
Book: The Logic of God

 Print  PDF  Email

Copyright 2014 by Dallas Carter.

<http://christiannetguide.com/>

ISBN-10:098900662X

ISBN-13:978-0-9890066-2-0

Cover Art is my modification of an image taken of a sculpture created by August Rodin. I obtained this image from Wikimedia Commons:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:The_Thinker_Musee_Rodin.jpg

I was granted the right to use this image and any derivative works under the [Creative Commons Attribution 2.0 Generic](#) license. This license should not be construed to imply any endorsement of this book by the original author of the original image or of Wikimedia Commons.

Table of Contents

Introduction to the *Logic of God*

Section 1: The falsification of Naturalism

Ch 1 – The falsification of Unlimited Uniformitarianism falsifies Naturalism

2 The inadequacy of assumptions based on Hyper-uniformitarianism

3 The Inability to Materialism and Naturalism to Explain the Subjective World

4 The Inadequacy of Naturalistic Epistemology Leads to Total Skepticism

5 The Inadequacy of the Self as a Reference Frame Leads to Total Skepticism

6 I think, therefore thoughts exist. – Man in the image of God

7 The Existence of Necessary and Undeniable Truths Falsifies All Forms of Atheism

8 The necessity of a transcendent Ground of causality.

9 The mathematical necessity of supernatural reality

10 God spoke creation into existence

11 The Intelligent Design of Life Revealed

12 Quantum Mechanics as God's Signature

13 The foundations of science and empirical inquiry

Section 3: Proof Christianity is true

14 The necessity of God as the reference frame for morals – God is necessarily just.

15 Freedom and the answer to the Logical Problem of Evil

16 Love is the answer to the Evidential Problem of Evil

17 The fall of man and the corruption of creation

18 God’s Trilemma

19 The Answer to God’s Trilemma

20 Proving Inspiration of Scripture

21 The Inspiration of the Bible is Foundational

22 Coherency as Proof of Divine Inspiration as evidenced by Covenants

23 How to Properly Approach Empirical Evidence.

24 Evidence Supporting the Action of God in History and Inspiration of the Bible

25 The Necessity of the Return of Christ

Appendix A: End Time Feasts.

Introduction to the *Logic of God*

Thank you for taking time to read this book. The *Logic of God* is a systematic presentation of strong arguments and evidence for the existence of God and truth of Christianity. This book uses the classical approach to apologetics used by Jesus, Paul, the early church, and Christians throughout the ages.

God has given humanity general revelation in the form of reason. There is no such thing as autonomous reason; attempts to make it autonomous result in an incoherent narrative filled with self-refuting statements.

The *Logic of God* uses all three epistemological methods, foundationalism, coherence, and evidential arguments, to provide support for the truth claims of Christianity.

There are three sections to this book. The first section presents arguments and evidence that falsify naturalism. The second section presents arguments and evidence that show the necessity of a personal, intelligent, and supernatural beginning. The final section presents arguments, and evidence that specifically support the truth claims of Christianity.

Section 1: The falsification of Naturalism

This first section is written to show that Naturalism is falsified. This has crucial implication in narrowing down the possible world-views. Dr Stephen Meyer, in discussing the implications of Big Bang Cosmology in an interview with Dr John Ankerberg, argued that there are four classes of

world-views: Theism, Deism, Pantheism, and Materialism. He argued that Big Bang Cosmology falsifies Naturalism; the falsification of Naturalism eliminates Materialism and Pantheism as viable candidates for a valid world-view [Sec1:1](#).

Big Bang Cosmology is one of several ideas that form powerful arguments that falsify naturalism. Because Materialism and Pantheism are two differing interpretations of naturalism, the falsification of naturalism falsifies Materialism, Pantheism, and the religions that presuppose these world-views.

When I write of the falsification of Naturalism in the next several chapters, I am not asserting that because Naturalism cannot explain everything or because of certain things we don't know, that Naturalism is false. I am asserting that there exists both positive evidence and logical arguments that show Naturalism to be false.

Section 1 References

- 1.A Cosmological Argument for God's Existence, pt. 4, Dr Stephen Meyer being interviewed by Dr John Ankerberg

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hCfSgw_yCsU

This is a four part interview. Below are links to parts 1-3

Part1: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tQMs2-GqUkA>

Part2: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0Rw4WCmp7t0>

Part3: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tEdyuDr9CCA>

[<back to text>](#)

Ch 1 – The falsification of Unlimited Uniformitarianism falsifies Naturalism

Critical to Naturalism is the idea that nature is the ultimate reality. From this it follows that nature is sufficient to account for everything. In quasi-scientific interpretations of naturalism, this principle is articulated as unlimited or hyper uniformitarianism. Hyper-uniformitarianism asserts that there is an unlimited scope and unlimited time span for natural law. An unlimited scope for natural law implies that natural law is an inherent property of nature as the ultimate reality. Falsification of unlimited uniformitarianism falsifies all forms of naturalism where nature behaves according to scientific laws.

The following argument does not falsify mystical or “magickal” interpretations of naturalism, particularly interpretations given to it by pre-modern thought-forms. These interpretations have the opposite problem: explaining the limited uniformity of cause and effects that is readily observed in the natural world. If the natural world that we live in is inherently mystical or magickal, then uniformity and regularity would not be expected in the natural world. (For more information on mysticism is not compatible with science, it is [here](#) in [Chapter 13](#)).

Additionally, arguments in the next two chapters after this falsify all forms of Naturalism, whether they be mystical or quasi-scientific.

There are three proofs that will show that Hyper-uniformitarianism is false. It can be conclusively demonstrated that natural law is neither eternal nor the ultimate foundation, ground, or “final cause” using The Second Law of Thermodynamics, Pasteur’s Law, and Big Bang Cosmology.

The Second Law of Thermodynamics is the principle asserting that the amount of energy available in a closed system decreases over time, resulting in increased entropy or disorder. Naturalism acts in opposition to the Second Law of Thermodynamics, implying that current natural process did not always apply that or apply universally. Naturalists respond to this charge by saying that we live in an open system that allowed for energy to come in from outside to prevent the dissipation of energy that causes entropy.

If what Naturalists mean by open system is the idea that the universe is an open system, then they would be affirming something compatible with the Creation Hypothesis, that is, the material universe is an open system with attributes and properties (natural law) set by causes outside the system (transcendent, supernatural).

If Naturalists mean by this that the domain in which evolution is occurs is a local system within a closed universe. This would imply that the domain in which evolution operates behaves according to different laws than the universe as a whole. If the scope of Naturalism is global, then the entire material universe is an open system **whose natural laws are the product of causes outside the system (supernatural, transcendent causes)** . If the scope of Naturalism is local, then natural laws defined by evolution are limited by the scope of evolution, **themselves being defined by causes outside the system.**

Unlimited uniformity of natural causes and natural law is incompatible with the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Entropy decrease that accompanies the development of life can only occur in open systems that operate under natural laws that do not operate outside of the scope of the open system.**The Second Law of Thermodynamics requires that entropy decrease (increase in organizational information or order) of any system be accounted for in terms of transcendent causes that lay outside of that system.**The Creation Hypothesis predicts an open system of natural causes and effects whose laws were set in place by God's creative act. The processes that produces the natural laws operate differently than the processes governed by those natural laws. **Unlimited Uniformitarianism is falsified.**

Pasteur's law asserts, that under natural law, abiogenesis (or creation of life from non-life) is impossible. No one has even seen or accomplished a violation of this law. Pasteur's law presents a difficulty for unlimited uniformity of causes and effect or eternally existing natural law. Unless

the biosphere is eternal, then logic dictates that at some point in the past a non-biological cause(s) brought forth a biological effect. It can be expressed through this conditional argument.

1. IF natural law uniformly governs all of reality, THEN biological effects cannot arise from non-biological causes.

2. Biological effects DID arise from non-biological cause (as conclusion of the following conditional sub-argument)

3. If Pasteur's law is extended indefinitely into the past, then the biosphere is eternal

4. The biosphere is not eternal

Pasteur's law does not extend indefinitely into the past

Natural law DOES NOT uniformly governs all of reality. (Modus Tollens).
Unlimited Uniformitarianism is falsified.

The Big Bang provides smoking gun proof that naturalism, with its principle of unlimited uniformitarianism, is falsified. There are two features of the Big Bang Model that falsify unlimited uniformitarianism

and naturalism: The existence of a beginning and the existence of the Big Bang Singularity.

The existence of a beginning implies that nature is not eternal. If the natural realm is not eternal, then the natural realm began to exist. This philosophically implies a transcendent cause as it is impossible for anything to come from nothing

The existence of the Big Bang Singularity means that natural laws did not operate at the beginning of the universe. According to the Big Bang Model, the laws of physics did not operate during the first 10^{-43} second after the beginning of the current time-line^{1:1}. This means that everything that is transcendent to the beginning and everything that operated within the time-line during the first 10^{-43} second has supernatural nature that is not reducible or explainable in terms of natural law. The bottom line is that the natural world was produced by a cause that ontologically^{1:2} transcendent – has a different type of being from created material objects.

Some have resorted to speculative Multiverse Hypotheses in the hope of escaping the necessity of a beginning or the necessity of a transcendent cause. This is plagued by the following dilemma: If the Multiverse is within the uniformity of natural causes and effect, then it would also have a beginning. If it is outside of that uniformity, then it is a transcendent cause to the universe. Bord, Guth and Vilenkin have

produced a theorem that asserts that in any inflationary context, inflation cannot be past-eternal. William Lane Craig has used this argument heavily in debates with atheists. During the course of these debates, there was a question of whether Craig misused the Theorem. Alexander Vilenkin, one of the architects of the theorem, sent out several communications to Lawrence Krauss, Victor Stenger, and William Lane Craig to clarify the implications of the theorem. In these communications, Vilenkin argued that inflation cannot be past-eternal. Vilenkin suggested that there are three possible alternative scenarios to an absolute singularity as a beginning^{1:3}.

1. Previous contraction before inflation began. According to Vilenkin, this would be very unstable with singularities, creating a condition that would make stable inflation impossible.
2. Previous small stable area that is static followed by inflation – no mechanism to enforce that condition
3. Quantum cosmology – definitely transcendent as we live in a classical universe that is quantum around the edges.

One feature in some versions of quantum cosmology is that our universe is a bubble that was formed when part of the multiverse decayed to a lower energy level. This poses a trilemma that points to the necessity of an absolute beginning and a transcendent cause. If the multiverse is absolutely infinite (infinite energy density), then the multiverse is fundamentally different or transcendent from our universe. If the multiverse is infinite but with energy finitely distributed (finite energy

density) and no Second Law of Thermodynamics, then the multiverse is fundamentally different from the universe. If the multiverse has energy that is finitely distributed (finite energy density) and that can decay into lower energy states, the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Decay that results in lower energy levels means a physical reality that can only last a finite time, requiring a beginning^{1:4}.

None of these escapes necessity of an ontologically transcendent cause. Appealing to quantum mechanics or a multiverse does not avoid the implications of the Big Bang, but only moves the question back a few more steps. No matter what theory one holds, the endpoint requires an ontologically transcendent cause or an absolute beginning that requires an ontological cause. Furthermore, in quantum mechanics physical reality emerges when an unentangled observer interacts with a quantum system and conducts a measurement. If the entire universe was a quantum system at the Big Bang, then the only possibilities that exist for un-entangled observers are supernatural observers^{1:5}. Quantum cosmology is more compatible with a Creation Framework than Naturalistic or Evolutionary Framework. More on quantum cosmology in chapter 10.

This transcendent First Cause is not merely first in line, but of a qualitatively different nature than the effects produced. The temporal

causes operated under one law of causation, but the First Cause is not subject to those rules. Natural laws that govern casualty in the natural universe have a limit. These laws require a First Cause to act as an Unmoved Mover to bring forth the space-time universe with natural laws as its attributes. Such a transcendent cause meets the minimal definition of supernatural – beyond nature. This is consistent with the creation framework and the Genesis account. The natural universe can only exist in its present form through a supernatural act.

Chapter 1 References

1. [Shttp://arxiv.org/pdf/gr-qc/0101003v2.pdf](http://arxiv.org/pdf/gr-qc/0101003v2.pdf)page 2

“Yet if quantum mechanics is a universal theory then it is inevitable that some form of “quantum cosmology” was important at the earliest of conceivable times, namely the Planck time, $t_{\text{Planck}} = (Gh)^{1/2} / c^{5/2} = 5.4 \times 10^{-44}$ sec, (equivalent to 10^{19} GeVas an energy, or 1.6×10^{-35} m as a length). At such scales, where the Compton wavelength of a particle is roughly equal to its gravitational (Schwarzschild) radius, irreducible quantum fluctuations render the classical concept of spacetime meaningless.” [<back to text>](#)

2. Ontology is the study of the nature of being. Ontology, ontological, and ontologically appear throughout this book. [<back to text>](#)
3. S <http://www.reasonablefaith.org/honesty-transparency-full-disclosure-and-bgv-theorem>[<back to text>](#)

4. S

http://www.damtp.cam.ac.uk/research/gr/public/qg_qc.html <back to text>

5. *An Introduction to Quantum Cosmology*, David L. Wiltshire, Department of Physics and Mathematical Physics, University of Adelaide, S.A. 5005, Australia, <http://arxiv.org/pdf/gr-qc/0101003v2.pdf> page 2

If the Copenhagen Interpretation of quantum mechanics is true and quantum mechanics is the best description of what happened during the first instants of the Big Bang, then a transcendent, supernatural observer is necessary. consider the following quote from Dr Wiltshire.

“On the face of it the very words “quantum” and “cosmology” do appear to some physicists to be inherently incompatible. We usually think of cosmology in terms of the very large scale structure of the universe, and of quantum phenomena in terms of the very small. However, if the hot big bang is the correct description of the universe – which we can safely assume given the overwhelming evidence described in the earlier lectures – then the universe did start out incredibly small, and there must have been an epoch when quantum mechanics applied to the universe as a whole.

“There are people who would take issue with this. In the standard Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics one always has a classical world in which the quantum one is embedded. We have observers who make measurements – the observers themselves are well described by classical physics. If the whole universe is to be treated as a

quantum system one does not have such a luxury, and some would argue that our conventional ideas about quantum physics cease to make sense. Yet if quantum mechanics is a universal theory then it is inevitable that some form of “quantum cosmology” was important at the earliest of conceivable times, namely the Planck time, $t_{\text{Planck}} = (\text{Gh})^{1/2} / c^{5/2} = 5.4 \times 10^{-44} \text{sec}$, (equivalent to 10^{19}GeV as an energy, or $1.6 \times 10^{-35} \text{m}$ as a length). At such scales, where the Compton wavelength of a particle is roughly equal to its gravitational (Schwarzschild) radius, irreducible quantum fluctuations render the classical concept of spacetime meaningless. Whether or not our current efforts at constructing a theory of quantum cosmology are physically valid is therefore really a question of whether our current understanding of quantum physics is adequate for considering the description of processes at the very beginning of the universe, or whether quantum mechanics itself has to be revised at some level. Such a question can really only be answered by extensive work on the problem. [<back to text>](#)

2 The inadequacy of assumptions based on Hyper-uniformitarianism

If unlimited uniformity of natural law and natural causes and effects cannot be sustained – in other words, if the laws of nature are not eternal, but valid only over a limited time span and in an open system subject to modification – then inferences about the distant past based the assumption of unlimited uniformity are not justified.

Much of the Hypothesis of Evolutionary Naturalism – the meta–narrative aspects – depend on inferences based on the assumption that natural law is uniform throughout eternity or at least indefinitely long ages of time. This epistemological assumption concerning which types of inferences are valid depends on meta–physical assumptions concerning the duration of natural law. If natural law has not existed from eternity (or at least indefinitely long eons of time, then extrapolations about events purported to occur eons on the past based on current natural law lacks epistemological^{2:1} justification.

Such extrapolation is common in evolutionary theories and theories that posit an extremely old earth. Because we cannot directly observe events millions and billions of years into the past, inferences based on understanding current natural laws and rates of change are read back into the past as if they are constant. If these are not constant or if the natural laws as we understand them are not representative of the whole, then the inference will be off base. Examples of such inference include the fossil record, dating methods, comparison of genetic similitude, and snapshots of starlight.

Fossils with structures that match the scientists interpretation of a transitional form are presented as proof of transitional forms. However, without a baseline of observed live transitional forms, there is no way to objectively test whether the scientists' interpretations are correct.

All **dating methods** assume constant rates of natural processes throughout eons of time. Natural processes, however, may occur at different rates in the past. Radiometric dating in particular assumes an initial combination of mother-daughter elements. Even isochron dating cannot escape these assumptions; it simply shifts the assumptions from mother-daughter to mother-sister isotopes [2:2](#).

