of worth or goodness and badness of something. For example, "Is my value, my worth as a person good or bad?"

When we speak of *duties*, we're speaking of moral obligations, what is right or wrong, what we should or shouldn't do. For example, "Is it right or wrong for me to serve in the armed forces?" It would be good for a person to be a police officer, doctor, nurse, lawyer, pastor, politician or a paramedic but a person is not obligated to enter one of those professions.

Who is to say that genocide is evil? What's wrong with it? Adolf Hitler felt a duty to kill Jews, gypsies, homosexuals, the mentally handicapped – who are we to say that he was wrong?

If I went out and shot my neighbor's dog because I felt it was my duty or drowned a gunny sack full of baby kittens so I wouldn't have to feed them, who's to say that what I did was wrong?

According to the naturalistic, atheistic worldview, human beings are just animals and ultimately have no moral obligations to each other. There are no absolute, transcendent moral standards and thus, no difference between Mother Teresa and Adolf Hitler – just one person subjective opinion over another’s and no one to say who’s right or wrong.

In other words, if morals and values are purely subjective in nature, then they are relative and situational to what one believes and what’s moral to you might not be moral to me and vice versa.

If naturalism is correct when it basically states that matter and chemical processes is all there is – and that there is no God, then why do human beings feel a sense of obligation and duty to do what’s right?

Dr. Douglas Jacoby states that “Without God and a sense of transcendent morality to guide our actions, power-or “rightness”- may very well go to the most powerful-often the most greedy, ambitious, and ruthless.”<sup>36</sup>

So the question again is, If God does not exist, do objective moral values and duties exist?

Again, Dr. William Lane Craig,

“The question is not about the necessity of *belief* in God for objective morality but about the necessity of the *existence* of God for objective morality.”<sup>37</sup>

Let’s look at the second: ***Objective moral values and duties do exist.***

C.S. Lewis wrote that, “Human beings, all over the earth, have the curious idea that they ought to behave in a certain way, and cannot really get rid of it. Secondly, that they do not in fact behave that way. They know the Law of Nature; they break it. These two facts are the foundation of all clear thinking about ourselves and the universe we live in.”<sup>38</sup>

Paul Copan, Christian theologian, philosopher, and apologist echoes this when he says that “there’s virtually no dispute that racism, theft, fraud, child abuse, murder, and rape are morally wrong. Even despots who carry out such acts will publicly deny rather than own up to such heinous acts.”<sup>39</sup>

Those who would not agree that these are wrong are just morally defective, plain and simple.

We live in a time when people speak of “human rights” but if naturalism is correct and morals are just a product of evolution, personal choice or our culture, then “rights,” a moral responsibility or an illusion and do not truly exist.

But if objective morals and intrinsic values like “rights” exist, then how could they have just emerged from impersonal, valueless, naturalistic processes over time. Again Paul Copan,

“If God doesn’t exist, human dignity, worth, and moral duty must have emerged from valueless processes. In fact, and in contrast, *from valuelessness, valuelessness comes*. On the other hand, God’s existence offers a ready explanation for the existence of value in the world.”<sup>40</sup>

And finally, the conclusion: ***Therefore, God exists.***

Theism has an explanation – the explanation is a personal Creator God.

Morality, goodness, rightness, kindness, fairness, compassion, impartial, etc. are attributes of personality.

Personality didn’t arise from non-personal processes but from God’s own nature which is the standard of goodness.

Human beings instinctively recognize - whether we choose not to admit it and ignore it or suppress our conscience – that we all should have basic moral insight, knowing truths available to any morally sensitive person.

- Romans 2:14, 15 says, “for when Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature do the things in the law, these, although not having the law, are a law to themselves, who show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and between themselves their thoughts accusing or else excusing them”

So, this begs the question, can atheists or non-theists be moral or act ethically? Of course, the Bible says that all human beings are created in the image of God but the atheist has no ultimate reason to act morally or ethically and no ultimate authority to look towards to make sure his line is straight.

- Genesis 1:27 says, “So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.”

