

# Strengthen your Faith

*(A short course in Christian Apologetics)*

*Peter Berean*

[www.GodAndScience.INFO](http://www.GodAndScience.INFO)

*Copyright ©2017*

*(15sep17)*

## Description

---

This eBook is a short course in Christian Apologetics. Its purpose is to help Christians to strengthen their Faith in the existence of God and in the Core of the gospel.

Title: Strengthen your Faith (From Atheism to Christ)

Topic: A Short Course in Apologetics

Purpose: To Strengthen the Faith of Christians

Audience: Christians who wish to strengthen their faith.

Time: 1 hour

---

### Topics

---

0. Introduction
  1. My Path from Atheism to Christ
  2. Seeking Truth
  3. Philosophy points to Theism
  4. Science points to Theism
  5. Philosophy & Science point to Mono-Theism
  6. Overview of Religions
  7. Polytheistic Hinduism
  8. Pantheistic Hinduism
  9. Bhakthi Vedanta Hinduism
  10. Agnostic Buddhism
  11. Poly-Spiritistic Buddhism
  12. Other Poly-Spiritistic & Polytheistic Religions
  13. Judaism
  14. Islam
  15. The Resurrection of Christ
  16. Christianity
  17. Conclusions
-

Source: [www.GodAndScience.INFO](http://www.GodAndScience.INFO) (Peter B.)

-----  
Disclaimer: This is a work in progress, and it will continue to be modified based on dialog and feedback.

---

## COPYRIGHT

---

Copyright © 2017  
by Peter Berean  
[www.GodAndScience.INFO](http://www.GodAndScience.INFO)

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form without prior written permission from the copyright owner. And, no part of this publication may be stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form, or by any means (electronic, paper, photocopies, printed copies, recordings or other) without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

\*\*\*

## Table of Contents

---

Section 1: Strengthen your Faith .....	7
0. Introduction .....	7
1. My Path from Atheism to Christ .....	8
2. Seeking Truth .....	11
3. Philosophy points to Theism.....	13
4. Science points to Theism .....	14
5. Philosophy & science point to Mono-Theism .....	16
6. Overview of Religions .....	17
7. Polytheistic Hinduism .....	18
8. Pantheistic Hinduism .....	19
9. Bhakthi Vedanta Hinduism .....	21
10. Agnostic Buddhism.....	23
11. Poly-spiritistic Buddhism .....	24
12. Other Polyspiritistic & polytheistic religions.....	25
13. Judaism.....	26
14. Islam .....	28
15. The Resurrection of Jesus Christ .....	30
16. Christianity .....	34
17. Conclusion .....	35
Appendix 1. Seeking Truth .....	36
Section 2. Philosophical Theism .....	42
0. Ex-Atheist & Philosophical Theist .....	42
1. God, Epistemology, Abduction .....	43
2. God, Truth & Christianity .....	46
3. My background .....	48
4. Theism is Logically Possible .....	49
5. ATHEISM is Logically IMPOSSIBLE .....	50

6. Ex-Atheism ..... 55  
7. Philosophical Theism ..... 56  
8. THEISM is True (as a Rational Inference) ..... 60  
9. Mere Christianity ..... 66  
10. Conclusion ..... 67

## Section 1: Strengthen your Faith

This eBook presents the path (and the evidence and the reasoning) that led me from Atheism to Christ.

I present it here in the form of a short-course to strengthen the faith of other Christians.

---

### 0. Introduction

---

#### Topic 0 - Introduction

P001. A friend asked me what drew me to Christianity over other religions (as I moved away from Atheism, and ultimately to Christ).

P002. This eBook is an attempt to briefly answer that question.

P003. I mean no offense to anyone by my comments below.

P004. I am merely describing the Path that led me out of Atheism, and ultimately to Christ.

---

## 1. My Path from Atheism to Christ

### Topic 1 - My Path from Atheism to Christ.

P101. My dad was an atheist

- I was influenced by him and by his library, which had a bunch of books by atheist intellectuals.
- I grew to be an agnostic-to-atheist as a teen and in my early 20s.

P102. I was always attracted to Beauty and Truth.

- this led me to science (and a career in science).

P103. I became an atheist existentialist

- experienced the despair (angst) of it.
- There is no point to life. Might as well kill yourself. Despair.

P104. However, something inside me said there HAS to be more to life.

P105. I grew to realize that atheism does NOT have answers to the Big questions of existence

- I grew to realize that Science does NOT have answers to the Big questions of existence

P106. Seeking Truth led me to Science

- Seeking Beauty led me to Astronomy

P107. Astronomy led me to Cosmology

- Cosmology led me to Evidence for the Big Bang
- The Big Bang led me to God (Deism/Theism)
- And, so did the Physics of the Fine-Tuning of the Universe

P108. Seeking Truth also led me to Philosophy

- Philosophy became another strand that led me to God (Deism/Theism)

P109. I started looking into the different religions (Hinduism, New-Age, Islam, Judaism, Jehovah's Witnesses, LDS, Secular Humanism).

P110. Over time, the Character of Jesus drew me to Him

- The Intelligence of Jesus drew me to Him
- The Humor of Jesus drew me to Him
- The Self-Sacrifice of Jesus drew me to Him

P111. My reading the New Testament gospels. I felt like I was literally there... and I was experiencing the things that the disciples experienced ... their initial unbelief (i experienced that) growing over time into the belief that he was More than Just a Man (i experienced that as well).

P112. A growing sense of the Reality of God in the form of Jesus.

P113. And a realization that Jesus provides a solution to the Problem of Pain and Suffering that NO other religion does. This drew me to Christianity.

P114. And the realization that GOD is the ultimate source of Both GOOD and EVIL (in the sense of being ultimately responsible for both). The Bible was unique in that sense, of accepting that truth.

P115. I can respect a God who accepts responsibility for his Actions (accepts responsibility for both good and evil). And, who provides an explanation or an apology in love, if you will, by experiencing the ultimate manifestation of Evil, suffering as an Innocent man on the cross.

P116. All of these drew me to the Character of the Christian God over all other pictures of gods (in the different religions).

P117. And these drew me to the character of Christ.

P118. Over time, I provisionally accepted Christ into my life, committed my life to him based on the Core of the Gospel\*, and asked him to make himself real to me (show himself as real in my life).

P119. Note\*: the Core of the Christian Gospel is the following (a) there is ONE God, (b) Jesus is God in human form, (c) Jesus suffered and died on the cross to enable reconciliation between God and us, (d) I accept this and I commit my life to Christ based on this, (e) the result is that I am an adopted child of God, with a

personal relationship with him in this life and in the life to come. I committed my life to Christ based on the Core of this gospel.

P120. I then went through a period when God answered a series of my prayers in ways that were truly amazing to me.

P121. And by doing so, he showed me beyond a reasonable doubt (to me) that HE is real, and that He loves me as his child.

P122. That is the path that has led me to where I now am, as a Christian.

I wish you Peace and Joy in Christ.

---

## 2. Seeking Truth

### Topic 2 – Seeking Truth

P201. I am an Ex-Atheist, a Philosophical Theist, and a Mere-Christian (i.e., a Christian who subscribes to the Core of the Christian Gospel, while NOT being dogmatic about secondary denominational doctrines).

P202. The Epistemology (method of coming to truth) that I use is a specific form of Abductive Reasoning (“Inference to a Rational Explanation”) based on Evidence, Logic and Reason.

P203. So, be aware that the reasoning below is Abductive, and is NOT intended to be Deductive in Nature.

P204. However, this is the SAME kind of reasoning that we use to come to the conclusion that (a) the physical world exists, (b) other minds exist, and (c) yesterday existed.

P205. Therefore, IF it is Rational to use this form of reasoning to come to the conclusion that (a) the physical world exists, (b) other minds exist, and (c) yesterday existed, (and it IS), then it is also Rational to use this SAME form of reasoning to come to the conclusion that (i) God exists, and (ii) the Core of Christianity is true.