Genetic comparisons asserts similarity or common patterns amongst genes as proof of common descent. The concept that similarity proves causation however is an informal logical fallacy. Valid inferences from genetic comparisons require baseline observations of a mechanism that establishes a connection. Genetic comparison within a species are valid, as baseline observation of the genetics of reproduction allow for valid inferences of a mechanism based on comparisons. No mechanism explaining the alleged relations between major branches of the evolutionary tree has been observed sufficiently to serve as a baseline to justify inferences based upon its existence.

Snapshots of starlight are commonly asserted as picture of the past. Assumes that cosmological constants have always been what they are today. The facts that light was the first of God's creation means that this constant was set early in the history of the universe.

Special relativity puts a strange wrinkle in interpretation of snapshots of starlight. Special relativity asserts that time is relative to the reference-frame of an observer (time dilation^{2:3}). As one moves closer to the speed of light, time dilates so that billions of years in our reference passes in only seconds in the reference-frame of the near light speed traveler. At the speed of light, all travel is done in zero time or instantaneously. What this means is that light from Galaxy Andromeda requires a travel time of two million years to reach us according to our reference-frame. If you were a “human quark” ready to surf the wave of a photon using a “god-particle” sized surfboard, however, the trip would be over instantaneously. According to relativity, there is no conflict between the six days of Genesis 1 and the long eons of contemporary cosmology, as these are calculated using different reference-frames. This is supported by Scripture, as the markers of our current reference-frame for marking time – the sun, moon, and stars – were not created until the fourth Genesis day. God created using a different reference-frame than man currently does.

Even when one takes into account the early creation of light in the Genesis narrative and the wrinkle in relativity, the use of starlight to infer the age of the universe is just an inference that is based on an assumption. Pictures of starlight are not “time machines” or time portals” as some declare them. The images of distant stars on photographic canvas cannot, by themselves, tell us anything about how long or how far away they are; they are only snapshot of the state of a star at a particular point of time. One must use inferences from what is observed by using things like parallax reading and red-shifts to infer distance and time. The inferences depend on assuming a constant rate for the speed

of light and the rate of cosmic inflation. Because they depend on such assumptions, using them to prove the speed of light or the rate of inflation commits the fallacy of circular reasoning.

When inferences are made concerning geological and biological events millions and billions of years based on limited observation over the past few hundred years, the fallacy of insufficient statistics (hasty generalization) is committed. There is not sufficient reason to believe that current observations are representative of the entirety of natural history. Because unlimited uniformitarianism has been falsified, it follows that current scientific understanding is not necessarily representative of conditions eons into the past.

The logical demarcation between uniformitarianism and hyper-uniformitarianism

There is a logical demarcation between between unlimited and unlimited uniformitarianism that manifests as an ontological difference and an epistemic difference:

The ontological difference stems from the fact that unlimited uniformitarianism has been falsified. This falsification is done using models that have the assumption of unlimited uniformitarianism as a feature of the models; these models lead to conclusions that show the necessity of an absolute beginning. These conclusions, by the nature of the assumptions that underlie the logical structure of the models, puts a demarcation between the world that is governed by a uniformity of natural law – uniformity of causes and effects – and a transcendent realm that does not operate by these natural laws.

There is also an epistemic difference between limited and unlimited uniformitarianism. This difference allows for us to have an epistemic demarcation. The demarcation concerns the boundary between where non-circular falsification is possible and where attempts to assign specific dates to uniformity of natural law involve circular reasoning^{2:4}.

The epistemic demarcation is human history. Natural law is constituted in such a way that any minor discontinuity during the course of human history would have produced consequences that would have left major clues. Major discontinuities would have ended the world as we know it and would have wiped out everything prior to the discontinuity. Therefore, inferences of uniformitarianism concerning events within human history are generally valid. Prior to human history, anything could have happened and we have no non-circular way to draw any conclusion about the uniformity of natural law other than that there is a necessity of an absolute beginning to the uniformity. Dating methods of events prior to human history depend on the principle of uniformitarianism, so attempt to prove uniformitarianism by resort to dating methods is circular reasoning. Inferences of uniformitarianism within human history are the only reliable inferences; anything else is a wild guess.

Why limiting uniformitarianism is not anti-science.

A common reply to the argument that limiting uniformitarianism is that it is science denial, anti-science, or otherwise anti-intellectual. This is a fallacy for three reasons: it is a false dichotomy, there exists alternate models that explain the data, and models with potentially false premises is not objectionable in science.

It is a false dichotomy because it assumes that uniformitarianism must be total or nothing. This has been demonstrated to be false. limited uniformitarianism can exist where natural law is produced by supernatural processes.

Models with potentially false premises are not objectionable in science. This is because science, when properly done, does not prove anything true. Science tries to approximate a true model of physical reality by proving alternative models false. This is often called Popper's falsifiability criterion because it was named after philosopher Karl Popper. In his book, *Logic of Scientific Discovery* (1959), Popper gave two main arguments why induction as science failed. One was there is no logical demarcation between reasonable leaps of faith that resulted in commitment to belief based on likelihood of being true and unreasonable leaps of faith. The other is that the logical structure of science does not allow for verification. Science works this way: *If a proposed hypothesis is true, then specified falsifiable consequences must be true.*

In this logical structure, the "specified falsifiable consequences" can be tested to see if they are false. If they are, then the hypothesis cannot be true. The truth of the hypothesis, however, cannot be validly tested. Attempts to do so commit the fallacy of affirming the consequent. It can be shown that this is fallacious.

Consider the equivalent logical structure in this statement: *If you get straight A's, you will get a scholarship.*

If one fails to get the scholarship, then one did not get straight A's as straight A's guaranteed a scholarship. If, however, one gets a scholarship, then it does not prove that they made straight A's. They could have acquired the scholarship based on musical or athletic ability, or need. In other words, there are multiple possible models or pathways for getting the scholarship. Science cannot prove any hypothetical model true because there could be other models that can account for the data that is being tested.

If science cannot prove anything to be true, then it can only approximate or presume truth. For example, science can approximate proof that cigarette smoking is unhealthy by testing hypotheses that cover the whole range of logical possibilities. The truth about the dangers of cigarette smoking can be approximated by ruling out alternative possibilities

This approximation fails when there exists alternate models that explain the same data. There are two classes frameworks on origins. One is the class of frameworks known as Evolutionary Naturalism where nature produces the world that we see through evolutionary processes that conform to natural law. The other class of frameworks asserts that supernatural or transcendent cause(s) produced the laws of science—including any evolutionary processes – that operate within a creation narrative.

One such Creation framework can be found in Genesis. The Genesis account, when viewed as a framework^{2:5}, asserts that a transcendent cause produced natural laws and the uniformity of causes and effects

that operates within those laws. This transcendent cause is, by definition, supernatural, because it is outside of the system of the uniformity of natural causes and effects. The Creation Framework allows for a very robust scientific method, limited uniformitarianism, and limited evolutionary processes. God created natural law and set it up to behave uniformly over a limited time span in an open system^{2:6}.

The Genesis narrative asserts that God did six days of relative work. during this time, He gave commands that instantiated natural laws and natural processes. Phrases like “let the land produce” and “let the waters teem” suggest that God has embedded what Augustine called seminal principles – these principles instantiated evolutionary processes on a limited scale – “according to their kinds.” These processes occur within a creation framework and are limited by that framework.

Concerning that which has actually been observed, The Creation Framework makes the same predictions as the prevailing Evolutionary Naturalist Framework. Concerning that which has actually been observed, The Creation Framework has the same applications as the Evolutionary Naturalist Framework. Where the Creation Framework differs from the prevailing evolutionary naturalist narrative is in relation to implications concerning which world-view is correct. The Creation Framework differs from the prevailing evolutionary naturalist narrative in areas that involve inferences based on assumptions concerning natural processes rather than inferences evidence. The assumptions that distinguish the evolutionary narrative from the creationist narrative have been falsified (see last chapter). The Genesis Framework, which asserts that a transcendent cause created the uniformity of natural causes of

effect in an open system, makes fewer assumptions (parsimony) about reality than evolutionary frameworks. Evolutionary frameworks make lots of assumptions about natural laws, natural process, and constants, Whereas the Creation framework requires only that there exists a transcendent cause to account for the existence of the uniformity of causes and effect we see in the natural world.

God engaged in relative rest on the seventh. From the perspective of an Infinite–Personal God, it takes no more effort to speak during the first six days as it did to bless the seventh day. The relative rest is a relative easing of supernatural intervention in the natural world. The first six days of creation were days of heavy supernatural intervention that brought forth the natural world and set in place natural law and fundamental cosmological constants. The seventh day would be marked by an increased role for the natural forces (though not a complete absence of supernatural events). Natural causes would be at work in the creation – even evolution – albeit evolution bounded by a creation framework produced through supernatural intervention of God.

Chapter 2 References

1. Epistemology is the study of how do we know what know. Epistemology is not concerned with how we learn things, but with how, or whether, we can prove something. Epistemology is the study of the nature of proof – how can we justify our knowledge claims. [<Back to Text>](#)

2. *Isochron Dating as a Scientific Clock*, **Age of the Earth and the Formation of the Universe Honors Seminar**, Professor Timothy Heaton, University of South Dakota (Fall 2005).

http://apps.usd.edu/esci/creation/age/content/current_scientific_clocks/isochron_dating.html <Back to text>

3. *Time Dilation*, Hyper Physics Lab, Georgia State University

<http://hyperphysics.phy-astr.gsu.edu/hbase/relativ/tdil.html#c2> <back to text>

4. Circular reasoning is a method of reason that argues something like this A is true because of B, B is true because of C...Z is true because of A. The very thing that needs proof is assumed. This is fallacious because it results in a variation of an infinite regress. There is ultimately no sufficient explanation that supports the proof, only an infinite series of insufficient explanations. [<back to text>](#)

5. The Genesis Account is much more than a mere scientific hypothesis; it is also (primarily) a narrative that informs a much larger meta-narrative that affirms the existence of God as a Creator and lays the foundation for the over-riding theme of redemption. The argument I am making is focused on the implications of Genesis as a presenting a creation framework – that a transcendent cause has produced limited uniformity of causes and effect that

have only operated for a limited period of time in an open system.

[<back to text>](#)

6. An open system simply means that a system that is subject to outside influences. According to quantum mechanics, classical physics breaks down at the smallest scales, suggesting that the natural world is porous, allowing for interruption of the uniformity of cases and effects by God and man. for more information on quantum mechanics, read chapter 12, [Quantum Mechanics as God's Signature.](#)[<back to text>](#)

3 The Inability to Materialism and Naturalism to Explain the Subjective World

Ch 3 - The inability of Naturalism to explain the subjective world

The subjective world represents the domain of reality that is the greatest failure of Naturalistic philosophy. By subjective world, I am referring the world of perceptions and thought that live inside of the minds of persons.

Inability of naturalistic epistemology to define the ontological status of perception

Perceptions have real existence. This can be proven rather easily. Having in the mind a perception has different consequences for the life of the mind than the absence of that perception. If that perception were NULL,

then there would be no difference between its presence and absence in the mind.

All perceptions have real existence as perceptions, but not all perceptions are valid as **signifiers** of reality that transcend the perception. For example, the statement “There are flying pink elephants.” may describe a perception that exists in the imagination, but it does not signify anything existing outside of the mind that imagined it.

Impossibility of naturalistic reality to create delusions that are a part of subjectivity

The subjective realm is the world of our conscious perceptions and concepts. Every person possesses this conscious world. It is undeniable that this world exists and that it has some type of ontological status. It is equally undeniable that the particular perceptions and concepts also exist, having an ontological status of some value that is defined by the conscious, subjective realm. All perceptions have ontological status as perceptions. They do because their existence changes the state of the subjective domain as a set.

Not all perceptions have the same ontological status. Some perceptions signify an ontology or being that lies beyond the perception as a perception. When I perceive it to be ‘daytime’ during the day, that perception accurately signifies something that is true beyond the perception. If I perceive it to be ‘nighttime’ during the day, that

perception fails to accurately signify any state of affairs beyond my perception. Perceptions that signifying reality beyond my perception have a different ontological status than perceptions that do not.

One of the distinct features of the subjective realm is imagination. Imagination can be used to frame simple or complex perceptions, ideas, and stories that do not exist outside of the realm of the imagination. Some imaginations are framed as imaginations, with the person understanding it to be imaginary. There are, however, some imaginations, that are framed in a mind as having actual existence outside the imagination when they have no such existence outside of the imagination. These are delusions.

Delusions have real existence in the imagination as imaginations; the ontological state of the imagination that has a given delusion is different than that same imagination without the given delusion. To deny this would imply that the imagination does not exist. It is undeniable that imagination exists, or we would not have imaginations. If imagination itself has ontological status, then the particular products of that imagination have an ontological status relative to that imagination; the ontology of the imagination confers an ontological status upon the objects it creates. Denial of this renders the concept of an imagination meaningless.

The fact that ultimate reality must be absolute truth creates difficulties for the Materialist narrative. When one considers that, according to the law of non-contradiction, nothing can be true and false in the same context; that truth is absolute. The very denial of absolute truth is a claim to absolute truth: it is either absolutely true or true only in certain contexts. If the denial of absolute truth is true only in certain contexts, then in the other contexts absolute truth is real and therefore absolute truth exists.

Absolute truth is the reference frame for relative or contingent truths. Particular truths are defined in relation to or compatibility with absolute truth, with falsehood designating the absence of a relation or denial of compatibility. Particular truths, then, must be compatible with absolute truth. **Absolute truth is, then, the ultimate reality.**

How is it possible, then, for a material ultimate reality as absolute to produce delusions or any structure that create delusions? Since it is impossible for truth to contradict itself then it is simply not possible for an impersonal, material absolute truth to create delusions or delusion creating structures. A material, absolute truth could only create material absolute truths; there is no possibility of contingent reality or delusions in a materialistic universe. While materialists may posit that consciousness, subjectivity and imagination are products of material processes, material reality lacks the categories to create virtual, imaginary, subjective layer with classes and objects existing at an inferior ontological status – as less than absolute truth or as constructs

containing falsehood^{3:1}. Only in a Theistic worldview is it possible for the creation of the contingent and corruptible objects that are commonly part of our experience.

Inability of naturalistic reality to define moral categories

Naturalistic reality is an insufficient ground for defining morality. Naturalistic reality can be interpreted in materialistic terms or pantheistic terms. Both fail to explain morality.

The materialistic or naturalistic worldview necessarily defines objective truth in terms of material reality. Thus, the only way for morality to be objective in a materialistic view is to be defined in terms of material properties. Objective morality exists because it is material. This, however, proves to be a very, very, flimsy base for morals. If materialism is true, then Marquis de Sade is correct when he says that “Whatever is, is right.” If morality is a material phenomena, then violations of the moral law are just as real as the moral law. Murders are just as real as the law against murder. Materialism provides no reference-frame for ontologically distinguishing good from evil.

Pantheism suffers the same problem as materialism in defining morals. If all of reality is the divine godhead, then there is no baseline to ontologically distinguish good events from evil events, as both types of events are equally divine.

As neither Pantheism nor Materialism has an adequate reference frame for ontologically distinguishing good from evil, all moral judgments made in religious and philosophical systems based on these world-views are completely arbitrary. These world-views have no basis to objectively assert any moral claims that are obligatory. Furthermore, in these views there are no properties inherent in the subjective world of another individual or of society that obligate one morally, and while empathy in early man and utilitarianism in modern man may motivate people to invent ethical systems, these factors are limited to sociological and anthropological significance and carry no moral authority.

Only a transcendent, supernaturalistic world-view can provide an adequate basis for ontologically distinguishing good from evil. The nature of supernatural reality in absolute truth provides the baseline which transcends the natural world. Events in the natural world can be evaluated on the basis of whether they are morally consistent with this transcendent, supernatural reality. In [chapter 14](#), it will be shown that the character of the Infinite-Personal God is the reference-frame for morality. In the next chapter it will be shown not only how God defines good and evil but how God responds to evil.

Chapter 3 References

1. For more information on how contingent and corruptible objects be created, go to chapter 10. [God spoke creation into existence](#). For more information about how humanity corrupted this creation, go

to chapter 17, [The fall of man and the corruption of creation.](#)
[<back to text>](#)

4 The Inadequacy of Naturalistic Epistemology Leads to Total Skepticism

Naturalism, in all its permutations, has disastrous implications for epistemology or our justification of knowledge claims. There are two major permutations of naturalism that this chapter will focus on, both of which lead to total skepticism. There are materialism and pantheistic emanationism.

