

LECTURE 5: A CUMULATIVE CASE FOR GOD'S EXISTENCE

Dr. Paul R. Shockley

www.prshockley.org

Lecture 5 of 12

In our fifth presentation our goal is three-fold: (1) understand the viability of appealing to common ground in order to (2) give reasonable proofs for God's existence based upon: (a) creation, (b) design, (c) morality, (d) existential need, (e) joy, (f) and the universal idea for God within humanity by appealing to Amos 1. (2) We will then proceed to summarize some of the significant arguments and evidences used to build a case for God's existence. (3) Afterwards, we will conclude our study with some practical suggestions.

I. APPEAL TO COMMON GROUND:

A. TWO IMPORTANT CLAIMS TO CONSIDER:

1. **Truth about reality is knowable (undeniable):**

- a. Abstract truth such as number or ideas corresponds to its object.
- b. Concrete truth such as God, people, or material objects corresponds to concrete reality.
 1. We can know actual reality because this is undeniable.
 - a. It is self-defeating to claim that "*we cannot know reality.*" But such a statement implies that we really do know something about reality.
 - b. it is self-defeating to claim "*that we cannot know truth.*" That statement itself claims to be true.
 - c. It is a self-defeating statement to say that "*all truth is relative.*" That statement itself claims to be true.
 - c. Therefore, we can know truth about reality.

2. **Biblical case for the correspondence view of truth:** Though this section of lecture 3 is for the believer and would not be used with the unbeliever if he or she did not believe in the authority of the Bible (there is no common ground), nevertheless, this is important for the believer for at least two reasons:

- a. There are those believers who contend that the correspondence view of truth is not biblical or doctrinal, arguing that it is sourced in philosophy, not the Scripture.

Those that argue for that position fail to understand that the very notion of truth and the use of truth; the biblical authors understanding of truth presupposes a correspondence view of truth for biblical truth is correspondent to reality: truth is (1) factual, (2) faithful, (3), and complete. It is used to discern right from wrong, true from false, trustworthy from untrustworthy, reliable from unreliable, just from unjust, and complete rather than incomplete.

- b. There are those believers who attempt to discount the correspondence view of truth citing passages from the Gospel of John that Jesus is the only truth.

Those that do say this fail to understand what the correspondence view of truth is by citing verses like John 3:16; 7:28, 8:16 in an attempt to discount the correspondence view of truth. Rather, the apostle John builds upon the

correspondence view of truth by adding *specific content* concerning the manifestation of truth in Jesus Christ (John 7:28; 8:16).

- c. In other words, the correspondence view of truth is biblical by its words, its use, and includes Jesus Christ as a specific content of manifestation or revelation of truth, the 2nd Person of the Trinity. Therefore we are able to conclude the following:

Truth is that which corresponds to reality, identifies things as they actually are, can never diminish, change, fail, or be extinguished, must be able to be expressed in propositional statements (it must be logical; $t + t = true$), and is sourced in the God of the Bible who is the Author of all truth.

3. The Opposite of what is true is false:

- a. The law of non-contradiction affirms that opposites cannot both be true.
- b. This law of non-contradiction is undeniable. Even those who deny it use it.
 - 1. The individual who contends, “*the law of non-contradiction is false*” uses the very law he or she is attempting to deny (arguing that the law is false instead of true).
 - 2. Those who claim that atheism is true imply that all non-atheisms (e.g., Christianity, Judaism, Islam, Mormonism, etc) are false.
 - 3. Those who claim that we should all be tolerant imply that intolerance is the opposite of tolerance.
 - 4. Those who claim that “*all truth is relative*” imply that the opposite of that statement—“*all truth is absolute*” – is false.
- c. Therefore, the opposite of what is true is false.

II. A CUMULATIVE CASE FOR GOD’S EXISTENCE:

1. What do I mean by Cumulative Case?

Commonly called the cumulative case method, this informal approach is a strategy of probability. This approach seeks to show that Christianity provides the best explanation of a broad range of data (holistic approach) in terms of probability. This is helpful especially in view of those who are pluralists.

- 1st Step: Combine various arguments together (e.g., cosmological, teleological, moral, historical record of the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ; experiential testimony):
- 2nd Step: For example, ask “*In light of the evidence given, what is more probable to believe...Christianity or Atheism?*”

2. Why use arguments and evidences for God’s existence? Because we are appealing to elements of God’s created order that both believers and non-believers alike are able to perceive that affirms His existence (Romans 1). In other words, we are appealing to general revelation which is a theological term.