P206. Please see Appendix 1 for more details regarding this epistemology. There we discuss four forms of Abductive Reasoning, (a) Abductive-Rational, (b) Abductive-Logical, (c) Abductive-Reasonable, and (d) Abductive-Inference to the Best Explanation.

P207. In the following sections, we look at (a) philosophy pointing to theism, (b) science pointing to theism, (c) philosophy and science pointing to MONO-theism, (d) overview of religions, (e) polytheistic Hinduism, (f) pantheistic Hinduism, (g) Bhakthi Vedantic Hinduism, (h) agnostic Buddhism, (i) poly-spiritistic Buddhism, (j) other poly-spiritistic & poly-theistic religions, (k) Judaism, (l) Islam, (m) Conclusions, (n) Appendix – Epistemology.

P208. This is a Reminder that in the following sections, we are talking about Abductive Arguments (and NOT Deductive Arguments) that point to God.

P209. So, let's move on to the next section, and briefly look at Philosophy pointing to Theism.

---

### 3. Philosophy points to Theism

#### Topic 3 – Philosophy points to Theism

P301. Philosophy pointed me to the existence of God.

P302. The philosophical evidence that influenced me away from atheism include the following.

P303. The Argument from Necessary Being points to Theism.

P304. The Kalam Cosmological Argument points to Theism.

P305. The Argument for a Volitional First Cause points to Theism.

.....

C301. These arguments point to the existence of a MIND that created the Universe.

C302. We call this Mind, God.

---

## 4. Science points to Theism

### Topic 4 – Science points to Theism

P401. In addition, multiple scientific arguments point to Intelligent Design of the Universe.

P402. The Big Bang shows (beyond a reasonable doubt) that the universe came into being about 14 billion years ago. This points to Creation of the Universe by God, rather than an Atheistic Universe that always existed.

P403. The Fine-Tuning of the Physical Constants of the Universe (to enable life to exist) points to Creation of the Universe by God.

P404. The Impossibility of Random-Chance Origin of Life points to Creation of First-life by God.

P405. The presence of Languages in DNA-Protein-systems points to Intelligent Design, and Creation of life by God.

P406. The presence of Software Codes in DNA-Protein-systems points to Intelligent Design, and Creation of life by God.

P407. The existence of Free-will (in us) points to a not-completely-materialistic reality, which then points to God.

P408. The existence of Consciousness (in us) points to a not-completely-materialistic reality, which then points to God.

P409. The existence of third-party-verified Delocalization-of-Soul/Spirit in some Near-Death Experiences points to the existence of Immaterial-Soul/spirit, which then points to God.

P410. The existence of third-party-verified Delocalization-of-Soul/Spirit in some Out-Of-Body Experiences points to the existence of Immaterial-Soul/spirit, which then points to God.

P411. Quantum-Mechanics double-slit experiments show that Local Realism is Violated. This indicates the existence of an Immaterial NON-local deeper reality. This then points to God.

P412. Quantum-Entanglement shows that Local Realism is Violated. This indicates the existence of an Immaterial NON-local deeper reality. This then points to God.

.....

C401. These evidences point to the existence of a MIND that created the Universe.

C402. We call this Mind, God.

---

## 5. Philosophy & science point to Mono-Theism

### Topic 5 – Philosophy & Science point to MONO-Theism

P501. In addition, there are multiple Philosophical arguments that point to a SINGLE God (monotheism) rather than a Multiplicity of gods (polytheism).

P502. The Argument from Necessary Being points to ONE God, not a multiplicity of Gods. That is because the moment there are multiple gods, the arrangement (or relationships among) those gods become contingent (they are not necessary). So, a multiplicity of gods becomes Contingent, rather than Necessary Being. This points to Monotheism rather than polytheism.

P503. Ockham's Razor argues for ONE God rather than a multiplicity of gods. If ONE God will explain all of reality, we do not need to postulate a multiplicity of gods to explain that same reality. So, this points to Monotheism rather than polytheism.

P504. In addition, we find that Ockham's Razor is amazingly effective in describing Reality. This is an indication of a deep underlying unity in reality. This is a reasonable expectation if reality was created by ONE God rather than by a bunch of independent gods. So, this points to Monotheism rather than polytheism.

P505. In addition, we find a deep underlying unity in reality (through science that shows uniform natural laws that operate throughout reality). This is a reasonable expectation if reality was created by ONE God rather than by a bunch of independent gods. So, this points to Monotheism rather than polytheism.

.....

C501. These evidences point to the existence of a SINGLE God that created the Universe, rather than a whole bunch of separate Gods.

## 6. Overview of Religions

### Topic 6 – Overview of Religions

P601. These (above) then led me to look into the various religions, and in particular monotheistic religions.

P602. As I investigated the different religions, I found the following.

P603. Almost all religions point to a Highest God (as a Highest MIND that created reality).

P604. Almost all polytheistic religions point to a Hierarchy of Spiritual beings, with the Highest God (monotheistic) at the top.

P605. So, there is a common core to most of these religions (with a highest God).

P606. All of the lower gods are creations of, or children of, or manifestations of, or incarnations of, this highest God.

P607. It is that highest God that I am interested in (based on the arguments in Topics 3,4,5)

P609. Independently of this, the Philosophical arguments in topic-5 pointed me to ONE highest God (not a multiplicity of polytheistic Gods).

.....

C601. All of these pointed me ultimately to a form of Monotheism.

---

## 7. Polytheistic Hinduism

### Topic 7 – Polytheistic Hinduism

P701. Hinduism has 3 major forms, (a) polytheistic Hinduism, (b) pantheistic Hinduism, and (c) henotheistic devotional Hinduism (Bhakthi Vedanta).

P702. Polytheistic Hinduism has a hierarchy of gods. All of the lower gods are avatars (manifestations or incarnations) of the highest god who is different from all of the secondary gods. So this form of Hinduism points to a form of Monotheism (one Highest God).

P703. Such Hinduism is open to Jesus being God, and Jesus being God in human form, and to the need for sacrifice for sin, and the need for redemption. So such Hinduism is fine with the Core of the Christian Gospel (God, Jesus as God in human form, Jesus sacrifice on the cross, our commitment to Christ and redemption through him).

P704. Polytheistic Hinduism also teaches that ALL spiritual paths lead to God. Including Christianity.

....

C701. So, if polytheistic Hinduism is true, really a form of monotheism (highest God) is true, and there is no impediment to being a Christian.

C702. This reasoning applies to the other different kinds of polytheistic religions (a highest God; sacrificial systems etc).

---

## 8. Pantheistic Hinduism

### Topic 8 – Pantheistic Hinduism

P801. According to Pantheistic Hinduism, all of reality is God.

P802. However, everything is illusion. Including reality. Including God.

P803. This form is self-refuting, and so can be discarded.

P804. If everything is illusion, that means that nothing is real. Including Hinduism. Including reality. Including me. That means that I (my mind) does NOT exist.

P805. But Descartes shows that that last statement (I don't exist) is self-refuting. I have to be exist because I cannot NOT exist and at the same time ask the question "do I exist?"

P806. So, this form of Hinduism is self-refuting. And so it is a kind of square-circle. And so it is false.

.....

C801. This form of Hinduism is self-refuting. And so it is false.

.....

P807. In addition, Pantheistic Hinduism teaches that the Law of Karma is absolute. (you reap what you sow, across multiple lifetimes of Reincarnation).

P808. However, Pantheistic Hinduism ALSO teaches the Law of Maya (everything is an illusion).

P809. However, if everything is illusion, then the Law of karma is also an illusion. And the Law of Maya is also an illusion. That means Karma is NOT real; and Maya is not real. This means that those laws are False.

P810. This is self-refuting. Therefore, this form of Hinduism is self-refuting. And so, it is false.

.....

C802. This form of Hinduism is self-refuting. And so, it is false.