The moral argument demonstrates that the two premises draws the conclusion that a personal, moral Being who is perfectly good and by His very nature defines what is good.

Assume for a moment that there was no God or as Friedrich Nietzsche famously wrote, “God is dead. God remains dead. And we have killed him,” then by what standard, what ruler do we measure goodness?

In order to know what’s morally good or bad, right or wrong, we have to have a standard by which to measure it.

For example, I’m 5’10” and I would be *relatively* tall if living among the munchkins in the Land of Oz, who in turn would to relatively tall if they lived among the six inch people of Lilliput from the Jonathan Swift novel *Gulliver’s Travels* but if I started hanging out with the Denver Nuggets basketball team, I’d be *relatively* short compared to those guys.

That's relativism - it's a moving target that has no basis on the consistent standard of goodness as defined by God's character and nature.

## 5. Historical Argument

One of the historical arguments, the argument for the *Resurrection of Jesus Christ* comes from several types of arguments that fall within the *Christological Argument*.

Basically, the argument for the resurrection asserts that the evidence of the resurrection of Jesus lends support and credibility to His claims that He is the Son of God and thus Deity.

Further, adding to this support was His claims before hand, not one or two times, but many times that He would be handed over to the authorities, killed and would rise again on the third day.

- Jesus said in John 2:19-21, "Destroy *this* temple and in three days I will raise *it* up!...*but He was speaking of the temple of His body.*" (emphasis added)
- Matthew 16:21 says, "From that time Jesus began to show to His disciples that He must go to Jerusalem...and be killed, and be raised on the third day."
- Matthew 17:22-23 says, "Now while they were staying in Galilee, Jesus said to them, 'The Son of Man is about to be betrayed into the hands of men, and they will kill Him, and the third day He will be raised up.'"
- See also Matthew 12:38-40; 17:9; 20:18, 19; 26:32; 27:63; Mark 8:31-9:1, 10, 31; 10:32-34; 14:28, 58; Luke 9:22-27; John 2:18-22; 12:34 and John Chapters 14-16.

In order to help us better remember the *Historical Argument for Evidence for the Resurrection*, we'll use the acronym **F. E. A. T. S.** since this is the greatest feat in recorded human history.<sup>41</sup>

1. **F**atal Torment
2. **E**mpy Tomb
3. **A**ppearances of Jesus
4. **T**ransformation of the Apostles

## 5. Skeptics Conversions

### **Fatal Torment**

In order to demonstrate beyond a reasonable doubt that Jesus rose from the dead, we obviously have to demonstrate that He died, he suffered **fatal torment**.

Dr. Gary Habermas, Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Liberty University, says that "the fact that's recorded in secular sources more than any other one, about twelve of the eighteen sources tell us that Jesus died, many telling us details, what happened to him, he died by crucifixion, etc...but about two-thirds of the sources tell us he died...we really do have good historical evidence."<sup>42</sup>

Jesus faced false testimonies (Mark 14:56) in front of the Sanhedrin and was then sent to Pontius Pilate, governor of Judea (Luke 23:1), and sentenced to die at the hands of Roman soldiers on the cross. But first, the beatings and the scourging took place.

Mark 15:15 says, "So Pilate...delivered Jesus, after he had scourged Him, to be crucified."

Dr. Gary Habermas and Dr. Michael Licona explain the scourging process:

"The usual instrument was a short whip...with several single or braided leather thongs of variable lengths, in which small iron balls or sharp pieces of sheep bones were tied at intervals...the man was stripped of his clothing, and his hands were tied to an upright post...The back, buttocks, and legs were flogged...The scourging...was intended to weaken the victim to a state just short of collapse or death...As the Roman soldiers repeatedly struck the victim's back with full force, the iron balls would cause deep contusions, and the leather thongs and sheep bones would cut into the skin and subcutaneous tissues. Then, as the flogging continued, the lacerations would tear into the underlying skeletal muscles."<sup>43</sup>

Luke 23:33 says, "And when they had come to the place called Calvary, there they crucified Him, and the criminals, one on the right hand and the other on the left."