- a. General revelation is God’s communication of Himself to all people at all times in all places. It refers to God’s self-manifestation through nature, history, and consciousness of the human person.

3. As we have already learned from past lessons there are **five witnesses** (Romans 1) **that testify to God's existence, truth, and basic right from wrong.**

DID YOU KNOW?

Aldous Huxley, a famous atheist, once stated:

"I had motives for not wanting the world to have a meaning; consequently assumed that it had none, and was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption. The philosopher who finds no meaning in the world is not concerned exclusively with a problem in pure metaphysics, he is also concerned to prove that there is no valid reason why he personally should not do as he wants to do, or why his friends should not seize political power and govern in the way that they find most advantageous to themselves....For myself, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation, sexual, and political.

So, like Blaise Pascal, Christian philosopher of the 17 Century says:

"The evidence of God's existence is more than compelling, but those who insist that they have no need of Him or it will always find ways to discount the offer."

- a. The issue is not that non-believers are ignorant of God's existence. Rather, those that refuse to pursue God, reject truth, and distort right from wrong, suppress the truth as revealed in general revelation and conviction by means of the Holy Spirit, and eventually, for some, attempt to substitute the truth by appealing to other worldview or false ideas (e.g., pantheism; atheism; agnosticism).
- b. Though this knowledge via natural theology "doubly" condemns the unbeliever (all unbelievers stand condemn already because of their position in Adam; Rom. 5), it is insufficient for salvation. What are these constant witnesses of general revelation:¹

1. **Witness of Creation:**
2. **Witness of Human Design:**
3. **Witness of Conscience:**
4. **Witness of God-ward longings:**
5. **Witness of Consequences.**

"There is an infinite, all-wise, all-powerful, all-loving God who has revealed Himself by means natural and supernatural in creation, in the nature of man, in the history of Israel and the Church, in the pages of Holy Scripture, in the incarnation of God in Christ, and in the heart of the believer by the gospel."

~ Bernard Ramm, *Protestant Christian Evidences* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1953), 33.

For example: let's consider Amos 1:3-2:3 as an example of God's witness from general revelation:²

In Amos 1 we are faced with prophetic historical account of God's judgment upon Gentile nations proximal to Israel: Damascus (1:3-5), Gaza (1:6-8) Tyre (1:9-10), Edom (1:11-12), Ammon (1:13-15), & Moab (2:1-3):

- a. The cause of judgment for each nation was its "sins," its covenant violations. The word for "sin" (peša') means "rebellion" or "revolt," and was historically used in secular treaties to describe a vassal's disobedience of the terms of a covenant (1 Kings 12:19; 2 Kings 1:1; 3:5,7; 8:22 ; Prov. 28:2). Moreover, this same word has been used in denouncing Israel's rebellion against God's covenant with her (Isa. 1:2, 28; 46:8 66:24; Jer. 2:8; Hosea 7:13; 8:1; Micah 1:5,13).
- b. Now Amos specifically viewed the sins of Judah (Amos 2:4-5) and Israel (2:6-16; cf. 3:14; 4:4; 5:12) as violations of the Mosaic Covenant. She had

¹ J. Budziszewski, *What We Can't Not Know: A Guide* (Dallas: Spence Publishing, 2003).

² Walvoord, J. F., Zuck, R. B., & Dallas Theological Seminary, *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: An Exposition of the Scriptures*, 2 vols. (Victor Books: Wheaton, IL, 1983-c. 1985).

failed to observe the terms of God's Law. However, what about the Gentile nations?

- c. The Gentile nations were guilty of rebellion (“*peša*”) against their own consciences. By their acts of barbarism (Amos 1:3), their wholesale deportations of slave populations (vv. 6,9), their unnatural and stubborn hatreds (v. 11), their sickening atrocities (v. 13), and their desecrations of the dead (2:1), they had violated their consciences performing inhumane acts. Because of these sins, the earth's sovereign God declared, “*I will not turn back My wrath.*”
 - d. Isaiah (Isa. 24:4-6; 26:20-21) said that God would bring a “*curse of drought*” to punish the people of the earth because they had “*broken the everlasting covenant*” by shedding blood. As the New Testament confirms, though Gentiles may not have received the spoken or written Law, the requirements of human decency are nevertheless known to them, and their own accusing conscience tells them when they violate God's standard (Rom. 2:14-15).
 - e. From these passages we are able to glean the following:
 1. God judged them on the basis of their conscience to explain to them that they violated God's standards.
 2. God judges them rightly knowing that they themselves were aware that they violated their consciences.
 3. God judged them cross-culturally; each person in these pagan nations was able to perceive and discern what is right from wrong; it is a universal standard.
 4. Whatever “light” Israel provided in its history that would motivate the neighboring nations to consider the God of Israel, the neighboring nations rejected (cf. Romans 1:18-2:15) it for their self-interests.
 5. They were not ignorant of the 5 witnesses of general revelation.
-