---

## 9. Bhakthi Vedanta Hinduism

### Topic 9 – Bhakthi Vedanta Hinduism

P901. As I mentioned above, Hinduism has 3 major forms, (a) polytheistic Hinduism, (b) pantheistic Hinduism, and (c) henotheistic devotional Hinduism (Bhakthi Vedanta).

P902. Henotheistic devotional Hinduism (Bhakthi Vedanta) is similar to Polytheistic Hinduism with the exception that we actually deal with only one Highest God.

P903. Such Hinduism has a hierarchy of gods. However, all of the lower gods are avatars (manifestations or incarnations) of the highest god who is different from all of the secondary gods. So, this form of Hinduism points to a form of Monotheism (one Highest God).

P904. Bhakthi Vedanta also subscribes to (a) Salvation through Faith in God, (b) Salvation through the Grace of God, (c) Salvation through the Love of God, (d) a personal relationship of love with God.

P905. Such Hinduism is open (in principle) to Jesus being God, and Jesus being God in human form, and to the need for sacrifice for sin, and the need for redemption.

P906. So, such Hinduism is fine (in principle) with the Core of the Christian Gospel (God, Jesus as God in human form, Jesus sacrifice on the cross, our commitment to Christ and redemption through him).

P907. In addition, Hinduism also teaches that ALL spiritual paths lead to God. Including Christianity.

.....

C901. So, if such Bhakthi Vedanta Hinduism is true, really a form of monotheism (highest God) is true, and there is no impediment to being a Christian.

.....

P908. There appears to be evidence that Hinduism developed Bhakthi Vedanta in a syncretistic manner based on the teachings of the early Christians (from the first to second centuries AD or so).

P909. This would explain why there are SO many similarities between Bhakthi Vedanta Hinduism and Christianity.

P910. This is also consistent with the Hindu view that ALL paths lead to God. Including Christianity.

.....

C902. So, if such Bhakthi Vedanta Hinduism is true, really a form of monotheism (highest God) is true, and there is no impediment to being a Christian.

C903. And, if such Bhakthi Vedanta Hinduism is true, and all paths lead to God, there is no impediment to being a Christian.

---

## 10. Agnostic Buddhism

### Topic 10 – Agnostic Buddhism

P1001. There are two major forms of Buddhism (a) agnostic Buddhism and (b) poly-spiritistic Buddhism.

P1002. Buddha himself was an Agnostic. He said that he does NOT know if God exists. But he just wanted to give us a way to live our lives so as to attain a measure of mental peace in this life. Walk the middle path. Avoid the extremes of both hedonism and asceticism.

P1003. Since Buddha was an agnostic (not an atheist), there is no reason for such a Buddhist to object on principle against the Core of the Gospel in Christianity.

P1004. And since my primary interest in seeing if there is a God, I can validly move past such Agnostic-Buddhism to look at other religions (such as Christianity that DO answer the question of whether God exists).

P1005. AND, the teachings of Buddha (on how to live our lives so as to attain peace of mind) are similar in many aspects to the teachings of Christ.

P1006. So, such an agnostic Buddhist should have no objection (in principle) to following the teaching of Jesus for this life.

.....

C1001. So, Agnostic Buddhism provides NO reason to NOT accept the teachings of Jesus Christ.

## 11. Poly-spiritistic Buddhism

### Topic 11 – Poly-spiritistic Buddhism

P1101. As I have mentioned, There are two major forms of Buddhism (a) agnostic Buddhism and (b) poly-spiritistic Buddhism.

P1102. Poly-spiritistic Buddhism is ultimately derived from (and similar to) polytheistic Buddhism.

P1103. So the same arguments that we discussed (re polytheistic Hinduism) apply to this form of Buddhism.

P1104. Poly-spiritism subscribes to a hierarchy of spirits. With a highest Spirit.

P1105. That highest Spirit would be similar in characteristics to the Highest God (as in Monotheism). And all of the lower spirits are creations or manifestations of this highest God.

P1106. So, this leads to monotheism as well.

P1107. And such Buddhism is fine with sacrifices to the spirits to enable relationship with the spirits (or gods), and to have prayers answered, and to pay for our sins etc.

.....

C1101. So, Poly-spiritistic Buddhism provides NO reason to NOT accept Monotheism, and the teachings of Jesus Christ.

---

## **12. Other Polyspiritistic & polytheistic religions**

### Topic 12 – Other Poly-spiritistic & Polytheistic religions

C1201. Similar arguments apply to the other poly-spiritistic and poly-theistic religions.

---

## 13. Judaism

### Topic 13 – Judaism

P1301. Judaism points to a Messiah. That messiah is Jesus Christ.

P1302. The scriptures of Judaism are the Tanach (what Christians call the Old Testament).

P1303. The Tanach has a host of prophecies that speak of a Messiah who is to come in the future.

P1304. Jewish Rabbis recognized that the Tanach has Messianic prophecies that point to (a) a Victorious King Messiah, and (b) a suffering servant Messiah.

P1305. They were able to explain the Victorious King Messiah, who would save Israel from its persecutors. BUT they had no explanation for the Suffering Servant Messiah.

P1306. Jesus came along and taught that he is BOTH (a) a Victorious King Messiah, and (b) a suffering servant Messiah. He comes as the Suffering-Servant in his first coming (to pay for our sins), and then as a Victorious King Messiah in his second coming (to redeem his followers from this world).

P1307. Jesus has an explanation for BOTH sets of Messianic prophecies whereas the Jewish Rabbis did NOT have any explanation for the Suffering-Servant Messiah passages.

.....

C1301. So, the Old Testament Prophecies point to Jesus as the Messiah.

.....

P1308. In addition, the Tanach has prophecies in the book of Daniel that indicate when the Messiah would arrive in Jerusalem.

P1309. These Daniel Prophecies indicate a time-frame of about 30 AD for the Messiah to arrive in Jerusalem.

P1310. Jesus arrived in Jerusalem in about 30 AD.

.....

C1302. So, the Daniel Prophecies point to Jesus as the Messiah.

C1303. So, ultimately Judaism points to Jesus as the Christ (the Messiah).

C1304. Many Jews are growing to realize this, and are becoming Messianic Jews (Jewish believers in Jesus Christ).

---

## 14. Islam

### Topic 14 – Islam

P1401. Islam arose about 600 AD, through the teachings of (the-Muslim-prophet) Muhammad. His teachings are captured in the Quran and the Hadiths.

P1402. The Quran & Hadiths teach that Jesus was without Sin (but that (the-Muslim-prophet) Muhammad did sin, so he was NOT sure if he would make it to heaven). And that Jesus was born of a virgin, and that his mother was a perpetual virgin even after Jesus' birth, and that Jesus was born by a Special Miracle by God (through Mary), and that Jesus did miracles, and that Jesus was crucified (but did not die), and later, he ascended to heaven.

P1403. So, a LOT of the teachings about Jesus (in the Quran and Hadiths) are very similar to those in the New Testament (called the Injil by the-Muslim-prophet Muhammad).

P1404. So, the Quran and the Hadiths present Jesus as the highest prophet, the most perfect prophet (sinless), even more perfect than the-Muslim-prophet Muhammad (who admits that he has sinned and wasn't sure if he would make it to heaven).

P1405. The-Muslim-prophet Muhammad tells his followers that we can learn about God from Jesus, and to love Jesus and to learn about him. And to learn about Jesus and his teachings by (a) asking his followers (Christians) and by (b) reading the Injil (what we call the New Testament).

P1406. By using the method that is recommended by the-Muslim-prophet Muhammad, we (a) ask Christians about Jesus, and (b) we read the Injil, the New Testament, to learn about Jesus. And both of these methods lead us to the Core of the Christian Gospel.

P1407. So, by following the teachings of the-Muslim-prophet Muhammad, we learn that Jesus is without sin, and that we can learn about God through Jesus. And when we follow the-Muslim-prophet Muhammad's instructions (and read the Injil, the New Testament), we are led to the Core of the Christian Gospel.