Crucifixion would have involved laying Jesus on His open lacerated bleeding back on a huge rough splintery cross. The Roman soldiers would take spikes, five to seven inches long and hammer them between the two arm bones at the wrist crushing the median nerve.

"The pain was absolutely unbearable...In fact, it was literally beyond words to describe; they had to invent a new word: *excruciating*. Literally, *excruciating* means 'out of the cross.'...they had to create a new word, because there was nothing in the language that could describe the intense anguish caused during crucifixion.

At this point Jesus was hoisted as the cross bar was attached to the vertical stake, and then nails were driven through Jesus' feet. Again the nerves in his feet would have been crushed...Crushed and severed nerves were certainly bad enough...his arms would have been immediately stretched, probably about six inches in length, and both shoulders would have been dislocated...This fulfilled the Old Testament prophecy in Psalm 22, which foretold the Crucifixion hundreds of years before it took place, 'My bones are out of joint.'"<sup>44</sup>

Often, death was caused by asphyxiation. Because of the position and tension on the diaphragm, the victim would have to push up on the spike in their feet, ripping flesh until it lodged against a bone, to take a breath of air.

John 19:33, 34 says, "But when they came to Jesus and saw that He was already dead...one of the soldiers pierced His side with a spear, and immediately blood and water came out."

Let there be no doubt, Jesus was dead. John 19:30 says, "[Jesus] said, 'It is finished!' And bowing His head, *He gave up His spirit.*" (emphasis added)

## Empty Tomb

Jesus had just been crucified and His words of 'rising again after three days' were still ringing in the chief priests and the Pharisees ears. This meant that there would be an **empty tomb**.

This worried them so they decided to talk to Pilate according to Matthew 27:62-64 and Pilate's response in verse 65 is very revealing.

"'You have a guard; go your way, make it as secure as you know how.' So they went and made the tomb secure, sealing the stone and setting the guard." (Matthew 27:65)

**The Soldiers.** The word *guard* or *watch*, in the KJV, [Greek: *koustodia*] means a "Roman sentry." For an important political figure like Jesus, it's highly possible that there were as many as 30, no less than 10 but likely 16 highly trained, able bodied, and fully armed Roman soldiers guarding the tomb.

**The Stone.** The Bible tells us that the stone that covered the entrance to the tomb where Jesus was laid, was of formidable size.

Scholars tell us that the stone could have weighed possibly as much as two tons, thus the comment by the three women wondering who would move the stone for them.

**The Seal.** The seal would have been more symbolic as a deterrent than the actual 16 Roman guards or two-ton stone.

Although the seal could be easily broken, the psychological factor that was associated with breaking an official seal of the Roman government would have been formidable in and of itself. Anyone breaking it without permission by the government would be executed.

The overall impact of these three security measures only increases the case for the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

## Appearances of Jesus

One of the strongest evidences for the resurrection is the physical **appearances** of Jesus in the days that followed His crucifixion and resurrection.

1 Corinthians 15:1-8 contains one of the earliest creeds in the New Testament.

- 1 Corinthians 15:1-5 says, "Moreover, brethren, I declare to you the gospel which I preached to you, which also you received and in which you stand, by which also you are saved, if you hold fast that word which I preached to you – unless you believed in vain. For I delivered to you first of all that which I also received: *that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures, and that He was seen by Cephas, then by the twelve.*" (emphasis added)

It is believed, and with good reason, that this creed developed within five years of the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

The bottom line is this, the number of witnesses to the resurrection of Jesus Christ is not only astounding and credible, but would stand up as evidence in a court of Law. Consider the following:

"If you were to call each one of the witnesses to a court of law to be cross-examined for just fifteen minutes each, and you went around the clock without a break, it would take you from breakfast Monday until dinner on Friday to hear from them all. After listening to 129 straight hours of eyewitness testimony, who could possibly walk away unconvinced?"<sup>45</sup>

## Transformation of the Apostles

So, what was the effect on the disciples after Jesus appeared to them physically? What **transformation** came over them?