The Failure of Materialism

Materialism is the premise that all of reality consists of, or is a product of, physical matter and energy. There is no spiritual or non-physical reality that exist outside the scope of material reality. This poses a problem of how logical reality is explained. Materialists face a trilemma, each of which is fatal to Materialism: Logical and Mathematical truths are mere physical object or exists relative to physical reality. Logical and Mathematical truths are not truths at all, but mere convention humans use to process information (Nominalism). Logical and Mathematical truths have a distinct, non-physical reality.

If Logical and Mathematical truths are mere physical objects or exist relative to physical reality, then they would have the same properties as physical reality. What this means is that logical and mathematical truths would have to be justified in the same way as our empirical knowledge of the physical world. We must use observations to gather information about the physical world and then test those to arrive at a probable conclusion. Because our senses are fallible, we must test those and reach a probable conclusion. This means that we would determine that $2+2 = 4$ and that the sums of the squares of the sides of a right triangle = the square of the hypotenuse through testing our observations of numbers and triangles rather than constructing mathematical theorems. In other words, theorems would have no evidential value in math if Materialism is true; if materialism is true, only empirical or experiential observation can supply proof – and only give probable conclusions.

If logical and mathematical truths are physical objects, then empiricism is true. Empiricism is the idea that all knowledge comes from sense experience. If all knowledge comes from sense experience, then one must use sense experience to justify this claim. Using sense experience to prove that sense experience is a valid way of knowing is circular reasoning. If logical and mathematical truths are physical objects, then self-refuting skepticism follows.

The method of proof of the truths of logic and mathematics is not compatible with the mode of proof that would necessarily be used if

logic and mathematics are physical objects or products of physical reality. Logical and mathematical truth are proved by theorems that are absolutely true and knowable without recourse to observations about the external world. The method of proof used in logic and mathematics is only valid if logic and mathematics is NOT a physical object or a product of physical reality.

The idea that logical and mathematical truth are not truths at all, but mere convention humans use to process information is an implication of a philosophical view called Nominalism. Nominalism denies that there are any universals. There are three big problems that arise if Nominalism is true; Language becomes meaningless. Mathematics and logic become meaningless. If language, math, and logic are meaningless, then Nominalism itself is meaningless^{[4:1](#)}.

If there are no universals, then all statements are meaningless. This is because virtual all statements invoke universal categories in either the subject or the predicate. The sentence "Socrates is a man" is meaningless because the attribute set designated by the word "man" would not represent the universal set 'man' if no universals exists. If the class or set 'man' does not exist, then it is meaningless to assert that a particular object can be a member of that class. It is the equivalent of saying "Socrates..." Such a statement has no semantic or linguistic meaning.

If there are no universals, then laws of logic and mathematics are meaningless because they cannot be defined or have any semantic meaning except as universals. The law of non-contradiction, for example, is not a particular truth but a universal principle. It says that it is impossible for anything to be true and false in the same context. It is valid in every context. No universals mean no law of non-contradiction. Mathematical theorems follow the same principle. In a world in which no meaningful statements in natural language are possible, logic and mathematics could not even apply to natural language. The fact that logic and mathematics necessarily apply to and constrain natural language proves that language, mathematics, and logic have meaning – and therefore ontology.

If logical and mathematical principles are not real, then there is no reason to believe that they have any ability or any value to describe reality. No reason to believe that natural laws exist either. Both science and everyday common sense become worthless.

If Nominalism is true, then everything is reduced to meaninglessness. Language is incapable of communicating any meaning, and logic/math and the disciplines that depend on their use, are incapable of describing the real world. We are left with only a self-refuting skepticism. The meaninglessness of Nominalism is self-defeating. If Nominalism is true, then the statement affirming Nominalism is itself meaningless.

Logical and Mathematical truths have a distinct, non-physical reality. This is the only coherent position to hold concerning the ontology or reality status of logical and mathematical truths. The fact that logic and mathematics **necessarily** apply to and constrain natural language proves that language, mathematics, and logic have both meaning and ontology. Meaning has ontology as meaning. The necessary nature of its application implies that logic and mathematics are not mere conventions but imply ontology. Logic and Mathematics are only useful for making inferences about the real world if they can tell us something about the real world. This, however, involves the falsification of Materialism. Material reality is not the only reality that exists – and not even the ultimate, defining reality that frames everything else..

The Failure of Pantheistic Emanationism.

Pantheistic Emanationism begins with the premise that there is a single reality from which emanates all of the objects and attributes that exist. Emanation necessitates the outflow of essence of the primordial reality. The essence of this primordial reality is necessarily absolute truth. This is because the existence of absolute truth is necessary; the denial of absolute truth itself involves positing an absolute truth – that the denial itself be an absolute truth. All particular truths exist in relation to absolute truth.

In an emanationist metaphysics, particular truths are just an emanation of absolute truth. Since emanation involves an outflow of the essence of the primordial reality which has now been established as absolute truth,

then all particular truths are themselves absolute truth. Absolute truth cannot be false, cannot be corrupted and cannot not exist. As such, everything exists, everything has necessary existence, self-existence, and therefore eternal existence. If everything necessarily exists, then nothing can be falsified and no temporal events ever occur.

If nothing can ever be falsified and no temporal events can ever occur, then there would be no contradictions in all of reality, everything and everyone would exist eternally, and everyone would have all of the powers of absolute truth. As applied to me, it follows that I should be able to have everything any one could want, simply by willing it into existence: money, power, glory, fame, pleasure. In fact, I wouldn't even need to since I would already have everything anyone could need. I could do these things and you could too – if Pantheistic Emanationism is true.

Needless to say, it doesn't take very long to falsify Pantheistic Emanationism. Religions that teach emanation generally take one of two paths to evade falsification:

One is to assert imperfect emanation where the emanation is an imperfect or corrupted outflow of the essence of primordial reality as an explanation of an imperfect and corrupted reality. Because absolute truth cannot be falsified or corrupted, the existence of an imperfect emanation represent a fundamental contradiction that falsifies the entire emanationist worldview.

The second option is to conclude that the totality of their perceptions are delusion. **The consequences of this type of thinking is that one would have no basis to believe that any of their perceptions tell them anything about the real world.** Their perception of causality of space-time events is an illusion. Their perception that they are limited is an illusion. Their perception of contradictions, corruption, and death is an illusion. This option is self-contradictory as it asserts that primordial reality, absolute truth, produced delusion. It is logically impossible for absolute truth to produce or imply delusion.

Emanationist philosophy often retreats into mysticism as the preferred way of dealing with the logical difficulties that are inherent in this philosophy. In this view, logic is indicted as being incapable of comprehending the ways of the primordial reality.

Because of the absolute truth claims of logic and the universal scope of its claims to necessary truth and logical impossibilities, logic is not selectively valid. If logic is instantiated once, then it is instantiated as a whole and applicable to the whole. This is where mysticism ultimately fails. It is impossible for anyone to consistently live in a mystical world. At some point the logic of the real world comes crashing in on everyone, regardless of whether they believe in logic or mysticism. The act of attempting to being and acting in a **consistently** mystical manner actually presupposes logic. If mysticism were really true, there would be no need for consistency as consistency is a property of logic; if logic is

false, one could act both mystically and non-mystically/logically without consequence.

Naturalism, in all of its permutations, leads to either self-contradictory consequences or to self-defeating total skepticism. Naturalism is not an adequate basis for our knowledge of the world, of life, or of ultimate meaning. Naturalism is not an adequate framework for understanding truth in its totality.

Chapter 4 References

1. Meaningless is a term that can mean one of two different things in philosophy.
 1. It can refer to Existential meaninglessness. This is referring to the dissonance between the human experience and the logical consequences of Materialism
 2. It can also refer to statements that cannot have any semantic or linguistic meaning because of how they are constructed or because their truth value is not definable. [<back to text>](#)

5 The Inadequacy of the Self as a Reference Frame Leads to Total Skepticism

We live in a time when many people do not believe that there is such a thing as truth. Others are not sure what to believe. One of man's basic

questions is how can we know what we know? What is the basis of our certainty or can we be certain of anything? There is a branch of philosophy called epistemology that deals with these issues. The philosophy or movement called postmodernism asserts that there is no objective truth and no knowledge of truth. All we have are perspectives and opinions. This mindset is increasingly becoming the dominant mode of thought among non-Christians.

Since Postmodernists do not believe in truth (in theory, at least) they do not regard language as communicating any predefined content. They reason that if there is no truth then one can read any meaning they want into a message. They call this deconstruction. This is commonly referred to as spinning or spin doctoring. Since postmodernist claim not to believe in any truth, they do not seek to gain a unified understanding of the particulars that they see by means of an appeal to objective truth or reality as a universal to provide a unified view of things. It like having a bunch of drawers with no dresser to put them in or worse a pile of clothes lying on the floor. A postmodernist looks to politics rather than truth to unite his or her private world. This is called political correctness.

How did we get to this place? Philosophy based on human wisdom and traditions rather than on Christ. The Bible says that God brings to nothing the wisdom of the world. (Is 29:9-14; 1 Corinthians 1:18-24) A study of the history of philosophy bears this out. In the 1600's, a man who is considered by many as the Father of modern philosophy established a self based philosophy. He coined the phrase ' I think,

therefore I am."^{5:1} He used the self-evident knowledge that we have thoughts to prove the existence of the self and then sought to prove everything else by the existence of the self. This created a problem. It does not follow that any perception I have of the outside world is true 'out there' simply because I perceive it in my mind. Descartes thinking created a divide between the inner world and the external world. If one only understands what is in his understanding, how can one go beyond the domain of thoughts to verify what is 'out there?'

In the quest to know what is 'out there,' a philosophy called empiricism developed. Empiricism is the belief that all knowledge comes from sense experience. The logical conclusion of empiricism is that all we can know are sensory perceptions. In a logically consistent empiricist epistemology or theory of knowledge, "Trying to go beyond perceptions, as metaphysics must, inevitably involves going beyond anything that can have cognitive content."^{5:2} There are several problems with empiricism. If ALL knowledge comes from sense experience, how can we know this statement to be true? If it is a self-evident proposition, then not all knowledge comes from sense experience. If it is a sense experience then it is a circular argument which goes like this: A is true because of B; B is true because of A; A has not yet been proved – the argument collapses.

Empiricism cannot explain between valid sense experience and illusion, since both are sensory experiences. It is necessary that something distinct from the sensory impression exist to serve as a standard of measurement to judge our experience. It is not raw experience but

processed experience that counts. A dog can see a barn, but we can also call it a barn and compare it with other barns.

Kant saw that experience had to be processed. He proposed that we have categories of hardwired knowledge that we bring into experience that interpret experience. He introduced several concepts that govern philosophy discussions to the present time. The world became divided into phenomenal realm (things as they appear to us) and the noumenal realm (things as they are).^{5:3} While Kant answered some problems unique to empiricism, he did not tell how we have this hardwired knowledge or how to bridge the gap between our subjective view and the way things really are. He seems to have widened that gap.

The next stage in the history of modern philosophy is called Logical Positivism^{5:4}. Logical Positivism, sometimes called Logical Empiricism, asserts that philosophy– logic in particular– can say nothing about what is ‘out there’. Logic provided rules of inference to assist the scientific method. Experiments and observation provided ALL knowledge of the real world. Positivists still had hope of salvaging the idea of verification – that it is somehow possible to verify that our perception of what happens “out there” is actually true “out there” Philosophy is valid for defining terms and constructing rules of valid reasoning for the scientific method but that knowledge about the outside world can be gained only by using the scientific method to parse empirical or experiential observation or experiment. In other words, philosophy was used to

construct the scientific method, but it was the scientist, as practitioner of the scientific method, who gathered knowledge about the world

This, however, did not solve the subject-object problem. If philosophy knows nothing about the world 'out there' how is it possible for philosophers to develop rules of inference that apply 'out there.' Logical Positivism does not make any provision for people to know that the categories of our perception correspond to categories as they exist "out there" or external to us. The practice of drawing inferences from observations or experiments involved a leap of faith. Since we can't exhaustively observe everything, we observe a sample with the belief that the results of a sufficiently large and representative sample will correspond to the result of the whole. This approach was flawed for two reasons. In order to know whether our sample is representative and sufficiently large, we would have to already know something about the whole before we can construct our experiment. How does man, beginning from the self as a frame of reference, do this?

A philosopher named Karl Popper comes along. In his book, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, destroys the idea that man can verify the world "out there." Popper argues that there is no logical demarcation for concluding that inferences are reasonable leaps of faith and other are unreasonable by using induction. This is because it is logically impossible to reduce universal statements to a finite set a particular statements.^{5:5} No matter how many observations one makes, the next observation could falsify

the theory. Any such attempt to draw universal statement out of particular one is risky – it is a leap of faith

In order to quantify likelihood of an inference being true, we would need to know something of the whole prior to starting the experiment; if we need this knowledge before the experiment, we cannot rely on applying the scientific method to these experiments to gain the knowledge. Without knowing something about the whole in order to quantify risk of the inference being incorrect, then the inference itself is no more than a blind guess. There is no logical demarcation between reasonable leaps of faith and mystical leaps of faith.

Popper proposed what he called the falsifiability criterion.^{5:6} Science could never verify anything but a scientist would test hypothesis to see if they would be falsified. Hypotheses that were not falsified would be accepted. The falsification criterion avoids the issue of inductive inferences committing the informal fallacy of sampling bias^{5:7} or hasty generalization^{5:8}. It also fits well with the deductive aspects of the scientific method. Experiments and observations can test only the consequences, and falsification is the only valid inference^{5:9}.

Falsification, however, suffers the same fundamental limitation as verification. Neither can actually reach the external world. No way to be certain that it is the external world and not a particular perception of it that falsifies the hypothesis. If rules of inference tell us nothing about

the real world, then Popper's falsification criterion – as a rule of inference – cannot tell us anything about the external world.

Analytic Philosophy states that logic – rules of inference – says nothing about the real world but reflects only the relations of terms used in language^{5:10}. If logic does not apply in the real world, then the scientific method collapses. None of these philosophies answers how we can move beyond our perception of reality to verify what is out there. We don't see what is out there, but only our perception of what is there. How do we know that there is anything beyond our perception if we cannot see beyond our perception? This logically leads to Postmodernism, which sees logic and science as nothing more than linguistic and social constructs. Postmodernists have concluded that we cannot know anything beyond our perception.

In the next section, I will show that there is a sufficient condition for knowledge and a sufficient explanation for the big issues. These can be explained in a theistic world-view.

Chapter 5 References

1. "I Think, Therefore I am.", Wikiquote

http://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/I_think_therefore_I_am

[<back to text>](#)

2. “David Hume”, section on Empiricism, para2, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hume/#Emp>

[<back to text>](#)

3. “Kant’s Theory of Judgment”, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-judgment/>

[<back to text>](#)

4. “Logical Empiricism”, section “Empiricism, Verificationism, and Anti-Metaphysics”, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logical-empiricism/#EmpVerAntMet>

[<back to text>](#)

5. The Logic of Scientific Discovery, page 4, Karl Popper, 1959

[<back to text>](#)

6. The Logic of Scientific Discovery, chapter 1, Karl Popper, 1959

[<back to text>](#)

7. “Fallacy: Biased Sample”, the Nizkor Project

<http://www.nizkor.org/features/fallacies/biased-sample.html>

[<back to text>](#)

8. "Fallacy: Hasty Generalization", The NizkorProject

<http://www.nizkor.org/features/fallacies/hasty-generalization.html>

[<back to text>](#)

9. Equipping the Saints, Week 43, section on Modus Tollens

[<back to text>](#)

10. Analytic Philosophy, section on V. Quine, Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy

[Analytic Philosophy](#)

[<back to text>](#)

[Section 2: The necessity of a personal, intelligent, and supernatural beginning](#)

Section 2 - The necessity of a personal, intelligent, and supernatural beginning

In this section, I will give positive evidence and arguments supporting the necessity of a personal, intelligent, and supernatural beginning. The types of argument used will include logical, mathematical, and evidential grounds of support, using theorems from logic, mathematics, morality and findings from quantum mechanics and biosemiotics.

6 I think, therefore thoughts exist. – Man in the image of God

In [chapter 5](#), I have shown that modern philosophy leads to postmodernism and skepticism. The basic problem is that the self is used as the frame of reference. The problem with this is that there is no way for a self-centered reference to move outside of the self and contact the external world. A self-centered reference frame has no means of validating whether the world outside of the perception really agrees with the perceptions of it.

Unless you are God, the universe does not revolve around you. However, it is not necessary that the self BE the reference frame, only that we have contact with the reference frame in our conscious. The Bible begins with the existence of thought as a reference frame. John 1:1 says that it is the Word of God that created the universe. God framed reality in His thoughts, His Language. We will see that the existence of thought is a better reference frame, and that in the midst of the weaknesses in our thoughts are thoughts that lead to God's superior thoughts.