.....

C1401. So, by following the teachings of the-Muslim-prophet Muhammad (about Jesus and the Injil), we are led to the Core of the Christian Gospel.

.....

P1408. In addition, the-Muslim-prophet Muhammad approved of the Injil that was available at the time of his life on earth, about 600 AD. And he directed his followers to read the Injil to learn about Jesus, and about his teachings. So, this means that the-Muslim-prophet Muhammad recognized the Injil (the New Testament) from 600 AD as being valid and correct.

P1409. We have manuscripts of the gospels (the New Testament) that date back to 600 AD and earlier. And the message about Jesus Christ (and the Core of the Gospel) is exactly the same in those manuscripts as in today's Bibles.

P1410. This means that the teachings about Jesus from the Bible today are the same as the teachings about Jesus from the Injil (New Testament) Gospels that were available in 600 AD.

P1411. And this means that the-Muslim-prophet Muhammad approved those Injil (New Testament) gospels (from 600 AD) as being authentic about the life and teachings of Jesus. And this means that the-Muslim-prophet Muhammad approved the message about life and teachings of Jesus that we read in the Injil (New Testament) gospels today (that match the 600AD gospels).

P1412. And by reading exactly those same gospels (that the-Muslim-prophet Muhammad approved as authentic), we come to the Core of the Gospel.

P1413. So, leading this logic, and by following the teachings of the-Muslim-prophet Muhammad, we are led to the Core of the Christian Gospel (about Jesus).

.....

C1402. So, by following the teachings of the-Muslim-prophet Muhammad (about Jesus and the Injil), we are led to the Core of the Christian Gospel.

## 15. The Resurrection of Jesus Christ

### Topic 15 – The Resurrection of Jesus Christ

---

#### INTRODUCTION:

---

P1501. So, what does the New Testament teach us about Jesus Christ?

P1502. Ten of the 27 books in the New Testament were written by disciples of Jesus Christ who were eyewitnesses of his life. They document his life, his teachings, his miracles, his suffering and death on the cross, followed by his resurrection (his coming back to life after 3 days).

P1503. The resurrection convinced the disciples (and more than 500 of Jesus' other followers) that he has power over death (and so he is God in human form). The disciples of Jesus document this growing realization in the books of the New Testament.

P1504. So, the core of what convinced the disciples (that Jesus is God) were his miracles, and his Resurrection (coming back alive from the dead).

P1505. So, let's look at the resurrection.

---

#### [A] THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST (A)

---

P1. The truth of Christianity hinges on the Resurrection of Christ.

P2. There is strong historical evidence for the Life of Christ and for His Resurrection.

P3. The only reason to reject the historical evidence for the Resurrection is dogmatic atheism (dogmatic naturalism).

P4. However, the evidence we have seen above (in the context of philosophical theism) shows that dogmatic naturalism is irrational.

C1 Therefore, there is no strong reason to reject the historical evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

---

P5. The message and the person of Christ is validated by God through the Resurrection of Christ.

P6. That message of Christ is the Core of the Gospel (as presented above).

C2. So, the Core of the Gospel is validated (by God) through the Resurrection of Christ.

---

## B. THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST (B)

---

P1. Jesus tomb was found empty by a group of his women followers on the first day of the week following his crucifixion.

P2. Various individuals and groups on different occasions and under varying circumstances experienced appearances of Jesus alive.

P3. The first disciples came sincerely to believe in Jesus' resurrection despite every predisposition to the contrary.

- Dr. William Lane Craig

C. Therefore, it is reasonable to infer that the Resurrection of Jesus Christ actually did occur.

---

## C. THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST (C)

---

P1. The primary reason to reject the resurrection is because of the atheist assumption that miracles are impossible.

P2. However, if God exists, miracles are possible. And the resurrection is possible.

P3. It is a reasonable inference that God exists. Therefore miracles are possible.

P4. The historical evidence (see above and below) supports the resurrection.

P5. The disciples paid with their lives for their repeated testimony that Jesus did rise from the dead. They had no motive to lie (no fame, fortune, women, or worldly success; just beatings, imprisonment and ultimate death). They had been skeptical, but were converted by the evidence for Jesus' resurrection.

C. Therefore, it is reasonable and rational to infer that the resurrection of Jesus Christ did indeed occur. There is no strong reason to reject it out of hand.

---

## INFERENCE

---

If the resurrection occurred, then this indicates (a) that Jesus is God (and so he has power over death) or (b) that God raised Jesus from the Dead.

If God raised Jesus from the dead, then this is indication that God is authenticating (declaring as true), the teachings of Jesus.

Jesus taught that he is God in human form.

So, in either case, the Resurrection indicates that Jesus is indeed God in human form.

---

## CONCLUSION

---

It is a reasonable inference (based on the evidence discussed above) that the Resurrection of Jesus did occur. The resurrection convinced the disciples (and more than 500 of Jesus' other followers) that he has power over death (and so he is God in human form).

So, the Resurrection of Jesus Christ authenticates his message (i.e., the core of the Christian gospel).

---

## 16. Christianity

### Topic 16 – Christianity

So, what is the Core of the Christian Gospel?

.....

The Core of the Christian Gospel is very simple.

(A) there is ONE God, creator of the universe.

(B) Jesus is God in human form; He came to earth to set an example in behavior for us, and to experience pain & suffering at the cross, to express solidarity with our pain & suffering and to set the stage for and to enable reconciliation between us and God.

(C) if we accept this and commit our lives to God based on this, we can be in relationship with him today, in this life, and in the life to come.

.....

I invite you to commit your life to God based on what Jesus has done for you (and us) on the cross.

---

## 17. Conclusion

### Topic 17 – CONCLUSION

C1701. So, as we have discussed above, we see the following.

C1702. Philosophy leads us to Theism.

C1703. Science leads us to Theism.

C1704. Philosophy, Science & Reason leads us to MONO-Theism over polytheism.

C1705. We also looked at polyspiritism, polytheism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism, and Islam. In each of these cases, we saw a chain of reasoning that leads us to Monotheism and ultimately to Christ.

C1706. So, this (above) shows the path of reasoning that led me from Atheism all the way to Christ, over a period of some years.

In Christ's love.

---

## Appendix 1. Seeking Truth

In this appendix, I first repeat Topic 2 (seeking truth), from earlier in this document (for purposes of continuity), followed by further details of my Epistemology (theory of how we can come to truth).

### A1.0 – [Topic 2] Seeking Truth

P201. I am an Ex-Atheist, a Philosophical Theist, and a Mere-Christian (i.e., a Christian who subscribes to the Core of the Christian Gospel, while NOT being dogmatic about secondary denominational doctrines).

P202. The Epistemology (method of coming to truth) that I use is a specific form of Abductive Reasoning (“Inference to a Rational Explanation”) based on Evidence, Logic and Reason.

P203. So, be aware that the reasoning below is Abductive, and is NOT intended to be Deductive in Nature.

P204. However, this is the SAME kind of reasoning that we use to come to the conclusion that (a) the physical world exists, (b) other minds exist, and (c) yesterday existed.

P205. Therefore, IF it is Rational to use this form of reasoning to come to the conclusion that (a) the physical world exists, (b) other minds exist, and (c) yesterday existed, (and it IS), then it is also Rational to use this SAME form of reasoning to come to the conclusion that (i) God exists, and (ii) the Core of Christianity is true.

P206. Please see Appendices A1.1 & A1.2 below, for more details regarding this epistemology. There we discuss four forms of Abductive Reasoning, (a) Abductive-Rational, (b) Abductive-Logical, (c) Abductive-Reasonable, and (d) Abductive-Inference to the Best Explanation.

P207. In the following sections, we look at (a) philosophy pointing to theism, (b) science pointing to theism, (c) philosophy and science pointing to MONO-theism etc.