During His trial, crucifixion and even after Jesus' death, we see that the disciples were discouraged, depressed and even scared. These guys are even recorded as cowering in a room after Jesus' death.

- We read that at the time of Jesus' arrest, "all the disciples forsook Him and fled." (Matthew 26:56; Mark 14:50)
- Simon Peter *cringes with cowardness* when confronted by a servant girl. (Matthew 26:69-75)
- The remaining disciples are hiding behind shut doors "for fear of the Jews." (John 20:19)

And yet, we see in a very short time after the disciples had seen the physical resurrected Jesus, that they were no longer the scared men hiding behind closed doors that they were just weeks earlier.

These men *believed* they had seen Jesus Christ raised from the dead and it had such an impact on them, that it transformed them into men who boldly preached the Gospel to the ends of the earth.

These men gave up their sociological and their theological identities because they sincerely *believed* that they had seen Jesus raised from the dead.

These men died and were martyred for their *belief* that Jesus Christ had been raised from the dead and liars make poor martyrs.

### **Skeptics Conversions**

And finally, we seek that two of the main **skeptics** of Jesus' claims, and how they were "convinced" and then ended up being two of His strongest supporters.

James, the brother of Jesus, like Jesus' other family members were not believers in Jesus during His earthly ministry:

- Mark 3:21 says, "But when His own people heard about this, they went out to lay hold of Him, for they said, 'He is out of His mind.'"
- Mark 6:3-4 says, "Is this not the carpenter, the Son of Mary, and brother of James...So they were offended by Him. But Jesus said to them, 'A prophet is not without honor except in his own country, among his own relatives, and in his own house.'"
- John 7:5 says, "For even His brothers did not believe in Him."

Next we hear of James in the 1 Corinthians 15:7 creed and we read:

- "After that He was seen by James, then by all the apostles."

Then, we read that James is identified as the leader in the Jerusalem church according to Acts 15. What happened? James turned a corner according to 1 Corinthians 15:7 – he saw Jesus alive.

Saul of Tarsus, later known as Paul the apostle, was a devout Jew and Pharisee by training and education.

Saul hated anything to do with Christianity since he believed that it was disloyal and disruptive to the traditions of the Jewish people and did everything he could to stop the early church.

- Acts 9:1 tells us that "Saul, still breathing threats and murder against the disciples of the Lord, went to the high priest and asked letters from him so that...he might bring them bound to Jerusalem."

So, how could a man, a Pharisee trained and educated, who was set and taught in the Jewish law, do a complete 180 degree turn and instead of hunting down the Lord's church, become one of the Lord's church?

First, Jesus spoke to Paul according to Acts 9:4 and second, Jesus appeared to Paul according to Acts 9:17; 22:14, 15; 26:16; 1 Corinthians 9:1.

We thus have to conclude that the sight of the risen Lord had to convince James and Saul of Tarsus that Jesus did indeed rise from the grave on the third day as He predicted.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, there are many good evidences for the existence of God and in fact, I believe better than not.

We cannot prove God exists by scientific evidence. It's circumstantial at best.

And, although the existence of God can be neither proved nor disproved, the Bible says that we must accept by faith the fact that God exists.

- Hebrews 11:6 says, "But without faith it is impossible to please Him, for he who comes to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of those who diligently seek Him."

The writer of Hebrews then lays down two requirements for faith. First, he must believe that God exists because "we must believe that He is..." and second, there must be a conviction about God's moral character, belief that "... God is a rewarder of those who diligently seek Him."

- Proverbs 8:17 says, "I love those who love me, and those who seek me diligently will find me."
- Jeremiah 29:13 says, "And you will seek Me and find [Me], when you search for Me with all your heart."

Blaise Pascal (1623-1662), French mathematician, physicist and philosopher stated a question known as "Pascal's Wager" that states basically that "If God doesn't exist, there's no payoff in the end and, whether we wager for or against Gods existence. For we neither gain nor lose anything if God does not exist. But if God exists, the wager to believe in Him (and make peace with

Him during our lifetime) offers us an infinitely better payoff – eternal life and joy with God! Thus atheism is a no-win bet but faith is a no-lose bet.”