Instead of 'I think therefore I am,' Descartes should have said 'I think, therefore thoughts exist.'" There are three things so profoundly self

evident that even the hardest skeptic acknowledges their existence: Language (logic), perception (consciousness), and intentionality.

Perception

Language has real existence as language and perceptions have real existence as perceptions. Language and perceptions are something and not NULL; whether or not a perception exists or is true or is delusional has ontological consequences. Even if all our perceptions are delusional, they still exist as perceptions – their presence in a consciousness is different from their absence.

The philosophical challenges occur when we take a perception as REPRESENTING something BEYOND the immediate perception or language as representing anything beyond the immediate perception (perceptions that are ‘ just your perceptions ‘). If and only if one makes the self the reference frame and puts content outside of self that a null value is obtained for perceptions and concepts. One must account for the existence of language and perception BEFORE setting up machinery for the subject–object relation.

We do however think of perceptions on two levels: one level can be described as ‘my perspective’. Every perception a person has real existence on this level. Some perception can exist only on this level. I can imagine that Saddam Hussein has paratroopers jumping off of flying

pink elephants over Louisville, but my imagining that does not mean that there are real flying pink elephants.

However the perception that the sun is yellow is not limited to 'just my perspective' but describes something happened 'out there.' Some perceptions also exist beyond our imagination. I am about to show that the law of non-contradiction exists both in my perspective and beyond my perspective.

The question is, are there any perceptions or concepts that exist beyond the immediate perception or concept that we have? If not then we have no means to critically analyze our perceptions or concepts. All we would have is imagination; there could be no knowledge of anything beyond what is in our heads. If we have in 'my perspective' at least one perception whose existence transcends or goes beyond 'my perspective' and have the ability to distinguish that perception from other perception that might be 'just my perspective' Then we have the means to critically judge our perceptions and beliefs about reality.

The law of non-contradiction exists both within and beyond our immediate perceptions. The law of non-contradiction asserts that no two things can be true where the truth of one makes the other false. This implies that not all perceptions and concepts have equal truth value. All perceptions equally exist as perceptions, so the only way possible to differentiate truth values among perceptions is if at least one of those

perceptions also has a quality distinct from that quality that make it a perception. This quality can be called truth. If so we can have a framework for the subject-object relationship.

The law of non-contradiction is a universal. Its application cannot be limited to “just my perceptions” or just as language or “formal” construct. If it is true in any context, it is true in every context^{[6:1](#)}.

Language

The Law of non-contradiction is related to the existence of language. Every language has a grammar or equivalent to grammar. Every language has categories of subject and predicate, and a copula that connects the subject with the predicate (a verb of being or action IE Jesus is Lord). Any language that can function in the world that is perceived also has categories that modify these basic two categories. This would include adverb, adjective, direct object, singular~ plural, diversity of tenses of time just to name a few. Without at least the two basic categories it would be impossible to construct the law of non-contradiction.

Philosophers have for years known the connection between the law of non-contradiction and language. There are those who would say that the law of non-contradiction asserts nothing about the ‘ real world ‘ but only the relations of terms used in language. This assumes that language doesn’t really exist. Language does exist though. If Language has real existence as language, then any laws of language also exist in reality.

The law of non-contradiction then asserts something about reality. The nature of the law of non-contradiction is absolute and universal. That means it cannot be applied to only part of reality. If it applies to reality with language then it must apply to all of reality in all of its forms.

The law of non-contradiction requires that different truth values exist for various perceptions and concepts. Some perceptions are just my own, others are real beyond my perception. The law of non-contradiction frames a distinction between each category. One is called subjective and the other objective truth. This implies that the law of non-contradiction has a quality of reality that transcends perceptions that are 'just my perspective' and that some perceptions and some concepts also have this transcendent quality. We call this quality objective truth.

Since the law of non-contradiction has both real perceptibility and this real transcendent quality and the law of non-contradiction indicates the existence of language, then there are two levels of reality both of which involve the presence of language communication and verbal thought and that the law of non-contradiction is real on both levels.

Chapter 6 References

1. This would not apply in cases where there is no context or NULL context. Whenever language is used as self reference or as meta-language (language that refers to talk about language rather than signify states of an ontologically external real or imagined world,

paradoxes occur. One such paradox is the Liars Paradox. The statement “I am lying” is formally self-refuting. If I am telling the truth about my lying, I am not lying. While it is formally self-refuting, it is seemingly ontologically possible. The problem is that the statement “I am lying” has no context. “I” can mean anything. A similar statement with context eliminates the logical problems, resulting in a statement in which the law of non-contradiction is applicable. The statement “Dallas is lying” evaluates to either true or false based on the evidence, but not to both true and false.

[<back to text>](#)

7 The Existence of Necessary and Undeniable Truths Falsifies All Forms of Atheism

Pilate said to Jesus Christ ‘What is truth?’ in response to the testimony of Christ that He came ‘to bear witness to the truth.’ Within the political context of this conversation it is reasonable to conclude that Pilate viewed as his own personal truth the political realities of Rome. Many people today view truth as subjective or relative to perspectives or situations. They do not believe there is such a thing as Absolute truth, or a universal reference point or eternal, infallible truths.

Logically speaking, the notion that there are no absolutes is self-refuting. Either there are absolutely no absolutes in which case the

denial of absolutes is itself an absolute, or sometimes the denial of absolutes is false in which case there are absolutes. The same follows for the existence of truth. The statement that truth doesn't exist is either true, proving at least one truth exists, or it is false proving the negative – that truth exists^{7:1}. From a logical standpoint, absolute truth necessarily exists.

Rejection of absolute truth commonly involves rejection or downgrading of logic. They would have you believe that logic and particularly the law of non-contradiction are merely constructs of language^{7:2} rather than a law of reality. They forget that language and perceptions themselves have real existence as language and perceptions. The laws of logic are therefore laws or constructs of reality as well as the constructs of language. Absolute can mean four things: universal, infallible, eternal, and reference point.

By universal that is truth that applies to everything. The law of non-contradiction is one example. If there is no universal truth then there is no objective truth. There would be only private, perspectival truths. If that is true then one would be god of his own universe. I could think worlds into existence, would no longer need food, water or outside air to live. I could will a harem of beautiful, voluptuous, naked women to service my every want and who would always be available whenever I wanted. I could fire my bosses at work. Fire the President. Why vote for someone else to be President when you are king of the world? This may

sound ridiculous, but it logically follows if there is no truth outside my perspective.

On September 11, 2001, the first stage of postmodernism collapsed with the two towers of the World Trade Center. Impressed on the global psyche is the notion that no individual lives in just his world. There is a world outside of your own private world that interacts with your world. Truth cannot then be relative to your perspective but there is a truth that applies to every private world as well as every community. Where the gospel stands apart from the world is that much of the world will never bow before Christ until compelled to do so on Judgment Day. Instead of looking to real truth they will seek a counterfeit truth in a mere man or manmade systems like the United Nations. These will bow before the antichrist, and as a consequence, suffer eternally in the Lake of Fire.

The law of non-contradiction stated a different way asserts that nothing can be both true and false in the same context. This means that truth cannot be false. Absolute truth is infallible. This property of Absolute truth requires that there exist a transcendent or supernatural reality. The natural world is infected with corruption, conflict and contradictions. Absolute truth cannot suffer decay and contradiction. Therefore the truth of the natural world is relative. In order to make that statement as a true statement there must exist truth that is both universal enough to apply to the entire natural realm and also implies that there exist truth that serves as a reference point for all natural truths.

Absolute truth is a reference point. This means that it does not need to be created or validated by reference to anything else. It is sufficient to stand on its own and is self-existent. All other truths depend on Absolute truth.

It is necessary to begin with something that is self-existent. If nothing is self-existent then everything that exists was caused and came into existence. If that is true go back far enough into the past and nothing exists and there nothing could ever come into existence. It is logically impossible for anything to be drawn from its contradictory—it is therefore impossible for something coming from nothing.

Self-existence and derived existence

Absolute Truth is self-existent. Absolute truth is necessarily and universally true. However there are many particular truths that apply just sometimes and over a limited context. For example, America was once a colony of Great Britain (UK) but that is no longer true. What is the relation between absolute truth and particular truths?

Particular truths derive their reality from Absolute Truth. Since no two contradictories can both be true they cannot be both the same thing. If they are not both the same then things or perceptions with the same attributes have a common source. Particular truths come from truth.

If every perception that is objectively true derives this objective truth from Absolute Truth, then the primitive categories of perception and reason are derived from truth. These primitive categories form the operating system of the human mind. From these primitive categories are formed the complex language and thought processes that we think.

This also means that the other categories of imagination, morality, and free will are also derived from Absolute Truth. This means that a rational human person with imagination and free will (These categories still exist even if the content is illusory) can exist only if the Ground of all Being (Absolute truth) is a Person with the same categories and He has anointed man with these categories.

There are three undeniable attributes that exist that are underivable in terms of any other attributes; rationality, consciousness, and intentionality. These are undeniable in that it is impossible not to avoid knowledge or experience of these, and underivable as they cannot be adequately explained as a product of other attributes.

Of these three, rationality can be expressed as a formal proof. rationality, or the laws of logic, must by their internal nature, be applicable to all of reality and not just a particular context; they cannot be limited to a particular context. The law of non-contradiction, for example, says it is impossible be true and false in the same context. This would, of necessity govern every context, otherwise there might

exist some context in which something could be true and false in the same context. Furthermore, if the law of non-contradiction is true, it cannot be false. To falsify the law of non-contradiction, one must deny the possibility that it can be true in any context. In other words, one must use the law of non-contradiction to deny the law of non-contradiction. The law of non-contradiction is universally and necessarily true.

The necessary and universal application of the law of non-contradiction means that it cannot be reduced as the product of something else. Since it is necessarily true, it is eternally true and self-existent. It follows immediately from the law of non-contradiction that absolute, objective truth exists. The denial of absolutes is either an absolute truth; one can deny the existence of truths valid in all contexts only by making their denial true in every context. If something is absolute in one context, then by definition it is true in every context. Absolute truth (true in all contexts) necessarily exists.

Consciousness is the second thing that is undeniable and underivable. Each us knows that consciousness exists through the personal experience of consciousness. Even if all of our perceptions are delusional, these delusions could only exist in a real consciousness.

In worldviews other than Philosophic materialism, this is taken for granted. Philosophical materialism, consciousness is seen as a product

of unconscious atoms and molecules acting in a random or predestined way. Philosophic materialists see consciousness as no more than electrical discharges in the brain.

Attempts to reduce consciousness to an unconscious or pre-conscious ground of being raises huge problems. If the fundamental reality or absolute truth is impersonal matter/energy, how can instances of consciousness containing delusions exist. If the fundamental reality or absolute truth is impersonal matter/energy, how can there exist any 'ought' categories or subjective experience as such simply does not exist in an impersonal object. Particularly, how can an unconscious absolute truth produce delusions or imaginations as an effect. Since absolute truth cannot be false, it cannot produce a falsehood as an effect. Delusions and imaginations cannot exist in any universe grounded upon an unconscious ground of being.

Intentionality is the third thing that is undeniable. From the personal experience, we make decisions are made with a sense of our own intentionality or purpose on a regular basis. While it can be hard to define precisely what intentionality is, it is not hard to know it when we see it.

If we live in a universe where there is ultimately no purpose, our capacity of intentionality (free will) would be a cosmic accident and therefore make absolutely no sense; it would, in fact, be a colossal absurdity. If

the universe suffers from the opposite extreme, where every event is pre-determined from the eternal past, then our perception of free will and the ability to act with our own intention is also colossal absurdity that cannot be accounted for by an unconscious ground of being.

Our conscious experience involves the perception of free will. We can conceive of alternate possibilities and also perceive of the freedom to select from multiple possibilities. This is undeniably a part of the human experience, and there is no way to reduce this to or derive this from an effect of another; if the perception were a product of another, different type of cause that is absolute truth, then the choice is pre-determined.

The undeniability and underivability of free will is especially apparent in cases where the perception of intention involves perception of conflicts and contradictions. Absolute truth cannot produce contradictions.

If absolute truth cannot produce delusions and contradictions, then how do we account for our perception that these types of events occur. Delusions and imagination can only exist inside a consciousness, and distinct intentionality can only exist inside a consciousness. An impersonal absolute simply cannot produce these things.

A personal absolute can produce imaginations, but never without the knowledge that they are imaginations or the decision to define them as imaginations. A personal absolute, that is one that has rationality,

consciousness and the capacity for intentionality, can define the existence of a created person ex nihilo who is able to use their capacity for intentionality to act in a way contrary to the absolute; This act of rebellion is the root of the existence of contradictions and delusions. (More on this in [chapter 17](#)).

These three things, rationality, consciousness, and intentionality, are not reducible to or derivable from other things. Only rationality can produce rationality, consciousness produce consciousness, and intentionality produce intentionality. These three attributes together define personhood.

The law of con-contradiction says that nothing can be true and false in the same context. This does not prevent a thing or proposition from being true in one context and false in another. Thirty-five years ago, for example, I was the shortest one among my siblings. During my teenage years, I grew from being the shortest to the tallest of my siblings. The truth value of a given state can change over time. There are many other contexts where a given statement may be true or false. What the law of non-contradiction does restrict are in two areas: The law of non-contradiction itself is true in all contexts, and it **eliminates the possibility of anything being true and false in the same context**. In the example above, it is impossible for me to be both taller and shorter than a someone else at the same time.

If nothing can be true and false in the same context, then it is impossible for anything to be itself and also its contradictory, as that would involve something being true and false in the same context. If something cannot be its contradictory, then it is impossible to draw out or derive from anything its contradictory.

The impossibility of drawing out of something its contradictory does not prevent a cause from bringing forth results that are merely different. For example, one might conclude on the surface that the law of non-contradiction prohibits prohibition of photons coming from “non-photons.” Photons, however, is a derivative of electromagnetic energy. Energy stored as potential energy in hydrogen atoms is released during nuclear fusion. Thus, what some might see as a violation of the law of non-contradiction but is really not. Instead on “non-photons” -> “photons,” it is energy (potential) -> energy (kinetic-photons). photonic and non-photonic energy are not contradictory to each other, but merely different derivatives of the same substance.

As I demonstrated at the beginning of this chapter, the three attributes of personhood, rationality, consciousness, and intentionality, cannot derived from anything different from them. Rationality can only be derived from rationality, consciousness can only be derived from consciousness, and intentionality can only be derived from intentionality. This means that non-rationality is actually contradictory to rationality, non-consciousness is actually contradictory to consciousness, and non-intentionality is actually contradictory to intentionality. These attributes

of personality can only exist in a reality where the fundamental reality or absolute has these attributes. If the ground of all being, as absolute truth, does not have the attributes of personality, then it is impossible for any finite or created object to ever have these properties. To put it another way: If an Infinite–Personal God does not exist, then none of us can exist as finite, created persons; we would have no consciousness, rationality, or capacity for intentionality (will).

8 The necessity of a transcendent Ground of causality.

In section 1, I demonstrated that Naturalism is not a coherent account of reality using multiple lines of argument. In chapter 1, I demonstrated that a particular interpretation of Naturalism, Hyper–uniformitarianism cannot be sustained in light of extant scientific evidence from the Big Bang Model, the Second Law of Thermodynamics, and Pasteur’s Law. In this chapter and the next chapter, I am going to demonstrate that hyper–uniformitarianism or unlimited uniformity of causes is logically and mathematically impossible. In philosophy, this is called the fallacy of the infinite regress.

The necessity of a transcendent ground of causality can be demonstrated as a generic cosmological argument. The first version of the cosmological argument was formulated by Aristotle.

1. Something cannot come from nothing (NULL), as that would imply that something shares the same essence as nothing or is derived from nothing; this would imply that something is equal to nothing, which is a contradiction.
2. All temporal effects came into existence, that is, far enough into the past and they did not exist.
3. All temporal effects must have a cause (to avoid something coming from nothing). If the cause is temporal, then it must have a cause, and so on.

All contingent effects depend on an ontologically prior cause for its existence. Without a cause, contingent effect lack sufficient ground for existence. It cannot exist by itself, and must derive its existence from something else. Because it is self-contradictory for something to come from nothing, a contingent or dependent effect must derive its existence from a something that is not nothing.

4. An infinite regression of temporal or contingent causes is logically impossible, because in the eternal past nothing would exist, and the present temporal effect would be the result of something coming from nothing – which is logically impossible. In the case of contingent causes, and infinite regression mean that one would never find a sufficient ground of existence.

5.5. Therefore, it is necessary that there exist a First Cause who is not temporal and not contingent. This first Cause is an Uncaused Cause and an Unmoved Mover.