P208. This is a Reminder that in the following sections, we are talking about Abductive Arguments (and NOT Deductive Arguments) that point to God.

Next – Appendix 1.1 & 1.2

### A1.1 – A Personal Epistemology (theory of knowledge)

A101. Each of us has a personal epistemology (a way of coming to what we believe to be truth) whether we think of it as an epistemology, or not.

A102. This post is intended to be a clarification of my personal epistemology. Some of you may share the same epistemology. Some of you may not. And that is OK.

A103. I subscribe to ABSOLUTE Knowledge when it comes to the Descartes Minimal-Set\* (and the truth of certain Abstract Objects).

A104. The \*Descartes Minimal Set\* is information based on the fact that “I must necessarily exist, in order to ask the question, do I exist?” This means that I can be absolutely certain that (a) something exists, (b) that something is conscious, (c) that something has choices, and so it is volitional, (d) that something has preferences, and so it has personality, (e) that something is MIND. I can know these things to be true with absolute certainty. The Abstract Objects (referred to above) are theorems and proofs in theoretical math and logic (these are true independent of the existence of the physical world). We can know these things to be true with absolute certainty.

A105. I subscribe to ABDUCTIVE levels of knowledge (NOT Deductive levels of knowledge) for ALL statements about Physical Reality.

A106. An Abductive Inference is an “Inference to the Best Explanation”. This is one form of Inductive Inference. So, its conclusions are NOT Absolutely Certain. BUT, they can be (a) Rational, (b) Logical, (c) Reasonable, and (d) the Best Explanation of the data.

A107. There are four possible kinds of Abductive Inferences. These are (a) Abductive-Rational, (b) Abductive-Logical, (c) Abductive-Reasonable, and (d) Abductive-Best. Definitions: (a) An Abductive-Rational inference is an Inference that is consistent with the rules of Rationality and does NOT violate those rules. (b) Abductive-Logical inference is an Inference that is consistent with the rules of Logic and does NOT violate those rules. (c) An Abductive-Reasonable Inference has Reasons for that inference that obey normal rules of reasoning. (d) An Abductive-Best Inference is an Inference to the Best Explanation, out of the set of available explanations.

A108. I subscribe to a Multi-Source Theory of Truth, i.e., a Multi-Source Epistemology.

A109. We have 5+ senses. It is true that one or two of our senses can be mistaken about a perceived state-of-affairs in reality (at a given time). However, IF the combination of the evidence from all of our senses points to the same state-of-affairs in reality, then our confidence in that state-of-affairs being true can be High.

A110. Abductive knowledge can come to us about events in reality from a variety of sources (a) our senses, (b) science, (c) epistemology, (d) philosophy, (e) historical methods, (f) personal experience, and the (g) testimony of other people. We can call these Abductive Methods.

A111. A hypothesis is a proposed truth-claim, a statement about reality.

A112. To determine if a hypothesis is FALSE, we can use the Abductive methods listed above to Disconfirm it (in an abductive sense). So, we look for DISconfirmation of a given hypothesis from MULTIPLE information-sources (for statements about reality; as described above) to see if that hypothesis is FALSE.

A113. If a hypothesis about reality is NOT disconfirmed by one or more information-sources, then we hold that hypothesis as being provisionally true.

A114. Conversely, to determine if a hypothesis is TRUE, we can use the Abductive methods listed above to Confirm it (in an abductive sense).

A115. So, we look for confirmation of a given hypothesis from MULTIPLE information-sources (for statements about reality; as described above) to infer that that hypothesis is true.

A114. If the Hypothesis is Confirmed by multiple abductive methods, that increases our confidence that that hypothesis is true.

A115. This (above) is my personal epistemology.

A114. When I use this method (epistemology) above, I come to the conclusion that (a) God exists, beyond a reasonable doubt; and (b) the Core of the Christian Gospel is true. Please see below.

## A1.2 – God, Epistemology & Abductive Inference

A201. My Epistemology (theory of knowledge) leads me to a Pascalian-level-of-certainty (beyond a reasonable doubt) that God exists.

A202. See below.

.....

A203. The Existence of God is a Reasonable and Rational Abductive Inference, based on the Evidence.

.....

A204. The existence of God is a Reasonable and Rational Abductive inference based on the Evidence (i) Epistemological, (ii) Philosophical, (iii) Scientific, (iv) Historical, (v) Testimonial, and/or (vi) Personal -Experiential, (vii) Personal-Mystical, (viii) Personal-Answered Prayers.

A205. I am an ex-atheist, and a philosophical theist, because of the Evidence (the kinds of evidence listed in items i-viii above).

A206. And I am a Mere-Christian because of the kinds of evidence listed in iv-viii above.

.....

A207. I am certain beyond a reasonable doubt that God exists (i.e., certain enough to commit my life to the truth of the Christian God).

A208. Having said that, my view is that ALL knowledge about reality is Abductive in Nature (NOT Deductive), with the exception of the Descartes Minimal Set.

A209. So, the existence of God is an Abductive Inference (a Reasonable and a Rational Abductive Inference based on the evidence). The Existence of God is NOT a Deductive Conclusion (so it does not have 100% certainty; but then you cannot have 100% certainty that (a) the physical universe exists, or (b) that Other Minds exist, or (c) that Yesterday Existed.

A210. You CANNOT be 100% certain that (a) the physical universe exists, or (b) that Other Minds exist, or (c) that Yesterday Existed.

A211. However, you can come to the Abductive Inference (or Abductive conclusion) that A,B,C are true (even though you cannot absolutely prove (with Deductive Certainty) that they are true).

A212. As a Theist, I use exactly the SAME mode of Abductive Reasoning to come to the Reasonable and Rational Conclusion (abductive inference) that God Exists.

A213. IF it is Rational to use Abductive Inference to infer that (a) the physical universe exists, or (b) that Other Minds exist, or (c) that Yesterday Existed ...

A214. THEN it is Rational to use Abductive Inference (the SAME mode of reasoning) to infer that (d) God Exists.

A215. We DO use Abductive Inference to infer that (a) the physical universe exists, or (b) that Other Minds exist, or (c) that Yesterday Existed. And we are Rational in doing so.

A216. Therefore, it is Rational to use Abductive Inference (the SAME mode of reasoning) to infer that (d) God Exists.

.....

A217. As I have mentioned above, the existence of God is a Reasonable and Rational Abductive inference based on the Evidence (i) Epistemological, (ii) Philosophical, (iii) Scientific, (iv) Historical, (v) Testimonial, and/or (vi) Personal - Experiential, (vii) Personal-Mystical, (viii) Personal-Answered Prayers.

A218. I am an ex-atheist, and a philosophical theist, because of the Evidence (the kinds of evidence listed in items i-viii above). And I am a Mere-Christian because of the kinds of evidence listed in iv-viii above.

.....

A219. The Topics discussed above (and below) describe some of the evidence that leads me to the inference above.

---

## Section 2. Philosophical Theism

### 0. Ex-Atheist & Philosophical Theist

---

I am an ex-atheist, a philosophical theist, and a Mere-Christian.

The following comments briefly explain my views. These are from past conversations I have had with friends and acquaintances (so there will be some repetition, with my apologies in advance).

Please see the following posts below.

- [1] God, Epistemology & Abduction
  - [2] God, Truth & Christianity
  - [3] My Background
  - [4] Theism is Logically Possible
  - [5] Atheism is Logically Impossible
  - [6] Ex-Atheism
  - [7] Philosophical Theism
  - [8] Theism is True (as a Rational Inference)
  - [9] Mere Christianity
-

## 1. God, Epistemology, Abduction

My Epistemology (theory of knowledge) leads me to a Pascalian-level-of-certainty (beyond a reasonable doubt) that God exists.

See below.