**Resources used for this teaching and recommended reading material:**

1. *On Guard – Defending Your Faith with Reason and Precision*, William Lane Craig, David Cook Publisher, 2010, ISBN: 978-1-4347-6488-1
2. *Reasonable Faith*, William Lane Craig, Crossway Books, 2008, ISBN-13: 978-1-4335-0115-9
3. *Evidence For God*, Edited by William A. Dembski and Michael R. Licona, Baker Books, 2010, ISBN: 978-0-8010-7260-4
4. *Answering The Objections of Atheists, Agnostics, & Skeptics*, Ron Rhodes, Harvest House Publishers, 2006, ISBN: 0-7369-1288-6
5. *Holman QuickSource Guide to Christian Apologetics*, Doug Powell, Holman Reference, 2006, ISBN: 978-080549460-0
6. *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, Norman L. Geisler & Frank Turek, Crossway Books, 2004, ISBN-13: 978-1-58134-561-2
7. *Compelling Evidence For God and the Bible*, Douglas A. Jacoby, 2010, Harvest House Publishers, ISBN: 978-0-7369-2708-6
8. *Beyond Opinion: Living the Faith We Defend*, Ravi Zacharias, 2007, Thomas Nelson, ISBN: 978-0-8499-1968-8
9. *10 Questions & Answers on Atheism & Agnosticism*, Rose Publishing, 2007, ISBN-13: 978-159636-123-2
10. *The 10 Most Common Objections to Christianity*, Alex McFarland, Regal Books, 2007, ISBN-13: 978-0-8307-4298-1
11. *The 10 Things You Should Know About the Creation vs. Evolution Debate*, Ron Rhodes, Harvest House Publishers, 2004, ISBN: 0-7369-1152-9
12. *Signature In the Cell*, Stephen C. Meyer, HarperCollins Publishers, 2009, ISBN 978-0-06-147279-4

If you have questions or comments, please feel free to email  
[info@calvaryCO.church](mailto:info@calvaryCO.church)