This First Cause is not merely first in line, but of a qualitatively different nature than the effects produced. The temporal causes operated under one law of causation, but the First Cause is not subject to those rules. Natural laws that govern casualty in the natural universe have a limit. These laws require a First Cause to act as an Unmoved Mover to bring forth the space-time universe with natural laws as its attributes. This is consistent with the Genesis Hypothesis. The natural universe can only exist in its present form through a supernatural act. But which Supernatural Actor is responsible for the universe?

If unlimited uniformity of natural law and natural causes and effects cannot be sustained – in other words, if the laws of nature are not eternal, but valid only over a limited time span and in an open system subject to modification – then inferences about the distant past based the assumption of unlimited uniformity are not justified.

What the cosmological argument rules out

The cosmological argument rules out the possibility of oscillating theories of the universe. These theories posit that the universe undergoes an infinite series of cycles of big bangs followed by big

crunches where the universe contracts back into a singularity. Each big bang occurs at a finite point into the past.

The cosmological argument also rules single instances of past-eternal universe based on the current uniformity of causes and effects. These cannot go back to infinity because each of these depends on an ontologically or temporally previous cause. None of these are infinite because there is another step beyond it either in terms of time or ontology (being). If an infinite series is not possible, then there must exist a first cause that is self-sufficient and self-existent. The condition of being an ultimate, self-existent cause of a chain of contingent effects makes this first cause an ontologically transcendent cause.

Some have responded to the cosmological argument by asserting that causality, the uniformity of causes and effects, is something that only exists within the universe and applying only to particular object within the universe. According to this theory, causality does not apply to the universe as a whole. This does not evade the necessity of a transcendent cause. That theory actually posits that the universe, as a whole, is fundamentally different than the objects within. It would necessarily be fundamentally different if causality does not apply to the universe as a whole; causality is the vehicle for defining both the existence and attributes of object within the universe. Because material reality is itself subject to causality, the universe as a whole would have to be immaterial if it is not subject to causality. The universe, as a whole, would be the non-material, transcendent cause in this interpretation.

This chapter has covered the logical necessity of a transcendent cause. The next chapter will demonstrate the mathematical impossibility of an infinite regress and the mathematical necessity of a transcendent reference frame for creation.

9 The mathematical necessity of supernatural reality

The very structure of mathematics requires that a transcendent reality exist. This can be seen when one studies the concept of infinity. Operations that work perfectly in finite arithmetic sometimes yield bizarre and even paradoxical results when extended to infinity. One response is to deny actual infinities exist. The more coherent answer is that infinities are qualitatively different, and that the qualitative difference is evidence that must exist both immanent and transcendent reality.

Paradoxes of infinity

There are several types of arithmetic operations that get wacky when they involve infinity. They include Zeno's paradoxes, Hilbert's Hotel, Grandi's Series, and the sum of certain infinite series.

Zeno's paradoxes originated in ancient times. An ancient Greek philosopher named Zeno proposed numerous paradoxes^{9:1}. One paradox asserts that motion is an illusion. Every distance covered by a moving object can be divided into smaller steps of shorter distance that can be divided into increasingly smaller and smaller steps of shorter distance until the division results in a step of 0 distance. If a distance is composed of the addition of steps that are 0 in length, the sum of these steps would be $0+0+0\dots+0 = 0$?!? What went wrong here? Zeno argued that motion was an illusion. Motion is, in fact occurring because distance and speed are defined. Zeno treated this as a problem of discrete mathematics when it is really a problem of continuity.

Hilbert's Hotel^{9:2} is a hypothetical hotel that has an infinite number of rooms that are full. More guests arrive, but where will they go. The host moves the guests in room#1 to room#2, room#2 to room#3, etc. Because there is no limit to the number of rooms, there is always an extra room to put the last guest. If an infinite number of new guests arrive, then everyone is put into a room whose number is twice that of their original number, freeing up every odd numbered room - of which there are an infinite number.

Grandi's Series^{9:3} is an infinite series that starts with 1 and alternately subtracts and adds 1: $1-1+1-1+1-1\dots$. For any finite number of terms, the answer will be 1 if it is an odd number of terms or 0 if it is an even number of terms.

When the series is taken to infinity, however, something strange begins to happen. There are actually three answers: 1, 0, and $\frac{1}{2}$, depending on how it is calculated.

$1-1+1-1+1-1\dots$ can be represented as $(1-1)+(1-1)+(1-1)\dots = 0 + 0 + 0\dots = 0$.

$1-1+1-1+1-1\dots$ can be represented as $1 + (-1+1) + (-1+1) + (-1 + 1) \dots = 1 + 0 + 0\dots = 1$

Most professional mathematicians regard $\frac{1}{2}$ as the best answer. This can be shown algebraically

$$1.S = 1-1+1-1+1-1\dots$$

$$2.1-S = 1-(1-1+1-1+1-1\dots)$$

$$3.1-S = 1-1+1-1+1-1+1\dots = S \text{ multiplied every term in brackets by } -1$$

$$4.1-S = S$$

$$5.1 = 2S$$

$$6.S = \frac{1}{2}$$

It should be apparent that the sum of this series for any finite number, no matter how big, is 1 for every odd number and 0 for every even number. It is only when the series goes to infinity that the bizarre result obtains.

Summing an infinite series is perhaps the most bizarre paradox of infinity. When I first saw this I rejected the answer and there is a part of me that is still inclined to reject this, but this answer is well accepted as mathematically accurate.

What is the sum of the series $1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 \dots$. The intuitive answer is infinity, but mathematicians have proved that the answer is “actually” – $\frac{1}{12}$ ^{9:4}.

What is the significance of these paradoxes?

Intellectuals have struggled with these paradoxes for 2,500 years. Various responses have emerged to these. Some have argued that infinity should be banned and that infinity cannot actually exist. This idea has found circulation on the Kalam version of the cosmological argument. The Kalam argument originated in and was quite popular in the medieval Islamic world. Both the Kalam and the idea that there are no actual infinities has become vogue in recent years in no small part to its promotion by Christian philosopher William Lane Craig^{9:5}.

The argument that there are no actual infinities is rooted in the idea that these paradoxes show that belief in actual infinities leads to absurdities. I do not believe that these paradoxes rule out all infinities. The common thread to these paradoxes is that they emerge only when one attempts

to count or iterate through lists of finite numbers to reach infinity. It is truly impossible to reach infinity through counting or summing finite numbers. No matter how many numbers are plugged in, there is a yet bigger number that exists. The paradoxical result of adding the sum of all natural numbers is rather a formal proof that one cannot count to infinity because infinity in these cases cannot even exist as a formal construct. Paradoxes based on attempting to count to infinity cannot prove that it exists formally but not actually. Other formally defined infinite series that are not based on counting have no problem approaching infinity. Geometric series where the common ratio is greater than 1 have no finite limit. Geometric series are based on multiplication rather than counting. The issue with paradoxes involving infinity is not whether it exists, but concerning which methods can actually reach infinity^{9:6}.

Concerning the quantitative aspect of infinity, it transcends all numbers; The quantitative property is defined as a quantity greater than all finite quantities. The problem is not with the existence of infinity but with the incoherence of attempting to define it using finite numbers as a reference-frame.

Why infinity must exist.

Denial of all actual infinity leads to several problems. Consider the following definition of infinity that is applicable to all uses of it.

Infinity is a property x , such that $x > n$, where n is quantifiable as any member of the set of all finite numbers. The denial of this is the affirmation that there are no properties or attributes that are greater than all finite numbers – absolutely everything is quantifiable as a finite number. If every attribute must be quantifiable as a finite number or numbers, then finite numbers define everything. Back to Zeno's paradox, every finite quantity can be reduced by more and more pieces of every vanishing quantities. Eventually finite numbers are reduced to an infinite number of divisions that are 0: $0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 \dots = 0$. Denial of actual infinity leads us straight back to Zeno's paradox.

An infinite reference-frame is necessary to define the finite. For example, the set of all finite numbers is itself infinite, as there is no limit to the number of finite numbers that can exist. All finite sets have a cardinality (the number of elements in a set) that is a member of the infinite set of all finite numbers. All infinite sets have a cardinality that is infinite^{9:7}. Without infinity, there is no way to define sets or have a coherent set theory.

Set theory is critical in establishing the existence of universals. Universals are special kinds of sets. These types of sets define attributes. The universal set 'green' defines 'green' as an attribute. All objects that have 'green' as an attribute are members of this special set.

In addition to the necessity of infinity to define sets generally, there is a unique constraint of universals that requires infinity. Universals are potentially infinite. This is because it is unknown how many members that exist as instances of a class attribute. Sets that define universals do not define a finite cardinality for the universal. Because of this, there is no limit to the number of members possible in this set. Universals are not limited to the accumulation of particular members, but exist as an inherent property of the set. The definition of the universal holds without respect to the number of members it contains. The universal transcends the accumulated particularity of its members; it cannot be described by counting the members of the set. It is greater than all of its members. The absence of limits plus transcendence of the particular members that are in the set are properties of infinity.

Without infinity, there are no universals. According to Francis Schaeffer, universals are needed to give meaning to particulars^{9:8}. Without universals, there is no way to define attributes that can make meaningful sense of particulars. Without universals, all propositions in logic and language are meaningless. This is true because all propositions distribute meaning in either the subject or the predicate. Distribute means that the meaning applies to the term as an entire set rather than just some particulars. For example, in the phrase "Socrates is a man," the term "man" is distributed – referring to the entire set "man." If there are no universals, the set "man" does not exist. Without the existence of the set "man," the phrase "Socrates is a man" becomes meaningless. It might

as well read “Socrates is ...???” without universals, it would be impossible to know what kind of being Socrates is, whether any statement about him is a statement of being or a description of an action, or even whether a definite or indefinite article follows.

Without infinity, there are no universals. Without universals, logic and language descend into meaninglessness. This view is actually affirmed in philosophy under the school of Nominalism. Nominalism denies that there are any universals. On the basis of this denial, Nominalists deny that logical truth and mathematical truth tell us anything about the real world. This is the background behind William Lane Craig’s argument that there are no actual infinities. In Craig’s view, infinity exist only as a formal mathematical construct or as a theological construct that has no relation to mathematics. This view leads to total meaninglessness; if logic and mathematics tell us nothing about the real world, then inferences from logic and mathematics are meaningless and have no explanatory power concerning the real world. Nominalism produces meaninglessness so pervasive that it is self-refuting. If Nominalism is true, then it is meaningless.

The defining characteristic of infinity is transcendence. Transcendence is the idea of no limits, of going beyond established or perceived limits. The necessity of infinity that is both conceptual and actual implies the necessity of transcendent reality. The temporal, finite, immanent reality that exists around us depends on eternal, necessary, transcendent reality for its existence. The next chapter will show the necessity of an

Infinite–Personal God as the transcendent reality and only viable explanation that accounts for the world that exists.

Chapter 9 References

1. *Zeno's Paradoxes*, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Section 3 – The Paradoxes of Motion,

<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2010/entries/paradox-zeno/#ParMot><back to text>

2. *Hilbert's Hotel*, Robert Crowston, Enriching Mathematics,

<http://nrich.maths.org/5788><back to text>

3. One minus one plus one minus one – Numberphile

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PCu_BNNI5x4<back to text>

4. Tony Padilla discusses this proof in an article and two videos:

1. Dr Padilla, a physicist at the University of Nottingham, discusses the proof that the sum of all natural numbers is $-\frac{1}{12}$ in an article titled “What do we get if we sum all natural numbers?”

<http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/~ppzap4/response.html>

12.A simplified algebraic version of the proof can be found at this Numberphile video called “ASTOUNDING– $1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + \dots = -\frac{1}{12}$.”

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w-l6XTVZXww>

1.The formal proof of this using calculus on the Reimann Zeta function can be found at this Numberphile video called “The Sum of Natural Numbers (second proof and extra footage).”

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E-d9mgo8FGk>

[<back to text>](#)

5. In Defense of the Kalam Cosmological Argument, William Lane Craig, <http://reasonablefaith.org/kalam> [<back to text>](#)

6. I believe Dr Craig’s denial of actual infinity is too broad. In the article below a much more precise denial is made: the denial of the possible of a specific type of infinity: a countable infinity. I believe that even this may be a tad too broad; the issue is not whether a certain type of infinity can exist, but of the incoherence of attempting to define infinity by an iteration or series of finite numbers. It is not possible to count to infinity. This impossibility strengthens the claim of the cosmological argument that was explained in [chapter 8](#).

Cosmology and Theology, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy

<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2013/entries/cosmology-theology/#6> [<back to text>](#)

7. Georg Cantor coined the word transfinite to refer to this type of infinity. He did not want to apply the full definition of infinity to the cardinality of different because of some of the counterintuitive implications in set theory. For example, the number of rational numbers that exists is infinite. The number of real numbers is also infinite – and larger than the number of rational numbers because they include irrational numbers like π . The discovery that some infinities are larger than other led Cantor to refer to these as trans-finite because they are larger than any finite number and are without limit. Modern mathematicians, however, use both terms interchangeably. **

[<back to text>](#)

8. “He Is There and He is Not Silent”, page 33–36, Francis Schaeffer? check [<back to text>](#)

10 God spoke creation into existence

In the last chapter, I illustrated the necessity of an infinite reference-frame to define the finite reality of particular and contingent objects. In this chapter, I will show through logical argument that it is God who is that Infinite-Personal reference frame who created all the things that were created.

The Creation of Finite Substance Ex Nihilo

While Absolute Truth is infallibly real and eternal, the created universe is temporal. The traditional notion of cause and effect is not sufficient to explain how an eternal reality through infinite motion through an infinite period of time can produce finite. It is impossible to create from eternity: an object cannot be eternal and temporal.

Time is defined by actions, whether the action is the earth rotation, revolution around the sun; or the number of vibrations per second of a Rubidium atom, Time is measured by action: Eternal by infinite action, Temporal by finite action. If the action from God is from the eternal past through familiar processes of causality, then it would either never make it to the present (finite) or blow by the present moment (infinite action).

The actions of God cannot be defined in terms of time unless He chooses to define them in terms of time. God is infinite and infinity cannot be numbered—it is beyond measurement. One way to show how God created is by means of a line. It is impossible to define a line by means of connected segments. No matter how many segments one connects the line always exceeds the total length of the connected segments. Rather, one begins with the line and picks a point, then picks another point: the distance between those points is a segment. God picks a point on what we call a timeline and calls it the Beginning, then picks another point and calls it the End (Rev 1:17;21:6). The distance between the Beginning and the End is called space–time history.

When God created temporal things He defined them as beginning, moving, and ending in space–time history. Every finite attribute can be measured mathematically. Every finite quantity can be numbered or measured, and each number can exist in terms of another number: 10 is ten 1's, 1 is ten $1/10$, $1/10$ is ten $1/100$ and on and on. Each successive number can be reduced or based on a smaller, more basic number, resulting in smaller and smaller numbers. As a finite quantity continues to get smaller it will reach zero.

If zero is the ultimate basis of finite existence then nothing finite can exist. It is absurd to conclude that anything can be drawn from 0+nothing. If zero cannot be a ground of being, then the ground of being cannot be finite either.

Therefore the ground of all being must be infinite. But is this an impersonal infinite or a Person? The impersonal relates with only “what is.” What is the finite in relation to the infinite? This can be mathematically calculated. The simplified version: Finite quantity/infinity. Whenever numbers are being divided, the more divisions the smaller the resulting quotient. For example $1/4$ is smaller than $1/2$ because 4 divisions creates smaller pieces than 2. What piece of infinity is any finite thing? Because infinity is beyond the biggest number that can exist, there is no limit to the number of divisions that exist. Since there is no limit to the number of divisions and each division

results in a smaller number the final result is 0. What piece of infinity is anything finite? It is 0. If the created finite is zero in relation to the infinite and can only exist in relation to the infinite; that which is finite cannot exist in an impersonal universe. It also cannot exist in any universe where finite reality emanates from uncreated reality.

What about a Personal Infinite. If the ground of all being– the Absolute Truth– is a Person, then it is possible that with His Mind He can ‘speak’ finite and temporal things into existence. Both being and action can be spoken into existence. This is what the Bible says (John 1:1–14; Genesis 1) finite things have a distinct existence because God defined it so. The Word of God defines finite objects with their classes, attributes, and properties.

A similar argument can be made concerning the nature of the existence of action. This speaking into existence finite reality that would otherwise be zero or null in relation to the infinite necessarily involves creation ex nihilo – **existence out of nothing that is sustained only by the fiat of One who is absolute truth.**

Genesis 1 describes God’s work of speaking the creation. First, He defines the beginning –the existence of space and time (v1). Then He defines the existence of matter and energy (v2). Then God made statements that organize space, time, matter and energy into a complex and living creation.

