

Christian Evidences

The Teleological Argument

- 1) The fine-tuning of the universe is due to either physical necessity, chance, or design.
- 2) It is not due to physical necessity or chance.
- ---
- 3) Therefore, it is due to design.

The Teleological Argument

Physical Necessity

- There are many possible constants but only a very few that support life

Chance

- This is astronomically large

The Multiverse

- No evidence
- Not even a mechanism for creating the multiverse

The Moral Argument

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

The Moral Argument

In a universe of electrons and selfish genes, blind physical forces and genetic replication, some people are going to get hurt, other people are going to get lucky, and you won't find any rhyme or reason in it, nor any justice. The universe that we observe has precisely the properties we should expect if there is, at bottom, no design, no purpose, no evil, no good, nothing but pitiless indifference.”

— Richard Dawkins, *River Out of Eden: A Darwinian View of Life*

The Moral Argument

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

The Moral Argument

We need to dispel first the idea that “people cannot be moral without God”

The Euthyphro Dilemma

Is something good because God wills it? Or does God will something because it is good? If you say that something is good because God wills it, then what is good becomes arbitrary. God could have willed that hatred is good, and then we would have been morally obligated to hate one another. That seems crazy. Some moral values, at least, seem to be necessary. But if you say that God wills something because it is good, then what is good or bad is independent of God. In that case, moral values and duties exist independently of God, which contradicts premise 1.

<http://www.reasonablefaith.org/the-new-atheism-and-five-arguments-for-god#ixzz4DFz5iPHG>

The Moral Argument

Solution

A third option

God wills something because he is good. God's own nature is the standard of goodness, and his commandments to us are expressions of his nature. In short, our moral duties are determined by the commands of a just and loving God.

The Ontological Argument

1 Chronicles 29:

10 Therefore David blessed the Lord before all the assembly; and David said:

“Blessed are You, Lord God of Israel, our Father, forever and ever.

11 Yours, O Lord, is the greatness,

The power and the glory,

The victory and the majesty;

For all that is in heaven and in earth is Yours;

Yours is the kingdom, O Lord,

And You are exalted as head over all.

The Ontological Argument

- 1) It is possible that a maximally great being exists.
 - 2) If it is possible that a maximally great being exists, then a maximally great being exists in some possible world.
 - 3) If a maximally great being exists in some possible world, then it exists in every possible world.
 - 4) If a maximally great being exists in every possible world, then it exists in the actual world.
 - 5) If a maximally great being exists in the actual world, then a maximally great being exists.
-
- 6) Therefore, a maximally great being exists.

The Ontological Argument

God is either

- Impossible
- Contingent
- Necessary

The Argument from Reason

1. No belief is rationally inferred if it can be fully explained in terms of nonrational causes.
 2. If naturalism is true, then all beliefs can be fully explained in terms of nonrational causes.
 3. Therefore, if naturalism is true, then no belief is rationally inferred (from 1 and 2).
 4. We have good reason to accept naturalism only if it can be rationally inferred from good evidence.
-
5. Therefore, there is not, and cannot be, good reason to accept naturalism.

Argument from Reason

If my mental processes are determined wholly by the motions of atoms in my brain, I have no reason to suppose that my beliefs are true ... and hence I have no reason for supposing my brain to be composed of atoms. —J. B. S. Haldane, *Possible Worlds*, page 209

Argument from Reason

If minds are wholly dependent on brains, and brains on biochemistry, and biochemistry (in the long run) on the meaningless flux of the atoms, I cannot understand how the thought of those minds should have any more significance than the sound of the wind in the trees.

—C. S. Lewis, *The Weight of Glory*, page 139

Arguments against Physicalism

...determinism is self-stultifying. If my mental processes are totally determined, I am totally determined either to accept or to reject determinism. But if the sole reason for my believing or not believing X is that I am causally determined to believe it I have no ground for holding that my judgment is true or false.

– H.P. Owen

The Argument from Reason

1. Since everything in nature can be wholly explained in terms of nonrational causes, human reason (more precisely, the power of drawing conclusions based solely on the rational cause of logical insight) must have a source outside of nature.
 2. If human reason came from non-reason it would lose all rational credentials and would cease to be reason.
 3. So, human reason cannot come from non-reason (from 2).
 4. So human reason must come from a source outside nature that is itself rational (from 1 and 3).
 5. This supernatural source of reason may itself be dependent on some further source of reason, but a chain of such dependent sources cannot go on forever. Eventually, we must reason back to the existence of eternal, non-dependent source of human reason.
-
6. Therefore, there exists an eternal, self-existent, rational Being who is the ultimate source of human reason. This Being we call God (from 4-5). (Lewis, Miracles, chap. 4)

Pascal's Wager

God is, or God is not. Reason cannot decide between the two alternatives.

A Game is being played... where heads or tails will turn up.

You must wager (it is not optional).

Let us weigh the gain and the loss in wagering that God is. Let us estimate these two chances. If you gain, you gain all; if you lose, you lose nothing.

Wager, then, without hesitation that He is. There is here an infinity of an infinitely happy life to gain, a chance of gain against a finite number of chances of loss, and what you stake is finite. And so our proposition is of infinite force, when there is the finite to stake in a game where there are equal risks of gain and of loss, and the infinite to gain.

But some cannot believe. They should then 'at least learn your inability to believe...' and 'Endeavour then to convince' themselves.