## Notes

1. Carl Sagan, *Cosmos*, pg. 4 as cited by Dr. Norman Geisler, *Atheism-Part Two*, <http://www.johnankerberg.org/Articles/PDFArchives/theological-dictionary/TD1W0603.pdf> 12/06/2007
2. [http://thinkexist.com/quotes/with/keyword/the\\_existence\\_of\\_god/](http://thinkexist.com/quotes/with/keyword/the_existence_of_god/) accessed May 6, 2010
3. [http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Christopher\\_Hitchens](http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Christopher_Hitchens) accessed May 6, 2010
4. From speech at the Edinburgh International Science Festival, April 15, 1992 as quoted by [http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Richard\\_Dawkins](http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Richard_Dawkins) accessed May 6, 2010
5. *Free Inquiry* (Spring 1982) as cited by [http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Isaac\\_Asimov](http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Isaac_Asimov) accessed May 6, 2010
6. Herbert Kohl, *From Archetype to Zeitgeist* (Little, Brown and Company: 1992), p. 49
7. "skeptical." *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Douglas Harper, Historian. 29 Oct. 2010. <Dictionary.com <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/skeptical>>.
8. Dr. William Lane Craig, *On Guard: Defending Your Faith with Reason and Precision*, (Colorado Springs, CO: Published by David C. Cook, 2010), pg. 30
9. *Ibid.*, pg. 35
10. Richard Wurmbrand, *Tortured for Christ* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1967), 34 as cited in *On Guard*, pg. 34
11. Dinesh D'Souza, *What's So Great About Christianity* (Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 2008), pg. 219
12. (<http://www.iep.utm.edu/argument/>) accessed November 15, 2010
13. Norm Geisler and Frank Turek, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist* (Wheaton, ILL: Crossway Books, 2004), pg. 30
14. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Causality#cite\\_note-dict-0](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Causality#cite_note-dict-0) accessed October 5, 2010.
15. Geisler and Turek, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, pg. 75
16. Doug Powell, *Holman QuickSource Guide to Christian Apologetics* (Nashville, TN: Holman Reference, 2006), pg 40
17. Stephen Hawking and Roger Penrose, *The Nature of Space and Time* (Princeton University Press, 1996), pg. 20 as cited in *10 Questions & Answers on Atheism & Agnosticism* (Torrance, CA: Rose Publishing, 2007), pg. 4
18. Ron Rhodes, *Answering the Objections of Atheists, Agnostics, & Skeptics* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House Publishers, 2006), pg. 50
19. William Paley, *Natural Theology: Or Evidence of the Existence and Attributes of the Deity, Collected from the Appearances of Nature*, Second Edition, vol 1. (Oxford: J. Vincent, 1828), pg. 65 as cited by Ron Rhodes, *The 10 Things You Should Know About the Creation vs. Evolution Debate* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 2004), pg. 118
20. William Lane Craig, *Reasonable Faith* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2008), pg. 158
21. *Ibid.*
22. <http://www.reasons.org/links/hugh/research-notes> accessed October 6, 2010
23. Douglas A. Jacoby , *Compelling Evidence For God and the Bible* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House Publishers, 2010), pg. 62
24. <http://www.reasons.org/links/hugh/research-notes> accessed October 6, 2010
25. Hugh Ross, *Why the Universe Is The Way It Is* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2008), pg. 35
26. *The Apologetics Study Bible* (Nashville, TN: Holman Publishers, 2007), pg. 832
27. William A. Dembski and Sean McDowell, *Intelligent Design* (Torrance, CA: Rose Publishing, 2009), pg 2.

28. William A. Dembski, *Intelligent Design* (Downers, IL.: IVP Academic, 1999), pg. 128E. Borel, *Probabilities and Life* (New York: Dover Publications, 1962), pg. 28 as cited in *Answers in Genesis Book2* pg. 24
29. E. Borel, *Probabilities and Life* (New York: Dover Publications, 1962), pg. 28 as cited in *Answers in Genesis Book2* pg. 24
30. Doug Powell, *Holman QuickSource Guide to Understanding Creation* (Nashville, TN: Holman Reference, 2008), pg 326
31. Peter Stoner, *Science Speaks* (Wheaton, IL: Van Kampen Press, 1952), pg. 75 as cited in *Answers in Genesis Book3* pg. 155
32. [http://www.origins.org/articles/thaxton\\_dnadesign.html](http://www.origins.org/articles/thaxton_dnadesign.html) accessed November 17, 2010
33. Doug Powell, *Holman QuickSource Guide to Christian Apologetics* (Nashville, TN: Holman Reference, 2006), pg 326
34. Fred Hoyle and N. Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Evolution from Space* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984), pg. 176 as cited from *Answers in Genesis Book2* pg. 24
35. Craig, *On Guard*, pg. 129
36. Jacoby, *Compelling Evidence For God and the Bible*, pg. 41
37. Craig, *On Guard*, pg. 134
38. C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity* (New York, NY: Macmillan, 1952), pg. 21 as cited by Norm Geisler and Frank Turek, pg. 192
39. Paul Copan, *True For You But Not For Me* (Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House Publishers, 2009), pg. 72
40. *Ibid.*, pg. 99
41. I did not create this acronym, other than to add the 'S', for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ but after looking at different methods of teaching the Resurrection, I've chosen Hank Hanagraaff's method which I believe accurately portrays an excellent apologetics approach. Specifically, his book *Resurrection* is the book I'm referring to.
42. Dr. Gary Habermas on <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4hF5uxjBulA> accessed November 13, 2010
43. Gary R. Habermas and Michael R. Licona, *The Case for the Resurrection of Jesus* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2004), p. 100
44. Lee Strobel, *The Case For Christ* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1998), p. 198
45. *Ibid.*, 237