We must, of course, recognize that these few statements recorded are not the only statements given to organize the complex universe. These statements represent broad principles within all particular principles operate. These principles are too numerous for mortal man to count completely but are partially enumerated in what we call “the laws of science.”

There exists a uniformity of causes and effects in an open system over a limited time span. This means that the laws of science generally apply evenly to all situations they describe, subject however, to outside intervention(hence open).

God created this universe with His Word. The Existence of His Word implies the existence of His Mind. God’s Mind organized the universe and spoke it into being (Gen 1; Proverbs 3:18–20;8:22–31,29,30;John1:1) The Word frames the categories of the universe and of the mind. While the finite substance is created ex nihilo, that substance is organized by eternally existing categories that are derived from the Mind of God.

The Creation of Impersonal Objects by the Word of God

When God created finite objects, He spoke them into existence. He used language to define things. Impersonal objects are merely defined by language that assigns methods and attributes, having no capabilities to

use language. Persons, however, are created with the ability to use language. People have the ability to use language to process information about intellectual, moral, and emotional categories because they are created in God's image.

God Creator of both Logic and Substance

God is the source of both the logic and substance of the universe. The logic is inherent in the nature of God. Every category of logic that exists, or has ever existed, is derived from God. This means that the categories of personality and morality that exist in humans must have preexisted eternally in God as a category of Absolute Truth. These categories provide the framework for the universe's form and structure.

God used logic to govern the structure of the ex nihilo creation

When God created the universe generally, and man in particular, He used information that already existed that was derived from information eternally existing. Hebrews 1:3 instructs us that Christ is the one "***Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.***" Colossians 1:16-17 echoes this same thought, instructing us that "***For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or***

principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.”

The finite and material substance of the universe, however, was created ex nihilo. Augustine used this Latin term, which means “out of nothing”, to describe the creation of matter. It is this substance which gives objects that “other” attribute. It is this substance that distinguishes the finite universe from the eternal reality of God. Objects created ex nihilo have distinct existence because God, as a Person who is absolute truth, says so.

In God’s acts of creation, He brings the eternally existent logical categories from His own substance and uses these to organize the finite objects or substances that He speaks into existence ex nihilo or out of nothing. The rest of the chapter further explains this process.

God, therefore, is the Source of all categories of Being.

Truth is absolute; Truth cannot fail. Yet our common experience reveals that most aspects of life are subject to falsification or corruption. In other words there are many things which can be true one moment and false the next. If something can be true one moment and false the next, then that something is not itself the truth but a “dependent thing” that depends on the presence of Truth to be real.

If a dependent thing is dependent on the Truth for its reality then its reality is either an overlap or duplication of a substance that exists in Truth. Every “positive essence” that exists must also exist as a substance or category of Absolute Truth.

God is the source of person-hood and morality

If a dependent category is drawn from the Truth it cannot be of a positive contrary to the Truth. To attempt to draw a contradictory category from the Truth would imply that there existed or exists an impossible union between the Truth and the contrary essence. Therefore every positive category that exists in the created exists in the Truth. This does not include sin. Sin deprives objects of their reality. This also does include so-called negative essences. Negative essences are not essences at all but a description of the absence of an essence. Non-personality is not an essence but a description of an attribute of an object that does not possess personality.

Two important examples of this are the categories of personality and morality. IF true personality exists in man, it must exist in the Truth. Now there are those who say that personality is an illusion, but either the illusion is real, requiring a real person to be deceived, or the illusion is false which means that personality exists. If personality exists then it must exist in Truth. Absolute Truth is a Person. I know Him as the Triune God: The Father, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit.

The necessity of the Trinity

Creation cannot be explained without reference to the Trinity. Trinity means tri-unity. God is three distinct person who are of the same substance. This means that all three persons have identical essential properties, while possessing different relational properties^{10:1}.

The trinity is self-evident structure of any Infinite-personal God. If God is a person who is not a particular being but infinite and transcendent universal, then there are three distinct and undeniable classes of properties that exists distinctly but necessarily conjoined.

1. God is pure Being and the source of all being. This can be represented as God the Father.
2. God also has an infinite Mind. This can be represented as the Logos or God the Son.
3. God also has consciousness and embedded intentionality. This can be represented as God the Holy Spirit.

Each of these three is involved in a transcendent pursuit of relationship with the other two. Each of these three has a distinct perspective defined by their unique property, making them distinct persons. Because they are necessarily joined and have the same substance, each has full Person-hood. There exists three divine persons loving each throughout all eternity and being one.

The existence of God as a Trinity means that there exist relational properties. If relational properties can exists then can exist object that have only relations to God but not the substance of God. This means that contingent reality can exist when God uses his categories of

freedom to freely create objects that have only relational properties and information from the conceptual categories that are in the mind of God, but not the substance of God. If there is no Trinity, then there are no relational properties and, hence, no relationships and no objects whose existence is defined relative to these relationships^{10:2}. If no relationships are possible, there is no way to define the relativity that must necessarily be the case on contingent objects.

Alternatives to creation ex nihilo not sufficient explanations

There are three basic accounts of the origins of the universe and humanity. These are emanationism, evolution, and creation ex nihilo. Of these, only creation ex nihilo is an adequate account.

Emanationism an inadequate account of creation

A common view of creation in many pagan and Eastern cultures is what is called emanationism. Out of the divine substance proceeds emanations of that substance. From these emanations emerge the universe in its present form. In Neo-Platonism, for example, the perfect abstract forms of various objects brought emanations that resulted in the concrete instances of these in the universe. The ideal chair emanated into actual chairs.

Since absolute truth necessarily exists, and absolute truth cannot be false; the process of emanation cannot result in truth decay. The resulting emanations are themselves absolute truth and therefore eternal truth. Accounts of emanations in various Pagan and Eastern religions are inconsistent in that they describe emanations that are inferior to the substances they emanated; these emanations have suffered truth decay.

If emanations cannot suffer truth decay, then emanationist philosophies cannot explain the delusions, contradictions and decadence that mark our world. Emanation cannot explain the passage of time as it would logically result in a universe where everything is eternal and self-existent. While emanation can explain some things, like the relationship of the Son and the Holy Spirit to the Heavenly Father, it is not an adequate explanation for creation.

Evolutionary frameworks not an adequate account of creation

A popular view of origins in modern times is the theory of evolution. The use of evolutionary theory as a meta-narrative implies that the material universe is gaining increased information and complexity by means of random, undirected processes. This theory runs up against the same difficulties as philosophic materialism; Materialism has been falsified by science.

The creation, and man in particular, are more than the collection of atoms and molecules. Man has rationality, consciousness, and intentionality that are underivable from material processes. Evolutionary theory can only some physical processes, it cannot provide an adequate explanation for creation. At the heart of evolution is the assumption of uniformitarianism. While uniformitarianism can explain the present consequences of natural law, it cannot explain origins. Origins requires an ontologically transcendent cause.

String Theory as a scientific parallel to Creation by God's Word^{10:3}.

In recent decades there has emerged a novel theory for interpreting subatomic reality. The hypothesis states that the subatomic level is composed of filaments of energy that vibrate in a geometry of 10 dimensions and one dimension of time. The structure of the geometries determines the nature of the vibrations. In string theory, the nature of these vibrations determines the structure of particles, the structure of space, the cosmological constants, and natural laws that prevail in a universe.

If string theory is true, then reality functions like a language. The mathematical properties of the eleven dimension geometry function like a grammar, the 11 dimension geometry functions like an alpha-numeric symbolic system, and the vibrating filaments of energy function to

express semantic meaning through the eleven dimension geometry.
Language is the structure of reality

This theory is remarkably similar to the Scriptural narrative of Creation. God spoke the universe into existence using language. If string theory is a reasonably close explanation of the language of Mind of God, then God's Mind has a set of basic symbols that numbers at least 10^{500} symbols*. Humans have roughly 200–40,000*symbols that we can encode into natural, mathematical, and logical languages. The expressive power of this language is more than sufficient to explain the structure of the reality in which we live.

Scripture References

Hebrews 1:3; Colossians 1:16–17; Revelation 1:17;21:6

Genesis 1; Proverbs 3:18–20; 8:22–31,29,30; John1:1

Chapter 10 References

1. This is not to be confused with modalism. Modalism is where is single object can have different relationships depending on the context. I can a brother in one context, a father in another context, and a husband in a third context. In modalism, the relationship is context-dependent . Relationships in the Trinity are not context-dependent. The Heavenly Father is God the Father in every context,

Jesus Christ is God the Son and God the Logos in every context, and the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God in every context. [<back to text>](#)

2. Francis Schaeffer made a similar argument for the necessity of the Trinity, but he used the word “diversity” rather than “relational categories.” If there is no Trinity, then God would lack the categories to support diversity in the creation. In his book *He is There and He is Not Silent* (1972), page 13, para 1–2, he writes the following

‘The word “god” as such is no answer to the philosophic problem of existence, but the Judeo-Christian content to the word “god” as given in the Old and New Testaments does meet the need of what exists—the existence of the universe in its complexity and of man as man. And what is that content? It relates to the infinite=Personal God, who is personal unity in diversity on the high order of the trinity.

‘Every once in a while in my discussions someone asks how I can believe in the Trinity. My answer is always the same. I would still be an agnostic if there were no Trinity, because there would be no answers. Without the high order of personal unity and diversity as given in the Trinity, there are no answers.’ [<back to text>](#)

3. The String Theory Landscape, Raphael Bousso and Joseph Polchinski, Scientific American Magazine, 2004, hosted on Johns Hopkins University Website

http://www.pha.jhu.edu/courses/172_113/BousoPolchinski.pdf <back
[to text](#)>

11 The Intelligent Design of Life Revealed

The existence and diversity of body plans reveals advanced procedural and object oriented programming in DNA.

In the classification system biologists use to describe the evolutionary tree of life, the existence of body plans is the demarcation for the classification of phyla. Discoveries about how DNA regulates the production of body plan reveal the existence of an advanced procedural programming structure to DNA.

Out of the thousands of genes in a given genome, there are about 200 homeobox genes. These genes produce strings of proteins that regulate gene expression. Consider the following description of the function of homeobox genes from the National Institutes of health

Homeobox genes are a large family of similar genes that direct the formation of many body structures during early embryonic development. In humans, the homeobox gene family contains an estimated 235 functional genes and 65 pseudogenes (structurally similar genes that do not provide instructions for making proteins). Homeobox genes are present on every human chromosome, and they often appear in clusters.

Many classes and subfamilies of homeobox genes have been described, although these groupings are used inconsistently.

Homeobox genes contain a particular DNA sequence that provides instructions for making a string of 60 protein building blocks (amino acids) known as the homeodomain. Most homeodomain-containing proteins act as transcription factors, which means they bind to and control the activity of other genes. The homeodomain is the part of the protein that attaches (binds) to specific regulatory regions of the target genes.[11:1](#)

Homeobox genes produce homeodomain protein which control the expression of other genes. another way of putting this is that they control which genes are turned on and which ones are turned off in different cells. Homeobox genes control differentiation in an embryo, resulting in stem cells differentiating into mature tissues, organs, and systems[11:2](#). Specifically, a subfamily of homeobox genes, hox genes, set positional markers that regulating the development of body plans or body layouts of organisms[11:3](#).

The homeobox genes and the homeodomains are analogous to control structures used in procedural programming. Control structure like If..then, while loops, and do loops turn on or off certain segments of code are used to decide which segments will be executed given certain conditions. The Hox genes, in particular, are analogous to constructs used in object oriented programming that use classes and methods.

Classes are used to define and instantiate different organs and system, and methods are defined to instantiate different physiological functions.

On an intuitive level, these are markers of intelligence. The remainder of the chapter will make the case for why intelligence is, in fact, a necessary explanation.

The Significance of the Existence of Semantic Information

Semantic information is the smoking gun for Intelligent Design. Semantic information is information that has logical and linguistic properties that are **not causally connected to physical processes**. Semantic information would include things like alphabetical, logical and mathematical symbols, and grammar.

Semantic information is used in both human language and computer programming. In human language, it includes how we use alphabets and words. In programming, it involves how both data and programming instruction are encoded. To help better explain the nature of semantic information, I shall include a couple of examples from human language and computer programming.

Semantics in language involves constructs that cannot be reduced to physical causes. These involves potential many to many correspondences that can only be logically mapped by arbitrary conventions. There are many words, for example, that represent what is meant by the color green. Green in English is expressed as 'verde' in Spanish, 'зеленый' in Russian, 'grün' in German, and 'ירוק' in Hebrew. Additionally, the same word can mean different things in different languages. These are sometimes called false friends. Linguists believes that this sometimes happens because of common etymology (word origins) and other times it is a separate evolution of different words. For example, the word 'bra' means good in Swedish; The same word is an abbreviation of the French word 'brassiere' in English and refers to an undergarment designed to cover a woman's breast. There is no physical reason for a given word to signify a given object.

If a word can have many different objects and an object can have many words, then there is a many to many correspondence of words to objects. From a physical perspective, there is no possibility of a causal relationship between any physical phenomena and linguistic symbols. Language involves a logical mapping of symbols and language constructs to reality. This logical mapping requires a mind to perform the operation; it cannot be explained totally in terms of physical or chemical causation.

In computer programming, semantic meaning is attached to any of a number of logical layers of abstraction that go on. The windows or

graphic interfaces that exist in a Windows, Mac, Linux, Android, and iOS are not really inside the computer. They are graphics generated for the purpose of making them user-friendly. The computer does not think in terms of windows or graphic user interfaces.

When user clicks on a graphic interface, programming code is executed. This code is often written in a high level language like PHP (my favorite), C++, or Javascript. The computer cannot think in terms of these languages. These languages have been created to make programming more user friendly to human programmers; they are compiled or interpreted by a compiler or interpreter that logically maps these languages with the language that the computer understands. **There is no physical cause for any given mapping.** A computer engineer builds a compiler that is **designed** to map the source code of the high level language to the language of the processor; The engineer uses his knowledge of how the computer actually thinks and his knowledge of how a given high level language works to design a method of mapping these two in a logical way. This can be done in multiple ways, and is done in different way in different computer architecture. Compiling for Linux or Android does this mapping in a different way than compiling for Windows. Higher level instructions will be translated into smaller steps that are done step by step in the processor. These steps are then encoded as binary code instruction set.

When programmers type code, they will generally type using characters that are defined in an encoding standard. One such encoding system is

called American Standard Code for Information Interchange (ASCII). ASCII maps character to binary code. The Ascii code for the letter 'A' is 01000001 (65 in decimal). The 01000001 is binary code. There is no physical reason for 01000001 to be 'A.' It could have been anything.

Binary code is the place where characters and instructions can be mapped to physical hardware. The digits of binary code represent electrical states. On is represented as 1, and off is represented as 0. binary code is read sequentially in time with a processor clock cycles. Using these clock cycles, the processor can differentiate discretely between on and off signals. Compilers will present these signals in a format that will allows the processor to receive both instructions and data and know which signals are instructions and which are data. There are multiple way of doing this mapping. There is no physical causal relationship that locks in any one method. **The logical to physical mapping only works if there is a mind to map a meaningful relationship between the logical and the physical.**

The existence of arbitrary mappings between logical and physical structures is irrefutable proof of intelligent design. Evidence of such in DNA and biologic processes is, then, proof of intelligent design of life.

The Existence of Semantic Information in DNA

Biologists are beginning to realize that purely physical models are not sufficient to explain the structure and function of DNA. Semantic and

linguistic models are emerging as better explanations of the structure and function of DNA

Sungjul Ji, a researcher at the Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology at Rutgers University, wrote the following in an article that appeared in Volume 870 of the Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences

*There are theoretical reasons to believe that biologic systems cannot be fully accounted for in terms of the principles and laws of **physics and chemistry** alone, but they require in addition the principles of **semiotics** – the science of **symbols and signs**, including **linguistics**.^{1–3} for convenience, we may refer to the belief, common among contemporary biologists, that the laws of physics and chemistry are necessary and sufficient as the **PC (physics and chemistry) paradigm**, while the alternative view that the principles of semiotics are **additionally absolutely required for a complete understanding of living systems and processes as the PCS (physics, chemistry, and semiotics) paradigm**.^{11:4}*

Sungjul develops two ideas in his article. He identifies six markers of language in DNA*, and he develops a hypothesis that there are two functional types of genetic code: Syntactic and Semantic genetic code^{11:5}. According to Ji, the non-coding DNA – the so-called junk DNA – is actually DNA that carries semantic meaning that controls the expression of the coding genes hypothesis^{11:6}. Think of them as advanced control structures in a high level language.