III. A CUMULATIVE CASE FOR GOD'S EXISTENCE:

In this second section we will examine significant arguments for God's existence to use when appealing to a common ground that may motivate others to consider what they already know to be true. The following arguments will be surveyed:

1. Cosmological
2. Teleological
3. Moral Argument
4. Argument from Joy
5. Religious Need
6. Innate Idea Argument
7. Arguments from Beauty

Within the teleological argument we will examine both Intelligent Design and the Strong Anthropic Principle. Under the moral argument we will give 8 reasons why the Moral Law is objective. Under the argument from beauty, we will also explore how beauty may be used to point us to God. Comment the following basic arguments to memory!

8. We could also continue building our case by
 - a. Turning to the historicity of Jesus Christ and his bodily resurrection
 - b. Personal testimony.

The Cosmological Argument:

A Cause at the Beginning. The universe had a beginning caused by something beyond the universe:

1. **The universe had a beginning.**
2. **Anything that had a beginning must have been caused by something (someone) else.**
3. **Therefore the universe was caused by something (someone) else.**

The Teleological Argument:

Since the universe is exceedingly more complex in its operation, there must be a Maker of the universe.

1. **All designs imply a designer.**
2. **There is a great design in the universe.**
3. **Therefore, there must be a Great Designer of the universe.**

A. Consider Intelligent Design:⁴

1. The theory of intelligent design asserts that certain features of the universe and of living things are best explained by an intelligent cause, not an undirected process such as natural selection. Intelligent design is an effort to empirically “detect” whether the “apparent design” in nature acknowledged by virtually all biologists is genuine design (the product of an intelligent cause) or is simply the product of an undirected process such as natural selection acting on random variations.
3. Early versions of intelligent design are articulated as early as Plato and Aristotle, as did virtually all of the founders of modern science. In fact, until the latter part of 19th century most scientists accepted some form of intelligent design. However, the scientific community largely rejected design in the early 20th century after the theory of Darwinian claimed to explain the emergency of biological complexity through the unintelligent process of natural selection acting on random mutations. Then near the end of the 20th century new scientific research and discoveries ranging from physics, cosmology, biochemistry, genetics, and paleontology have caused a growing number of scientists and scholars to question Darwinian and propose design as the best explanation for the existence of specified complexity in the natural world.

The basic argument is as follows:

⁴ Material adapted from Dr. Michael Behe, *The New York Times*, 7 Feb. 2005 and www.discovery.org. Many major proponents of Intelligent Design are members of the Discovery Institute's Center for Science and Culture: 1511 Third Ave., Suite 808-Seattle, WA 98101. 206-292-0401 phone-206-682-5320 fax e.mail: cscinfo@discovery.org.

- a. **We can often recognize the effects of design in nature.**
- b. **The physical marks of design are visible in aspects of biology.**
- c. **We have no good explanation for the foundation of life that doesn't involve intelligence.**
- e. **In the absence of any convincing-non- design explanation, we are justified in thinking that real intelligent design was involved in life.**

3. Concluding Thoughts on Intelligent Design:

- a. It is important to keep in mind that it is the profound appearance of design in life that everyone is laboring to explain, not the appearance of natural selection or the appearance of self-organization.
- b. Design should not be overlooked simply because it's so obvious.
- c. We can't settle questions about reality with definitions or by searching relentlessly for a non-design explanation.
- d. Intelligent design is not a religiously based idea even though religious people cite it in their arguments.
- e. Intelligent design is based on physical evidence and a straightforward application of logic.