-----  
The Existence of God is a Reasonable and Rational Abductive Inference,  
based on the Evidence.  
-----

The existence of God is a Reasonable and Rational Abductive inference based on the Evidence (i) Epistemological, (ii) Philosophical, (iii) Scientific, (iv) Historical, (v) Testimonial, and/or (vi) Personal -Experiential, (vii) Personal-Mystical, (viii) Personal-Answered Prayers.

I am an ex-atheist, and a philosophical theist, because of the Evidence (the kinds of evidence listed in items i-viii above).

And I am a Mere-Christian because of the kinds of evidence listed in iv-viii above.

.....

I am certain beyond a reasonable doubt that God exists (i.e., certain enough to commit my life to the truth of the Christian God).

Having said that, my view is that ALL knowledge about reality is Abductive in Nature (NOT Deductive), with the exception of the Descartes Minimal Set.

So, the existence of God is an Abductive Inference (a Reasonable and a Rational Abductive Inference based on the evidence). The Existence of God is NOT a Deductive Conclusion (so it does not have 100% certainty; but then you cannot have 100% certainty that (a) the physical universe exists, or (b) that Other Minds exist, or (c) that Yesterday Existed.

You CANNOT be 100% certain that (a) the physical universe exists, or (b) that Other Minds exist, or (c) that Yesterday Existed.

However, you can come to the Abductive Inference (or Abductive conclusion) that A,B,C are true (even though you cannot absolutely prove (with Deductive Certainty) that they are true).

As a Theist, I use exactly the SAME mode of Abductive Reasoning to come to the Reasonable and Rational Conclusion (abductive inference) that God Exists.

IF it is Rational to use Abductive Inference to infer that (a) the physical universe exists, or (b) that Other Minds exist, or (c) that Yesterday Existed ...

THEN it is Rational to use Abductive Inference (the SAME mode of reasoning) to infer that (d) God Exists.

We DO use Abductive Inference to infer that (a) the physical universe exists, or (b) that Other Minds exist, or (c) that Yesterday Existed. And we are Rational in doing so.

Therefore, it is Rational to use Abductive Inference (the SAME mode of reasoning) to infer that (d) God Exists.

.....

As I have mentioned above, the existence of God is a Reasonable and Rational Abductive inference based on the Evidence (i) Epistemological, (ii) Philosophical, (iii) Scientific, (iv) Historical, (v) Testimonial, and/or (vi) Personal -Experiential, (vii) Personal-Mystical, (viii) Personal-Answered Prayers.

I am an ex-atheist, and a philosophical theist, because of the Evidence (the kinds of evidence listed in items i-viii above). And I am a Mere-Christian because of the kinds of evidence listed in iv-viii above.

.....

I hope to post a couple of comments below that will help further explain my views.



## 2. God, Truth & Christianity

Here (below) are some questions that I have been asked in this context (of my being an ex-atheist, a philosophical theist and a Mere-Christian).

-----  
//What made you accept Christianity as truth? //  
-----

Divinely speaking, the Holy Spirit.

Humanly speaking,

- (a) the angst of atheist existentialism, followed by
- (b) searching for meaning, truth and beauty, followed by
- (c) the scientific evidence for God, which led me to the
- (d) philosophical evidence for God, which led me to
- (e) the transition period where I provisionally accepted God (in the hope he exists), followed by
- (f) personal evidence -- answered prayer in my life, in response to prayer to the Christian God, followed by
- (g) a prior near-mystical experience and a post-conversion near-mystical experience...

-----  
//Did you read the Bible first? //  
-----

Not at first. Later on, yes.

-----  
//Did you research other religions and compare? //  
-----

Yes. All of the major religions.

-----  
//Did you have a more deistic approach first? //  
-----

-----  
Yes.

-----  
//What was convincing for you?//  
-----

My period of provisional Deism was followed by a period of provisional Theism.

And I prayed to the Christian God to be Real in my life... and I then experienced a period of time where God answered so many of my prayers (and in such amazing ways) that I could no longer write them off mere coincidences.

And that convinced me that God is real (in addition to the Philosophical, Scientific evidence), and that he does actually love me as an individual.

---

### 3. My background

- My Dad was an atheist; influenced me to atheism; and to science
  - I grew to become fascinated by knowledge, science, philosophy and later, theology
  - My atheism was initially an atheism of young-man arrogance
  - Later on my atheism grew to existentialism, and then to Existential Angst
  - The angst influenced me to seek truth (is atheism really true; is this all there is?)
  - I was influenced by finding atheist intellectuals who came to theism through intellectual means (at least in part).
  - e.g., CS Lewis, GK Chesterton, Fred Hoyle, Prof Anthony Flew, and others.
  - Over time, I was influenced to Theism by (a) the philosophical evidence, (b) the Scientific Evidence, and (c) later on, personal evidence.
  - Note: these are NOT Deductive Proofs. But rather, reasonable and rational evidence.
  - The Inference to God is an Abductive Inference, not a Deductive Proof (just like the inference that Other Minds exist is an Abductive Inference).
-

## 4. Theism is Logically Possible

P1. It is Logically Possible that God exists.

Explanation-for-P1: The existence of God does NOT violate any rule of Logic or of Rationality. Therefore, it is logically and rationally possible that God does exist. This means that it is Logically and Rationally Possible that Theism is True.

.....  
P2. Theism does NOT require (or necessitate) the existence or the reality of any Square-Circle impossibilities.

.....  
P3. Therefore, Theism is NOT logically Impossible.

.....  
P4. Therefore, THEISM is Logically Possible.

.....  
P5. Therefore, it is NOT IRRational to believe in God.

.....  
P6. Therefore, Theism can Reasonably be said to be Rational.

---

### CONCLUSION

---

C1. Theism is Logically Possible.

C2. Therefore, it is NOT IRRational to believe in God.

C3. Therefore, Theism can Reasonably be said to be Rational.

---

## 5. ATHEISM is Logically IMPOSSIBLE

### A2.5 - Atheism is Logically IMPOSSIBLE

---

P1. Atheism is NOT Logically Possible (see below).

.....

P2. So, Atheism is Fundamentally and Foundationally Irrational.

.....

P3. It is impossible for a Square-Circle to actually exist.

Explanation-for-P3: Two features of an actual object cannot be mutually contradictory (in the same sense and at the same time in the actually existing object). So, it is impossible for a Square-Circle to exist in actual reality. A shape cannot be perfectly Square, and perfectly Circular at the same time. Similarly, an object cannot be a perfect Cube and a perfect Sphere at the same time.

.....

P4. If a Hypothesis requires (or necessitates) the existence of a Square-Circle Impossibility, then that Hypothesis is necessarily False. I.e., it is necessarily Impossible for that hypothesis to be true.

.....

P5. ATHEISM requires (or necessitates) the existence or the reality or the Truth of one of two sets of Square-Circle Impossibilities (see Appendix below).

.....

P6. Therefore, ATHEISM is itself a Square-Circle impossibility (based on P4-P5 above).

.....

C1. Atheism is False. I.e., Based on the discussion above, it is a reasonable and rational inference that Atheism is False.

-----  
A2.5.1 - SUB-APPENDIX-1  
-----

P101. ATHEISM requires (or necessitates) the Existence or the Reality or the Truth of one of two sets of Square-Circle Impossibilities (see discussion below).

P102. Therefore ATHEISM is itself a Square-Circle Impossibility (see discussion below).

.....  
P103. If Atheism is true, the only options are

A) a past-infinite single universe

B) a past-infinite multiverse

C) Literally Nothing existed and it created a Single Universe with No Cause

D) Literally Nothing existed and it then created a temporally-finite multiverse with No Cause.

There are NO other Atheist Options (if you are trying to avoid God).  
.....

P104. Option-A and Option-B above require the crossing of an infinity. This is impossible. A square-circle. So to insist on Option-A or Option-B is Irrational.

Therefore, both Option-A and Option-B are Square-Circle Impossibilities.