According to Ji, interactions in the DNA show evidence of double articulation. In Linguistic analysis, double articulation (sometimes called duality) is where meaningless symbols like letters can be combined to form meaningful symbols. This duality is played out in the biochemistry of the DNA, this plays because molecules in DNA can use Out of a macro-molecule that has the same combination of atoms, the same co-valencies, and the same ionic affinities can form different products based on the geometry of the molecule. Another way of putting this is that from the same chemical differing proteins can be made because the molecule can geometrically fold into different shapes. The different shapes matter because which shapes protein fold into determines whether life continues and determine whether the organism is an ameoba, a dog, or a human.

Because of these multiple possibilities, this process cannot be determined solely in terms of physical causation. Ji proposes that the final products of genes are not statically fixed by physical laws but “dynamic processes collectively called intracellular dissipative structures whose generation is catalyzed by enzymes encoded in structural gene.” In what Ji calls the “DNA-polypeptide-IDS hypothesis,” Structural genes operate “under the control of spatio-temporal genes,” which are really semantic DNA^{[11:7](#)}.

Ji study relies heavily on the work of von Neumann and Patte, who developed a theory of Matter–symbol complementarity.

We easily agree with Einstein that a Beethoven symphony cannot be appreciated as only “agraph of air pressures,” although in principle it has such a physical description. In the same way we understand Bohr that, “You don’t explain a tea party by quantum mechanics.” On the other hand, it is not so easy to understand why you cannot adequately explain genetics with biochemistry or enzyme catalysis with quantum mechanics. Because we believe no events at tea parties, in genes, or in enzymes violate any physical laws we might assume that their descriptions differ only in their degrees of complexity. What biosemiotics illustrates is that symbolic controls are categorically different from laws and that they are irreducible to physical laws even though their material vehicles obey the laws and have a correct physical description.

What we need to understand is that physical laws are universal and must apply to all conceivable systems. Therefore laws are empirically moot with respect to any particular system until its particular initial conditions are specified. This requires information, and physical laws cannot specify this information. In physics jargon symbol systems are special types of initial condition called boundary conditions or constraints (Polanyi, 1968; Pattee, 1972). Consequently an adequate explanation of any living organism requires more than a detailed lawful physical description or merely the confirmation that the laws of nature are always inerrantly

followed. One must explain how informational constraint structures locally control the universal physical laws so as to propagate and evolve.[11:8](#)

Symbolic controls are not reducible to physical laws. Physical laws can only have universal effects and they cannot specify initial conditions. Information is required to specify initial condition. Information must be front-loaded into a biological system as the initial condition in a process that is not determine by physical law. While physical laws can set boundaries to linguistic systems, the linguistic are determined by non-physical causes.

The Max Planck Institute has created a slide presentation of describing semantic information in DNA sequences[11:9](#). This information includes using “non-sense codons” to create “formatting” so that the code can be properly read (slide 10)[11:10](#). According slide 17 “*DNA translation similar to Turing machine.*”[11:11](#). A Turing machine is any machine that can compute a task according to a set of instructions or algorithm[11:12](#).

The study of biosemiotics is an emerging field. The wikipedia article on it describes biosemiotics as “a paradigmatic shift in the scientific view of life.”[11:13](#).

Because bio-semiotics is not reducible to physical and chemical processes, it represents a logical layer embedded in the physical world

of life. Biosemiotics demonstrates that biological systems carry semantic meaning that can only be established by minds.

The Semantic Nature of Human Brain Activity

The human brain, in particular, operates on a semantic level. The brain operates as a distributed architecture, using parallel processing and information storage capabilities distributed amongst many neurons and synapses^{11:14}. The brain's parallel processor is the equivalent to 10^{14} processors or 100 trillion processors^{11:15}. The brain also “learns online,” reprogramming itself to adapt for new information input^{11:16}.

The distributed architecture of the brain means that there is a many to many correspondence between possible neural structures and outside perceptions. This means that there is no way to explain solely in terms of physics and chemistry the conscious activity of the brain. In information systems, many to many correspondences of data make little sense on their own. Such relations necessitate a logical layer to mediate the relationship in a way that is meaningful. In a school, for example, there are many students in a class and many classes to students. This many to many relationship only makes sense when “enrollment” is inserted as a logical construct. There are many classes to each enrollment, and each student has one enrollment. In the same way, a logical mind animates the brain, interacting with its physiological functions to enable learning.

The quantum mechanical mind as the animator of the brain

Recent studies have revealed that the macro-molecules like the DNA and the macromolecules in the neurons of the brain operate on a quantum mechanical level rather than classical mechanics^{11:17}. Classical mechanics refers to the physical laws that we encounter in our everyday lives. Quantum mechanics asserts that, at the smallest scales [Compton wavelength or Plancke length], the classical laws of physics break down. Particles of physical matter do not exist until an observer outside the system conducts a measurement on the system, and their exact state is not determined until that observer conducts the measurement. In the human brain, the results of these measurements produce the combination of neuron-firings that result in the thought and decisions that emerge. The quantum mechanical observer performs the functions attributed to consciousness. In the next chapter, I will show that it is the consciousness. The next chapter also explains other features of quantum mechanics that falsify Materialism.

Chapter 11 References

1. "Homeobox Gene Family", National Institutes of Health

<http://ghr.nlm.nih.gov/geneFamily/homeobox>

[<back to text>](#)

2. "Homeodomain", Biology Online

<http://www.biology-online.org/dictionary/Homeodomain>

[<back to text>](#)

3.Hox genes and the evolution of diverse body plans. Michael Akam,
CRC Institute and Department of Genetics

[http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/56229?
uid=3739680&uid=2&uid=4&uid=3739256&sid=21103623149663](http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/56229?uid=3739680&uid=2&uid=4&uid=3739256&sid=21103623149663)

[<back to text>](#)

4. Sunjul's paper, *The Linguistics of DNA*, can be accessed in two
places:

1.Wiley Online has archived the article at :

[http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/enhanced/doi/10.1111/j.1749-
6632.1999.tb08916.x/](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/enhanced/doi/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1999.tb08916.x/)

1.The article is also on Sunjul's web site, Conformon.net

[http://www.conformon.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Linguistics-
of-DNA.pdf](http://www.conformon.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Linguistics-of-DNA.pdf)

[<back to text>](#)

5. ibid [<back to text>](#)

6. ibid [<back to text>](#)

7. ibid [<back to text>](#)

8. *The Necessity of Biosemiotics: Matter–Symbol Complementarity*,
Published in Introduction to Biosemiotics, Marcello Barbieri, Ed.,
Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 2007, pp. 115–132.

<https://www.academia.edu/3144895/>

[The_Necessity_of_Biosemiotics_Matter–Symbol_Complementarity](#)

[<back to text>](#)

9. Semantic Information in Genetic Sequences, Hinrich Kielblock,
Network Dynamics Group, Max Plancke Institute for Dynamics and
Self–Organization, June 1, 2010

<http://www.nld.ds.mpg.de/~bioentropy/talks/causality.pdf>

[<back to text>](#)

10. *ibid*, slide 10 [<back to text>](#)

11. *ibid*, slide 17 [<back to text>](#)

12. Turing Machine, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, para 2

<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2013/entries/turing-machine/>

[<back to text>](#)

13. Biosemiotics – Wikipedia

<http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?>

[title=Biosemiotics&oldid=594184976](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Biosemiotics&oldid=594184976), accessed February 6, 2014

[<back to text>](#)

14. Computation and the Brain – Grush, Rick, para 3,

<http://mind.ucsd.edu/papers/reviews/compbrain/compbrain-text.html>

[<back to text>](#)

15. Computation in the Brain

<http://www.williamette.edu/~gorr/classes/cs449/brain.html>

[<back to text>](#)

16. *ibid*

[<back to text>](#)

17. Quantum entanglement between the electron clouds of nucleic acids in DNA,

Elisabeth Rieper¹, Janet Anders² and Vlatko Vedral^{1,3,4}

1 Center for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, Republic of Singapore

2 Department of Physics and Astronomy, University College London, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom

3 Atomic and Laser Physics, Clarendon Laboratory, University of Oxford, Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PU, United Kingdom and

4 Department of Physics, National University of Singapore, Republic of Singapore,

(Dated: February 24, 2011)

<http://arxiv.org/pdf/1006.4053v2.pdf>

[<back to text>](#)

12 Quantum Mechanics as God's Signature

The discovery of quantum mechanics shortly after the turn of the twentieth century has provided a radically different scientific perspective on the nature of reality than Classical Mechanics or Newtonian physics. Newtonian Physics lead many scientists to believe that the universe was a colossal machine that mechanical obeyed physical laws with absolute determinism. Many scientists who were unbelievers began to see the universe as a closed mechanical system that had no room for God or free will. Many scientists at the turn of the twentieth century were Materialists who believe that matter/energy was the ultimate reality.

Quantum mechanics has resulted in conclusions that challenged whether Materialism is true, and even whether realism is true. Quantum mechanics is dragging people in the scientific community back to God "by the hairs of their heads."

Features of Quantum Mechanics

Quantum Mechanics assert wave–particle duality for subatomic particles. This means that subatomic particles have some behavior of particle and other behaviors of waves. In quantum mechanics, subatomic particles can be described as a wave function^{12:1}. Wave functions defines ranges of potentialities called superpositions^{12:2}. Wave function define this using complex numbers. Complex numbers are combination of real numbers and imaginary number. Imaginary are based on imaginary unit i being defined as the square root of -1 or $i * i = -1$. The square root of -1 cannot exist in the “real” world as there is no combinations of any two number that can be multiplied to get a negative number. For years after mathematicians developed techniques for doing calculations on imaginary and complex numbers, it was criticized as being worthless for real world applications. The emergence and applications in which quantum mechanics plays a role have provided opportunities for real world applications of imaginary and complex numbers.

The significance of complex numbers is that, since they cannot describe what is naively thought of as the real world, that their existence as values of the wave function implies that these values are describing ontological states of being that are different than that of the real world. This author believes that these numbers represent possible realities rather than actual reality. These possible realities are called superpositions. To illustrate the nature of these superpositions, physicist Erwin Schrödinger proposed a thought experiment. A cat is placed in a box along with a piece of radioactive material, a Geiger counter, and a vial of poisonous gases. If the Geiger counter indicates radioactivity, the

needle will open the vial to releases poisonous gases that kill the cat. If not, then the cat lives. Is the cat alive or dead? According to Schrödinger, before the box is opened, the cat is in a superposition state containing two quantum states. In one state is that the cat is alive, and the other state, the cat is dead. According to Schrödinger, neither superposition appears as an actual state of being either alive or dead until the box is opened. The actual state of the cat is determined by observation or measurement of the cat^{12:3}.

Because of the probabilistic nature of the wave function, it is not possible to precisely predict both momentum and location. This uncertainty is formulated as the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle^{12:4}. This uncertainty is not a product of the limitations of the technology used in observation. This uncertainty is an inherent property of the quantum system, as the act of measurement on a quantum system affect the outcome of the measurement. This uncertainty is narrowly defined by the form of the wave function.

Values for the wave-function cannot be established with certainty until a measurement collapses a wave-function. The double-slit experiment provides experimental confirmation that physical reality is observation-dependent. a single stream of electrons was ran through a double slit onto special film that recorded bombardment of electrons. The electron would create a diffraction pattern reminiscent of waves on the film. When they placed a device to directly observe the electrons, the bombardments behaved like particles and displayed a pattern of

particular bombardment rather than waves. In another variation of this experiment, the electrons go through the slit. After the exposure begun, an observation device was placed between the slits and the film. Not only were the electron observed as particle, but a back history was loaded so that electrons that previously entered through the slit as waves actually entered as particles. This is known as the quantum eraser experiment [12:5,12:6](#).

Key to understanding how observers interact with quantum systems is that the observer must be outside of the quantum system to cause a wave function collapse by conducting a measurement on the system:

On the cosmological level, the entire universe was a quantum system during the first 10^{-43} sec of the Big Bang. The quantum wave-function could only collapse if a Cosmic Observer who was outside of the universe conducted a measurement on the system. This understanding has much in common with the description of the universe ex nihilo in [chapter 10](#). God spoke the substance of space-time which was compressed into a singularity. The act of conducting a measurement on this system defined its properties. The result was an “explosion” and the beginning of the instantiation of physical laws [12:7](#).

On the biosemiotic level, the fact that macro-molecules in DNA operate on a quantum mechanical level [12:8](#) rather than classical mechanics demonstrates that an Outside Observer has conducted a measurement

on life. Both the complexity of life and the invisibility of the macro-molecular world to any biologically contained observer would imply that this observer lay outside of the biological realm. The same Cosmic Observer whose initial measurement created the Big Bang conducted successive measurement(s) that defined the parameters of life. These measurements defined the semantic meaning of DNA and embedded it inside of DNA.

At the level of neurobiology, particular that of the human brain, an observer conducts measurements on the quantum states in the cells of the brain. These measurements determine which way the quantum wave-functions collapse. The results of these collapses control how neurons fire and which synaptic connections occur. Who is measuring the quantum system of the human brain? The measurement of this observer of the activity inside of brain cells produces the combinations of wave-function collapses that result in the phenomena of perceptions, thoughts, decisions, and beliefs. This is the same role that is attributed to the consciousness. The best inference is that the consciousness of the individual is interacting with the brain on a quantum mechanical level. Quantum mechanics suggests that there is a non-material soul that animates the physical body of a living creature.

Interpretations of Quantum Mechanics

Quantum mechanics raises questions about whether materialism is an adequate view of reality. It also raises questions about whether realism is true. These implications bother the scientists who research this. There is

pressure to try to interpret quantum mechanics in a way that preserves materialism and realism. There are three major interpretations of quantum mechanics: the Bohm–de Broglie Interpretation (Neo–realism), the Many Worlds Interpretation, and the Copenhagen Interpretation^{12:9}.

The Bohm–de Broglie Interpretation asserts that undetectable pilot waves guide the particle. In this view, the particle is actually in the waveform and survives a waveform collapse. This view makes an additional assumption about what is happening in the waveform. It also does not have good explanation for why the particle behaves like a wave when not observed and why it switches to particle behavior (including back–loading a particle history) when observed. This interpretation would preserve materialism and realism, but it violates Occam’s Razor. Occam’s Razor says that when two or more hypotheses have similar explanatory power, that the one that makes the fewest assumptions or uses the fewest or simpler concepts is more likely to be the better explanation. The Bohm–de Broglie Interpretation has slightly less explanatory power and definitely makes a more complicated explanation.

The Many Worlds Interpretation denies that there is a wave function collapse. This interpretation asserts that different quantum states of a wave function represent different worlds and that what appears to be a wave function collapse is merely observation of one world of many. One of the bizarre implications of this interpretation is that observation creates parallel universes. If this interpretation is true, then each human

being creates billions of universes every second. This is because the body of each human being is composed of billions of molecules. This means that, during my lifetime, I have created 2,808,626,400,000,000,000 or 2.8 quintillion or 2.8 million trillion universes.

The Many Worlds Interpretation is the interpretation most compatible with materialism; but it begs the question of why we observe the wave function collapse. It assumes that there is something we simply don't or can't see. It has slightly less explanatory power and is almost infinitely more complicated (not to mention bizarre) explanation. The Many Worlds Interpretation definitely violates Occam's Razor.

While the many worlds interpretation is attractive to materialists, it has consequences that are lethal to materialism:

If the Multiverse Hypothesis is true, then our universe is not all there is; it is an open system that was formed and shaped, with natural laws and cosmological constants set, by causes outside of the system. If the definition of supernatural means that which is beyond the natural scope, then the Multiverse Hypothesis is a supernatural explanation of origins and ultimate reality.

If the Multiverse Hypothesis is true, then uniformitarianism is limited. There is a discontinuity between causes within the system of the

universe and causes that lie outside the universe. There are other discontinuities via black hole and subatomic physics. The falsification of unlimited uniformitarianism calls into question inferences that rely the assumption of unlimited uniformitarianism, such as the meta-narrative inferences of evolutionary theory.

If the many-worlds hypothesis is true, then every event that is possible is inevitably true in at least one possible universe. The only limitation is the truths of logic and mathematics, which are necessarily true in every possible universe. Natural laws are the products of cosmological constants which vary from universe to universe, so that events deemed impossible in this universe are possible in other universes. with this in mind.