B. **Anthropic Principle:**⁵

- 1. The anthropic principle (Gr. *Anthropos*, "human being") states that the universe was fitted from the very first moment of its existence for the emergence of life in general and human life in particular. For if there were even the slightest variation at the moment of the big bang, making conditions different, even to a small degree, no life of any kind would exist. In order for life to be present today an incredibly restrictive set of demands must have been present in the early universe-and they were.
- 2. Not only does the scientific evidence point to a beginning of the cosmos, but it points to a very sophisticated tuning of the universe from the very beginning that makes human life possible. Thus, for life to be present today an incredibly restrictive set of demands must have been present in the early universe.

Consider the following 12 arguments (there are at least 100 such arguments for fine-tuning of the universe:

- a. Oxygen comprises 21% of the atmosphere. If it were 25%, fires would erupt, if 15%, humans would suffocate.

⁵ Most material adapted directly from Norman Geisler's *Baker's Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999), 26-29.

DID YOU KNOW?

Nobel Laureate Arno Penzias, co-discoverer of the radiation afterglow stated:

“Astronomy leads us to a unique event, a universe which was created out of nothing and delicately balances to provide the exactly the conditions required to support life. In the absence of an absurdly—improbable accident, the observations of modern science seem to suggest an underlying, one might say, supernatural plan.”

- b. If the gravitational force were altered by 1 part in 1040 (that's 10 followed by 40 zeroes), the sun would not exist, and the moon would crash into the earth or sheer off into space. Even a slight increase in the force of gravity would result in all the stars being much more massive than our sun, with the effect that the sun would burn too rapidly and erratically to sustain life.
- c. If the centrifugal force of planetary movements did not precisely balance the gravitational forces, nothing could be held in orbit around the sun.
- d. If the universe was expanding at a rate one millionth more slowly than it is, the temperature on earth would be 10,000 degrees C.
- e. The average distance between stars in our galaxy of 100 billion stars is 30 trillion miles. If that distance was altered slightly, orbits would become erratic, and there would be extreme temperature variations on earth. (Traveling at space shuttle speed, seventeen thousand miles an hour or five miles a second, it would take 201,450 years to travel 30 trillion miles).
- f. Any of the laws of physics can be described as a function of the velocity of light (now defined to be 299,792,458 miles a second). Even a slight variation in the speed of light would alter the other constants and preclude the possibility of life on earth.
- g. If Jupiter was not in its current orbit, we would be bombarded with space material. Jupiter's gravitational field acts as a cosmic vacuum cleaner, attracting asteroids and comets that would otherwise strike earth.
- h. If the thickness of the earth's crust was greater, too much oxygen would be transferred to the crust to support life. If it were thinner, volcanic and tectonic activity would make life untenable.
- i. If the rotation of the earth took longer than 24 hours, temperature differences would be too great between night and day. If the rotation period was shorter, atmospheric wind velocities would be too great.
- j. Surface temperature differences would be too great if the axial tilt of the earth were altered slightly.
- k. If the atmospheric discharge (lightning) rate were greater, there would be too much fire destruction; if it were less, there would be too little nitrogen fixing in the soil.
- l. If there were more seismic activity, much life would be lost. If there was less, nutrients on the ocean floors and in river runoff would not be cycled back to the continents through tectonic uplift. Even earthquakes are necessary to sustain life as we know it.⁶

⁶ Arno Penzias quote is referenced from Walter Bradley, "The 'Just-So' Universe: The Fine-Tuning of Constants and Conditions in the Cosmos," in William Dembski and James Kushiner, eds., *Signs of Intelligence* (Grand Rapids: Baker,

Geisler and Turek's comments on the Anthropic Principle is well stated:

“The extent of the universe's fine-tuning makes the Anthropic Principle perhaps the most powerful argument for the existence of God.”⁷

The Moral Law Argument:

The roots of moral argument for God are found in Romans 2:12-15 in which humanity is said to stand unexcused since there is “a law written on their hearts.” Moral laws don't describe what is, they prescribe what ought to be.

- 1. Moral laws imply a Moral Law Giver.**
- 2. There is an objective moral law.**
- 3. Therefore, there is a Moral Law Giver.**

[Objective wrongdoing is violating a command issued by God. God is not subject to committing sin because he is not in subjection to violating a command by someone over himself (I can't break my own commands; e.g., I should be in by midnight; I did not commit a sin by violating it)].

What if someone denies in objective moral laws? Consider the following 8 points:⁸

1. Absolutes are undeniable. Consider...we know right from wrong best by our reactions when we react to wrongs done to us.
2. We wouldn't know injustice if there was no absolute sense of justice (you only know something is wrong by comparing it an unchanging standard of what is right); it is the unchanging standard or basis of justice.⁹

2001), 168; see also Geisler and Turek, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to be An Atheist*, 104-6, for a presentation on the strong anthropic principle.