.....  
P105. Option-C and Option-D require that "Literally Nothing" is "Actually Something"... because in these atheist views (C,D), "Literally Nothing" is "Doing Something" (when it creates the universe).

This (above) is Incoherent. And to insist that this is the case (to avoid God) is Irrational.

"NOTHING" cannot be Something at the same time as it is being Nothing.

Therefore, "Literally Nothing" CANNOT be "Actually Something" (in order to Do Something, like Create the Universe).

Therefore, this is a Square-Circle Impossibility (to insist that Absolutely-NOTHING created the Universe).

Therefore, both Option-C and Option-D are Square-Circle Impossibilities.

.....  
P106. In addition, ONLY "Some-thing" or "Some-Entity" can have the Ability to DO Something.

Nothing (NO-thing) CANNOT have any ability to do Something.

Therefore, it is impossible for NOTHING to have the ability to Create the Universe.

Therefore, both Option-C and Option-D are Square-Circle Impossibilities.

.....  
P107. Therefore, ALL four Atheist options (A,B,C,D) are Square-Circle Impossibilities.

.....  
P108. Therefore, Atheism itself is a Square-Circle Impossibility.  
.....

C101. ALL four Atheist options (A,B,C,D) are Square-Circle Impossibilities.

C102. Therefore, Atheism itself is a Square-Circle Impossibility.

-----  
A2.5.2 - SUB-APPENDIX-2  
-----

P201. In addition to the above, in Atheism (options C,D) this "Literally Nothing" is given "God Powers" to

(a) conceptualize an infinite number of sets of mathematical equations for possible universes, and

(b) somehow select among these infinite sets for just those sets of equations that are internally-system-consistent, and

(c) decide which specific one of these sets of internally-system-consistent mathematical equations to actualize into an actual physical universe, and

(d) then, to actually actualize that particular set of mathematical equations into a physical universe.

.....

P202. This (P201 above) is Incoherent.. and for Atheists to insist that this is the case is Irrational.

---

#### A2.5.3 - SUB-APPENDIX-3

---

P301. In addition, ALL of the items above are consistent with the behavior of a MIND...

P302. So, the most Rational Choice is to say that a MIND actually did A-D above rather than "Literally Nothing".

---

#### A2.5.4 - SUB-APPENDIX-4

---

P401. In addition, if the entire universe was created by Literally Nothing and with No cause, this completely destroys any Rational Warrant for Cause and effect.

P402. So, given that Atheism requires this, Atheism destroys any Rational Warrant for Cause and Effect.

P403. And, since Rationality is based on Cause and Effect; AND science is based on Cause and Effect...

P404. This means that Atheism destroys the ground for (a) cause and effect, and therefore, for (b) rationality, and (c) for science.

.....

C401. This reasoning above shows that Atheism is completely irrational (given any of the options A,B,C,D above).

---

## CONCLUSIONS

---

C1. Atheism is Logically Impossible.

C2. Atheism is False.

C3. Based on the discussion above, it is a reasonable and rational inference that Atheism is False.

---

## 6. Ex-Atheism

So, I am an ex-atheist, in part, as a result of my recognizing the intellectual poverty of Atheism.

And, I moved to Theism because of the totality of the Evidence, (a) scientific, (b) philosophical, and (c) personal evidence. I.e.

For me, the existence of God is a Reasonable Inference to a Rational Explanation of the totality of the evidence

(a) scientific,  
(b) philosophical,  
(c) personal.

And, for me, the existence of God is the Best Inference to the Best explanation of the totality of the evidence (a) scientific, (b) philosophical, (c) personal evidence.

And this is the case for me beyond a reasonable doubt. And, with a level of certainty that is high enough for me to bet my life (and eternity) on the existence of God, and the truth of Mere-Christianity (cf: Pascal's Wager).

I invite you to do the same.

---

## 7. Philosophical Theism

This (below) is a brief write up of why I moved from Atheism to Philosophical Theism (over a period of some years).

In this comment I will just discuss Philosophical Theism. In a future comment, I can briefly discuss ex-atheism and Mere-Christianity.

---

### Philosophical Theism

---

If we consider Theism and Atheism to be metaphysical hypotheses (explanations of reality) then we can use the relevant guidelines/ methods to come to a reasonable inference to choose between the two.

There are certain features about reality that make more sense (or flow more naturally from) a Theistic Worldview than from an Atheistic Worldview.

And there is a reasonable argument for the existence of God from the wonder and order of the natural universe.

---

### Evidence

---

The key areas of evidence (features about reality) that have struck me are:

(1) The big bang origin of the universe (more to be expected a-priori if Theism were true than Atheism)

(2) The anthropic fine-tuning of the universe/physical constants of the universe for life to exist (more to be expected a-priori if Theism were true than Atheism)

(3) The origin of first-life defies random-chance and natural law (more to be expected a-priori if Theism were true than Atheism)

(4) The presence of codes, language, and software in DNA is more in keeping with Intelligent Design than with purely naturalistic-atheistic processes. (This is more to be expected a-priori if Theism were true than Atheism.)

(5) Free-will, moral obligations and responsibility; all of these fall apart if atheism is true (atheism expects pure materialism/physicalism which necessitates determinism, which eliminates free-will, and therefore moral obligations and responsibility; but none of us and no society can live reasonably in a manner consistent with no free-will, no moral obligations, no moral responsibilities, no rewards for good behavior, no punishments for bad behavior, no civil laws, no criminal laws, no justice system).

(6) Mind, consciousness; These flow naturally (are more to be expected) if Theism is true. However, these do not naturally obtain if atheism (physicalism/materialism) is true. Mind, consciousness have properties that are completely different from mere collections of atoms.

(7) Out of Body Experiences -- where the person's consciousness experiences a change in location (in point of view) and the person sees things at a distance from their body (where there is no line-of-sight). And these things that they saw (events they saw) are independently confirmed by an external third party or parties. This is evidence for mind-body dualism (and against mind-brain monism). And again, this is more in keeping with Theism (it matches more closely with the expectations of theism; and does not match the materialistic/physicalistic expectations of atheism)...

These (above) are some (but not all) of the things that I looked into in some detail, and which convinced me (over time) that Theism is the more rational view (based on the evidence) than Atheism... and that the evidence (as above) supports Theism over Atheism.

---

### Scientist Quotes

---

Let's look at a few relevant quotes from Scientists.

Quote: "If we have eyes to see, the anthropic principle will speak to us of the signs of God's purpose present in the remarkable potentiality with which our universe has been endowed in the basic ground of its physical process." (John Polkinghorne, physicist) *A Potent Universe*, in *Evidence of Purpose*, 1994, p. 115.

Quote: "Modern physics and cosmology impact in a number of ways upon our understanding of a God who purposefully creates and sustains the world. (Russell Stannard, physicist) in *Evidence of Purpose*, 1994, p. 90.

Quote: [The] origin of life appears to be almost a miracle, so many are the conditions which would have to be satisfied to get it going. (Francis Crick, Nobel Prize winner, biochemist) *Life Itself*, 1981, p 88. Note: my understanding is that Crick is an Agnostic.

Quote: If we could play God, and select values for these natural quantities at whim by twiddling a set of knobs, we would find that almost all knob settings would render the universe uninhabitable. Some knobs would have to be fine-tuned to enormous precision if life is to flourish in the universe. Paul Davies, *Evidence of Purpose*, 1994, p. 49. Note: my understanding is that Davies is an Agnostic.

Quote: It is in that province (speaking of the fundamental constants of nature) that we find the most surprising evidence for a grand design. (Paul Davies, physicist) *God and the New Physics*, 1983, p. 187. Interpolation within parentheses.

Quote: In some mysterious way, God is the creator of all the living forms in the evolutionary process, and particularly in human persons, each with the conscious selfhood of an immortal soul. (A Theistic Evolutionist, John C. Eccles, Nobel Prize winner, physiology, medicine) *Evidence of Purpose*, 1994, p. 132.