⁷ Geisler and Turek, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be An Atheist*, 105.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 172-8.

⁹ One interesting point a philosopher of religion made in a casual conversation with me is whether ethics can be used to establish God's existence or whether God's existence must be established prior to ethics.

As C. S. Lewis writes:

[As an atheist] my argument against God was that the universe seemed so cruel and unjust. But how had I got this idea of just and unjust? A man does not call a line crooked unless he has some idea of a straight line. What was I comparing this universe with when I called it unjust?¹⁰

3. Real moral disagreements would not be possible without the Moral Law. Every moral issue would be a matter of opinion (e.g., the moral actions between Mother Teresa vs. Adolf Hitler...there is a difference!).
4. Everything can't be relative if there is nothing to be relative to. There must be some independent standard otherwise nothing could be measured.
5. We would not make excuses for breaking the Moral Law if it didn't exist.
6. We wouldn't know the world was getting worse (or better) if there was no moral law.
7. The Moral Law is the "prescriptive" basis for political and social dissent.
8. Since we know what's absolutely wrong, there must be an absolute standard or basis of rightness.

The Argument from Joy:

Creatures are not born with desires unless *satisfaction for those desires exists*. A baby feels hunger; food can satisfy.

- 1. Every natural innate desire has a real object that can fulfill it.**
- 2. Human beings have a natural, innate desire for immortality.**
- 3. Therefore, there must be an immortal life after death.**

¹⁰ Lewis, *Mere Christianity*, 45.

The Religious Need Argument:

Is the desire to believe in God an illusion, human wishes, purely psychological, or is it factual? The desire for God does exist, not as a psychological wish, but from real existential need.

1. **Human beings really need God.**
2. **What humans really need, probably really exists.**
3. **Therefore, God really exists.**

Innate Idea Argument:

Knowledge of God is Innate (Rom. 1:19-21, 32)

- 1. *All* people have *some* knowledge of God.
 - This knowledge is constitutive to the human framework.
- 2. The mind perceives certain things to be true without proof and without instruction.
 - There is no instruction or use of senses needed to have some knowledge of God...it is intrinsic knowledge (e.g., the deaf/blind know possess within themselves some knowledge of God) within man.
- 3. Related to the Moral Law argument in that there is this sense of dependence and accountability to a being higher than themselves which exists in the minds of all people.

- a. Always remember and communicate to others that the reasons why believe in God's existence are not based upon feelings, intuitions, or empty promises.

ARGUMENT FROM BEAUTY: HOW CAN BEAUTY BE USED TO POINT US TO GOD?

"Now if a man believes in the existence of beautiful things, but not of Beauty itself, and cannot follow a guide who would lead him to a knowledge of it, is he not living in a dream?" Plato's *Republic*, 476c

- A. Is it reasonable to believe that beauty points us to God? Or is beauty merely in the eye of the beholder?
- B. While not discounting the possibility of a subjective aspect to beauty, subjectivity does not automatically mean the non-existence of objective beauty or that objectivity is necessarily oppositional to subjectivity. Could it be that both objective beauty and subjective beauty are co-extensive (i.e., two sides of a coin)?
- C. Is it reasonable to believe that beauty points us to God? Or is beauty merely in the eye of the beholder?
- D. While not discounting the possibility of a subjective aspect to beauty, subjectivity does not automatically mean the non-existence of objective beauty or that objectivity is necessarily oppositional to subjectivity. Could it be that both objective beauty and subjective beauty are co-extensive (i.e., two sides of a coin)?
- E. **Consider: Do we have an objective standard of beauty?**
 1. *How had I got this idea of beauty and ugliness? A man does not call a line crooked unless he has some idea of a straight line. What was I comparing object X with when I called it ugly?*
 2. Argument # 1: Argument from Aesthetic Normativity for God's Existence:
 1. It appears to human beings that aesthetic normativity (i.e., a transcultural standard of validity) exists.
 2. The best explanation of aesthetic normativity is that it is grounded in God.
 3. Therefore God exists.
 3. Argument # 2: Argument from Universal Signatures of Beauty:
 1. Universal signatures of beauty exists (e.g., symmetry, proportion, unity, complexity, intensity)
 2. Universal signatures have the properties of being objective.
 3. The best explanation for the existence of universal signatures of beauty is provided by theism.

4. Therefore the existence of universal signatures of beauty provides good grounds for thinking theism is true.
4. Beauty is a rational enterprise:
 1. Beauty would not be a rational enterprise if there were no aesthetic “order” in the world (e.g., unity, intensity, complexity).
 2. Only the existence of God traditionally conceived could support the hypothesis that there is an aesthetic order in the world.
 3. Therefore, there is a God.
5. Argument from Objective Beauty:
 1. There must be objective beauty.
 2. Objective beauty is beyond individual persons and beyond humanity as a whole.
 3. Objective beauty must come from an objective Mind of beauty because
 4. Therefore, there must be a beautiful, personal Mind behind objective beauty.
6. Argument from Aesthetic Value Judgments:
 1. Value judgments would not be a rational if skepticism were true.
 2. There is too much unresolved disagreement for us to suppose that skepticism can be avoided if human sources of aesthetic value judgments are all that we have.
 3. Therefore we must assume that there is an extra-human, divine source for aesthetic value judgments.
7. Why aren't we satisfied with what is ugly, out of proportion, random, and chaotic? Moreover, why do we respond negatively to that which is random, not proportional, etc? When we seek to depict or represent something, *why* do we seek to make it beautiful in terms of arrangement, order, shape, and color? We will even call an object beautiful if the artist is able to recreate the object perfectly-even if the object itself is ugly. 9
 - a. Consider the words of St. Thomas Aquinas: “Everyone who represents or depicts something does so in order to produce something beautiful.”¹¹

¹¹ In De divi. Nom. C. IV lect. 5 (Mandonnet, 366).

- b. *But why do we seek to produce something beautiful? Because we take pleasure in harmony, symmetry, complexity, intensity, etc.*

Aquinas states: "The lion rejoices when he sees or hears a stag, because of the promise of food. And man experiences pleasure with the other senses and not only because of food, but also because of the harmony of sense impressions. And since sense impressions deriving from the other senses give pleasure because of their harmony-for instance, when a man delights in well harmonized sounds-then this pleasure is not connected with keeping him alive."¹²

8. Existential approach to Beauty:

1. Why aren't we satisfied with the mundane?
2. Why aren't we satisfied with monotony?
3. Why aren't we satisfied with "colorless" surroundings?
4. Why do we anticipate an encounter with the sublime?
5. Why are we in "awe" when we encounter something that is truly beautiful and are "repulsed by what is "ugly."
6. Why do we hunger for beauty (e.g., partner, spouses, home, personal presentation, accessories, vehicle).
7. Why do we want to be around "beautiful" people?

Could the sublime be anticipatory to Him who is the Ultimate Sublime, the Sum-total of His Infinite Perfections (Revelation 1; 21-22)

8. Existential Desire for the Highest Form of Beauty:

"Man does not like to remain alone; and as he loves, he must look elsewhere for an object for his love. He can find it only in beauty. Since, however, he is himself the most beautiful creature that God has created [Genesis 1:26-27], he must find within himself a model for the beauty he seeks beyond himself."¹³

- F. Coupled with historical facts such as the bodily resurrection of Jesus, the 500 plus eyewitnesses of the resurrected Christ, the uniqueness and reliability of the Bible, experiential account of all those who have had transformed lives, we offer evidence that is both honest and reasonable, and scientific observations such as intelligent design and the strong anthropic principle, we have a cumulative case that can withstand all those who claim that the Christian faith and practice is based upon irrationalism, well-wishers, and dogmatic superstitious beliefs.

¹² *Summa Theol.*, II-a II-ae q. 141 a. 4 ad. 3.

¹³ Blaise Pascal, *Discours sur les passions d'armour*, Oeuvres completes (ed. de la Pleiade, 1954, 539-40).

IV: HOW SHOULD WE THEN LIVE?

- A. Learn these proofs for God's existence so that you and I both may be able to readily share them when asked to give reasons why we believe in God's existence.
- B. Take time to marvel, to reflect upon God's handiwork as an expression of His infinite creativity, genius, and tender care for both the saved and unsaved alike.
- C. Share these Gospel of Jesus Christ; you have the truth. Examine where they are using the 12-step methodology and be prepared to defend the knowability of truth, the law of non-contradiction, and God's existence.
- D. God honors an active faith.