Quote: Nevertheless, just as I believe that the Book of Scripture illumines the pathway to God, so I believe that the Book of Nature, with its astonishing details, the blade of grass, the *Conus cedonulli*, or the resonance levels of the carbon atom also suggest a God of purpose and a God of design. And I think my belief makes me no less a scientist. (Owen Gingerich, astronomer) *Evidence of Purpose*, 1994, p. 23.

---

This (above) is just a representative sampling of quotes from scientists.

I have come across many many other such quotes from scientists, and I have personally come across many very intelligent scientists who are Theists... and who find Theism to be foundationally logical and rational ... (and more logical and rational ultimately than Atheism).

---

Bottom Line (re Philosophical Theism)

---

These items discussed above show that it is not illogical (or irrational) to believe in God.

It is true that these are not deductive proofs of the existence of God.

However, they provide reasonable inferential grounds for belief in the existence of God.

So, it is NOT illogical (or irrational) to believe in God.

---

---

## 8. THEISM is True (as a Rational Inference)

P1. It is Logically Possible that God exists.

Explanation-for-P1: The existence of God does NOT violate any rule of Logic or of Rationality. Therefore, it is logically and rationally possible that God does exist. This means that it is Logically and Rationally Possible that Theism is True.

.....  
P2. Either God exists, or He does not. There is no third option. This means that either Theism is true, or Metaphysical-Atheism is true. There is no third option.

.....  
P3. It is impossible for a Square-Circle to actually exist.

Explanation-for-P3: Two features of an actual object cannot be mutually contradictory (in the same sense and at the same time in the actually existing object). So, it is impossible for a Square-Circle to exist in actual reality. A shape cannot be perfectly Square, and perfectly Circular at the same time. Similarly, an object cannot be a perfect Cube and a perfect Sphere at the same time.

.....  
P4. If a Hypothesis requires (or necessitates) the existence of a Square-Circle Impossibility, then that Hypothesis is necessarily False. I.e., it is necessarily Impossible for that hypothesis to be true.

.....  
P5. Theism does NOT require (or necessitate) the existence or the reality of any Square-Circle impossibilities. Therefore, Theism does NOT violate P4.

.....  
P6. In contrast, ATHEISM requires (or necessitates) the existence or the reality or the Truth of one of two sets of Square-Circle Impossibilities (see Appendix below).

.....  
P7. Therefore, ATHEISM is itself a Square-Circle impossibility (based on P5-P6 above).

.....  
P8. Therefore, THEISM is Logically Possible (P1,P5) and ATHEISM is NOT Logically Possible (P3,P4,P6).

.....  
P9. However, one of the two (Theism or Atheism) MUST necessarily be true (see P2).

.....  
P10. Therefore, Theism is true.  
.....

C1. Theism is True. God does Exist. I.e., Based on the discussion above, it is a reasonable and rational inference that God does exist.

C2. Atheism is False. I.e., Based on the discussion above, it is a reasonable and rational inference that Atheism is False.

-----  
A2.8.1 – SUB-APPENDIX-1  
-----

P101. ATHEISM requires (or necessitates) the Existence or the Reality or the Truth of one of two sets of Square-Circle Impossibilities (see discussion below).

P102. Therefore, ATHEISM is itself a Square-Circle Impossibility (see discussion below).

.....  
P103. If Atheism is true, the only options are

A) a past-infinite single universe

B) a past-infinite multiverse

C) Literally Nothing existed and it created a Single Universe with No Cause

D) Literally Nothing existed and it then created a temporally-finite multiverse with No Cause.

There are NO other Atheist Options (if you are trying to avoid God).

.....

P104. Option-A and Option-B above require the crossing of an infinity. This is impossible. A square-circle. So to insist on Option-A or Option-B is Irrational.

Therefore, both Option-A and Option-B are Square-Circle Impossibilities.

.....

P105. Option-C and Option-D require that "Literally Nothing" is "Actually Something"... because in these atheist views (C,D), "Literally Nothing" is "Doing Something" (when it creates the universe).

This (above) is Incoherent. And to insist that this is the case (to avoid God) is Irrational.

"NOTHING" cannot be Something at the same time as it is being Nothing.

Therefore, "Literally Nothing" CANNOT be "Actually Something" (in order to Do Something, like Create the Universe).

Therefore, this is a Square-Circle Impossibility (to insist that Absolutely-NOTHING created the Universe).

Therefore, both Option-C and Option-D are Square-Circle Impossibilities.

.....

P106. In addition, ONLY "Some-thing" or "Some-Entity" can have the Ability to DO Something.

Nothing (NO-thing) CANNOT have any ability to do Something.

Therefore, it is impossible for NOTHING to have the ability to Create the Universe.

Therefore, both Option-C and Option-D are Square-Circle Impossibilities.

.....  
P107. Therefore, ALL four Atheist options (A,B,C,D) are Square-Circle Impossibilities.

.....  
P108. Therefore, Atheism itself is a Square-Circle Impossibility.  
.....

C101. ALL four Atheist options (A,B,C,D) are Square-Circle Impossibilities.

C102. Therefore, Atheism itself is a Square-Circle Impossibility.

-----  
A2.8.2 – SUB-APPENDIX-2  
-----

P201. In addition to the above, in Atheism (options C,D) this "Literally Nothing" is given "God Powers" to

(a) conceptualize an infinite number of sets of mathematical equations for possible universes, and

(b) somehow select among these infinite sets for just those sets of equations that are internally-system-consistent, and

(c) decide which specific one of these sets of internally-system-consistent mathematical equations to actualize into an actual physical universe, and

(d) then, to actually actualize that particular set of mathematical equations into a physical universe.  
.....

P202. This (P201 above) is Incoherent.. and for Atheists to insist that this is the case is Irrational.

---

A2.8.3 – SUB-APPENDIX-3

---

P301. In addition, ALL of the items above are consistent with the behavior of a MIND...

P302. So, the most Rational Choice is to say that a MIND actually did A-D above rather than "Literally Nothing".

---

A2.8.4 – SUB-APPENDIX-4

---

P401. In addition, if the entire universe was created by Literally Nothing and with No cause, this completely destroys any Rational Warrant for Cause and effect.

P402. So, given that Atheism requires this, Atheism destroys any Rational Warrant for Cause and Effect.

P403. And, since Rationality is based on Cause and Effect; AND science is based on Cause and Effect...

P404. This means that Atheism destroys the ground for (a) cause and effect, and therefore, for (b) rationality, and (c) for science.

.....

C401. This reasoning above shows that Atheism is completely irrational (given any of the options A,B,C,D above).

---

CONCLUSIONS

---

C1. Theism is True.

C2. Atheism is False.

C3. Based on the discussion above, it is a reasonable and rational inference that God does exist.

C4. Based on the discussion above, it is a reasonable and rational inference that Atheism is False.

---

---

## 9. Mere Christianity

Mere-Christianity is very simple.

(A) there is ONE God, creator of the universe.

(B) Jesus is God in human form; He came to earth to set an example in behavior for us, and to experience pain & suffering at the cross, to express solidarity with our pain & suffering and to set the stage for and to enable reconciliation between us and God.

(C) if we accept this and commit our lives to God based on this, we can be in relationship with him today, in this life, and in the life to come.

I invite you to commit your life to God based on what Jesus has done for you (and us) on the cross.

---

## 10. Conclusion

### CONCLUSION

C1001. So, as we have discussed above, we see the following.

C1002. Philosophy leads us to Theism.

C1003. Science leads us to Theism.

C1004. Philosophy, Science & Reason leads us to MONO-Theism over polytheism.

C1005. We also looked at polyspiritism, polytheism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism, and Islam. In each of these cases, we saw a chain of reasoning that leads us to Monotheism and ultimately to Christ.

C1006. So, this (above) shows the path of reasoning that led me from Atheism all the way to Christ, over a period of some years.

I wish you Peace and Joy in Christ.

---