The one version of the Multiverse Hypothesis that atheists love for its ability to destroy the fine-tuning argument, the many-worlds hypothesis, has implications that falsify an atheist or materialist meta-narrative. The Materialistic meta-narrative is particularly vulnerable because of its narrow and reductionist view of reality that is absent from alternative world-views. For example, an atheistic universe does not falsify a theistic Multiverse, as God can choose one universe to be heavily involved in while ignoring other universes. An atheistic Multiverse, however, is not compatible with the existence of a theistic universe. If the Many Worlds Hypothesis is true, then it follows that in at least one universe, that Jesus Christ physically rose from the dead, all of the Bible stories literally happened, and Biblical Inerrancy is true. The

Materialist meta-narrative simply cannot be sustained if the Multiverse Hypothesis is true.

As of the time of this writing, there is a plan to test for the Multiverse. This test involves searching for “*for disk-like patterns in the cosmic microwave background (CMB) radiation*^{12:10}.” This test will determine whether our universe has had any collisions with objects outside of the universe. Thus, this test can provide proof that the material universe is not the only reality that exists and that it is an open system subject to outside influences. This test will not, from a scientific perspective, tell us much meaningful information about the nature of what is outside the universe; it will only tell us that something else exist outside of our universe and that we are colliding with it. It’s just as likely that our universe could well be bouncing off pillars in the Temple of God as bouncing off of other universes. Because the natural laws of our universe do not operate outside of our universe, the use of both direct observations and the invalid inferences used to construct the evolutionary meta-narrative to draw conclusions about what is outside of our universe is out of the question.

The Bohm-de Broglie Interpretation and the Many Worlds Interpretation both assume that there are unseen (and possibly unobservable) forces that explain away the observation. These interpretations are essentially arguments from ignorance that are designed to be ad hoc fallacies. They exist for no other reason than to salvage materialism from falsification

by quantum mechanics. These interpretations are currently minority views in the scientific community.

The Copenhagen Interpretation is the interpretation of the plurality of physicists. The Copenhagen Interpretation asserts that observation/measurement really causes the wave function collapse and that material reality is observer-dependent. Material reality is defined by wave function collapse that happened when a wave function is observed by an observer. While there are some different points of view within the Copenhagen Interpretation as to why the observer is so important, the only logical demarcation for why the observer is that the observer has the attribute of consciousness. Consciousness collapses the wave function

Implications of Quantum Mechanics

If consciousness collapses the wave function and material reality is observer-dependent, then what we naively call material reality is not objective reality in the way the modern Western mind thinks. What does it mean?

It means that material reality is composed of constructs existing in conscious minds. Since matter is conscious observation dependent, it has no existence apart from conscious observation. Matter, then, is a construct of a rational conscious mind.

It means that logic and mathematics absolutely constrain observations. Logic and mathematics are necessary properties of the mind of God and the mind of God is a necessary property of God. Logical and mathematical necessities, then, are constraint on all of reality. They **internally** constrain God (The Bible teaches that God is constrained by His own nature. i.e. “God cannot lie Hebrews 6:18) and **externally** constrain all of creation.

It means that contingent observers are classical observers who are necessarily outside the quantum system. Classical observers are outside of the quantum systems that function at a subatomic level, thus observations collapse the wave function to create matter. As the classical systems, the physics of everyday life, are based on upon the quantum systems, they are not sufficient to be a foundation for constraints on the classical observer. The constraints on how observation creates the constructs of reality are inherent in the consciousness, not the constructs. Contingent conscious observers are then constrained by a higher consciousness. This consciousness is the ultimate cause of reality.

It means that, because of the inherent uncertainty that is in the fabric of the universe, that the behavior of objects is not totally deterministic. This mean that there exist multiple possibilities of effect, and that effect cannot be precisely determined by the initial state of a cause. Deterministic causes require a specific chain of causes and permit no

other possible sequence of events. The Heisenberg uncertainty, then, rules out as a transcendent or ultimate cause any agent that behaves deterministically. In other words, the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle could only work in a universe that has an in-deterministic ultimate cause – which is the higher consciousness.

A non-rational higher consciousness that is non-deterministic is in-deterministic, but does not have free will because that conscious would lack the conceptual faculties to conceive of his/her/its observations of multiple possibilities as multiple possibilities. Because of this lack of conception of multiple possibilities, this type of consciousness is unable to make any meaningful free will choices.

A rational higher consciousness that is non-deterministic is not only in-deterministic, but also has free will because that consciousness has the conceptual faculties to conceive of his/her/its observations of multiple possibilities as multiple possibilities. Because of this conception of multiple possibilities, this type of consciousness is able to make any meaningful free will choices by directing intentionality towards a selected possibility.

If the higher consciousness that is the ultimate cause or ground of being is a non-rational consciousness, then rationality is not a fundamental of the universe and would not – could not– be used to frame constructs of the real world or constrain conscious observers. In that case, we should

not expect the real world to follow logical and mathematical laws. In fact, there would be no basis for the existence of such laws within the contingent and constrained consciousnesses that we are familiar with. The nature of logic and mathematics is such, that if these are instantiated or embedded as reality anywhere, then they are instantiated everywhere and exist as fundamental properties of ultimate reality. The fact that logic and mathematics constrain our consciousness indicates that the higher consciousness is a rational consciousness with logical and mathematical properties that are necessarily part of His Nature.

It means that God is not a classical observer. He can directly observe the quantum wave function, discerning every possible contingent state. These states are not neatly organized as possible worlds. A possible world is defined as a combination of all wave function collapses. The sum of all possible worlds is, then, every possible combination of all wave function collapses. God constrains contingent classical observers to observe the physical universe as generally obeying classical laws. God can also choose to observe a given wave function classically, collapsing the wave function into the construct of His choosing. God administers the history of the universe by simply designing constructs to collapse in specified patterns and in specified timings, using His foreknowledge of every possible value combination of every wave function to construct possibilities for him to select.

Classical observers are constrained observers; they generally cannot choose how their observations of the wave function form material reality. Classical observers are classical observers because they are constrained to observe material reality as generally obeying laws of classical physics.

It means that a Rational, Cosmic Consciousness creates the constructs and sets constraints. God creates the constructs of our experience of objective reality. God creates natural laws which probabilistically constrain observations. Because of the probabilistic nature of the quantum wave function and because they are contingent constructs, the constraints are not absolute. Events are exceptions to natural laws can occur without violation of natural law because natural law is probabilistic in nature. Miracles and divine intervention are compatible with a quantum universe.

Since the consciousness of contingent, classical observers is necessarily outside of the quantum system, then these consciousnesses are not determined by physical reality. As contingent consciousnesses can also conceive of multiple possibilities, they exercise free will by rationally directing their intentionality towards selected possibilities.

Chapter 12 references

1.Wave functions – definition and properties

<http://hyperphysics.phy-astr.gsu.edu/hbase/quantum/wvfun.html>

[<back to text>](#)

2.What is quantum superposition?, Curiosity.com, answered by Science Channel,

<http://curiosity.discovery.com/question/what-quantum-superposition>

[<back to text>](#)

3.What is Schrödinger's Cat?, Andrew Zimmerman Jones, About.com Physics,

<http://physics.about.com/od/quantumphysics/f/schroedcat.htm>

[<back to text>](#)

4.HyperPhysics Lab at Georgia State University

<http://hyperphysics.phy-astr.gsu.edu/hbase/uncer.html>

[<back to text>](#)

5.Quantum Eraser Experiment (Science Daily)

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2013/01/130109105932.htm>

[<back to text>](#)

6. Quantum Eraser Experiment (Youtube), From Phy 201 at Yale University

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uK2eFv7ne_Q

[<back to text>](#)

7. *An Introduction to Quantum Cosmology*, David L. Wiltshire, Department of Physics and Mathematical Physics, University of Adelaide, S.A. 5005, Australia,

<http://arxiv.org/pdf/gr-qc/0101003v2.pdf> page 2

If the Copenhagen Interpretation of quantum mechanics is true and quantum mechanics is the best description of what happened during the first instants of the Big Bang, then a transcendent, supernatural observer is necessary. consider the following quote from Dr Wiltshire.

“On the face of it the very words “quantum” and “cosmology” do appear to some physicists to be inherently incompatible. We usually think of cosmology in terms of the very large scale structure of the universe, and of quantum phenomena in terms of the very small. However, if the hot big bang is the correct description of the universe – which we can safely assume given the overwhelming evidence described in the earlier lectures – then the universe did start out incredibly small, and there must have been an epoch when quantum mechanics applied to the universe as a whole.

“There are people who would take issue with this. In the standard Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics one always has a

classical world in which the quantum one is embedded. We have observers who make measurements – the observers themselves are well described by classical physics. If the whole universe is to be treated as a quantum system one does not have such a luxury, and some would argue that our conventional ideas about quantum physics cease to make sense. Yet if quantum mechanics is a universal theory then it is inevitable that some form of “quantum cosmology” was important at the earliest of conceivable times, namely the Planck time, $t_{\text{Planck}} = (Gh)^{1/2} / c^{5/2} = 5.4 \times 10^{-44}$ sec, (equivalent to 10^{19} GeV as an energy, or 1.6×10^{-35} m as a length). At such scales, where the Compton wavelength of a particle is roughly equal to its gravitational (Schwarzschild) radius, irreducible quantum fluctuations render the classical concept of spacetime meaningless. Whether or not our current efforts at constructing a theory of quantum cosmology are physically valid is therefore really a question of whether our current understanding of quantum physics is adequate for considering the description of processes at the very beginning of the universe, or whether quantum mechanics itself has to be revised at some level. Such a question can really only be answered by extensive work on the problem.

[<back to text>](#)

8. Quantum entanglement between the electron clouds of nucleic acids in DNA,

Elisabeth Rieper¹, Janet Anders² and Vlatko Vedral^{1,3,4}

1 Center for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, Republic of Singapore

2 Department of Physics and Astronomy, University College London, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom

3 Atomic and Laser Physics, Clarendon Laboratory, University of Oxford, Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PU, United Kingdom and

4 Department of Physics, National University of Singapore, Republic of Singapore,

(Dated: February 24, 2011)

<http://arxiv.org/pdf/1006.4053v2.pdf>

[<back to text>](#)

9. *Miracles, materialism, and quantum mechanics*, Dr. Neil Shenvi, Department of Chemistry, Duke University.

[<back to text>](#)

10. First Observational Test of the Multiverse, Phys.org

<http://phys.org/news/2011-08-multiverse.html>

[<back to text>](#)

13 The foundations of science and empirical inquiry

Christianity and the Historical Development of Science

The Genesis hypothesis influenced the development of modern science. Early scientists were Creationists who believed that God created nature and set up natural laws in a systematic way through the supernatural action. These early scientists also believed that created man with the categories of reason and cognitive structure that is compatible with the laws of logic and the laws of nature. There are multiple scientists who believed this, but I will focus in this brief piece with a few quotes from Isaac Newton and Johannes Kepler.

Isaac Newton is considered the father of modern science. Newton's achievements led the way to the development of modern science. Isaac Newton believed God "built" the natural world and that he created us and the natural realm in such a way to allow the possibility of knowledge.

"This Being governs all things, not as the soul of the world, but as Lord over all: And on account of his dominion he is wont to be called Lord God παντοκράτωρ, or Universal Ruler...

...We have ideas of his attributes, but what the real substance of anything is, we know not. In bodies we see only their figures and colours, we hear only the sounds, we touch only their outward surfaces,

we smell only the smells, and taste the savours; but their inward substances are not to be known, either by our senses, or by any reflex act of our minds; much less then have we any idea of the substance of God. We know him only by his most wise and excellent contrivances of things, and final causes; ...

...Blind metaphysical necessity, which is certainly the same always and everywhere, could produce no variety of things. All that diversity of natural things which we find, suited to different times and places, could arise from nothing but the ideas and will of a Being necessarily existing. But by way of allegory, God is said to see, to speak, to laugh, to love, to hate, to desire, to give, to receive, to rejoice, to be angry, to fight, to frame, to work, to build. For all our notions of God are taken from the ways of mankind, by a certain similitude which, though not perfect, has some likeness, however. And thus much concerning God; to discourse of whom from the appearances of things, does certainly belong to Natural Philosophy. [13:1](#)

Newton proclaimed that God created man with categories roughly similar to categories that exist in the external world. God created us in such a way that our critical observational and reasoning processes will yield an understanding of reality that closely approximates reality. Newton built modern science within the framework of a Christian world-view.

Newton was not the only one who believed that God created humanity with the categories that are compatible with the mind of God and with

the physical world. Perhaps the clearest statement of this idea can be found in the writings of Johannes Kepler.

“To God there are, in the whole material world, material laws, figures and relations of special excellency and of the most appropriate order. ...Let us not try to discover more of the heavenly and immaterial world than God has revealed to us. Those laws are within the grasp of the human mind. God wanted us to recognise them by creating us after his own image so that we could share in his own thoughts...” [13:2](#),[13:3](#),[13:4](#)

Science unintelligible without a Theistic foundation

Science is built on two main ideas: the natural world exists as an orderly system governed by natural laws, and the human mind exist in such a way that the categories of perception and reason roughly correspond to categories in the physical world. These ideas are not ideas to be proved by science; they are ideas that must be in place to justify scientific inquiry. As such, they are the product of world views. There are three major classes of worldviews: Pantheism, Materialism, and Theism.

When one considers the fact that unlimited uniformitarianism is falsified, it follows that the natural world exists as an open system in a larger reality. This means that there is a demarc or demarcation between natural and supernatural reality. Materialism and Pantheism become falsified.

Materialism asserts that matter–energy is the ultimate reality. From this follows the idea that the natural world is a closed system and that uniformity of natural laws and natural causes is eternal/indefinite. If materialism is true, then there is nothing behind natural laws and unlimited uniformitarianism is true. The falsification of uniformitarianism is the falsification of materialism.

Pantheism is the belief that all is God. Pantheism asserts emanation as its account of origins. Emanation is the outflow of substance from the ultimate reality to produce “lesser” realities. As the lesser realities share substance with the ultimate reality, there is no demarcation between necessary and contingent being or between ultimate reality and particular realities. If Pantheism is true, there is no demarcation between natural and supernatural reality; if there is no demarcation between natural and supernatural reality, then unlimited uniformitarianism is true. The falsification of uniformitarianism is the falsification of Pantheism.

Theism asserts that God is self–existent ground of all being. Through God’s power, finite, contingent, and temporal creations were produced. the reality of God is not merely of magnitude, but also a qualitative difference from the rest of reality. This can be thought of as the distinction between the supernatural (beyond nature) and the natural. Depending on the interpretation of theism, there may be multiple layers of natural and supernatural reality. Theism is the only class of world–views that is compatible with limited uniformitarianism.

Scientific inquiry can only be justified in a theistic world-view. Pantheism and Materialism pose difficulties in their attempts to justify scientific inquiry.

Pantheism, because it asserts emanation, implied a created reality that is equal to the ultimate reality. This means that mere creature like me can do all of the works of God. If Pantheism is true, then I am God. It doesn't take long to falsify that view. The general response in Pantheism, and this is seen in eastern religions that teach Pantheism, is to argue that human experience is largely illusory. According to Pantheism, our sense of limitedness is a delusion. If so, then most of our perceptions are false; the faculties of man have no connection to the real world, meaning there is no reason to conduct experiential observation or perform experiments as the results of these are not likely to yield any information about the real world. Such a view is deadly to science.

Materialism asserts that impersonal matter-energy produced everything that exists. Mathematics, logic, and mind are either the product of natural forces or do not have reality. Materialism provides no explanation of how logic and mathematics can be products of natural evolution or how natural law can exist. If material reality is the ultimate reality, how is it that it is governed by fundamental natural law that necessarily contains non-material attributes such as logical and mathematical properties. Materialism provides no explanation for why the categories of the human mind should correspond to the categories of the natural world. If there is no design, then it would be a colossal co-

incidence – no basis to justify inferences about the real world based upon the perception of it.

Theism asserts that God created the universe and constructed natural law according to logical and mathematical attributes that already existed in His Mind. He willed contingent material substance into existence and fashioned according the template of natural law He created. He then created the human mind with categories of perception and reason that correspond roughly both to the mind of God and the categories of the natural world. Theology is the study of God, and science is the study of this natural world. This is the only adequate explanation for the justification of scientific inquiry.

Chapter 13 References

1. Principia Mathematica, General Scholium, pages 504–506

<http://newtonprojectca.files.wordpress.com/2013/06/newton-general-scholium-1729-english-text-by-motte-letter-size.pdf>

[<back to text>](#)

2. Kepler, Letter to Johannes George Hewart von Hohenburg,” April 9–10 1599, cited in Johannes Kepler: Life and Letters, Carola Baumgardt, 1951, page 50 [<back to text>](#)

3. Kepler's Philosophy and the New Astronomy, Rhonda Martens, page 79, 2000, Princeton University Press. [<back to text>](#)

4. *Six ways Christianity supported the growth of science*, Saints and Skeptics

<http://www.saintsandseptics.org/six-ways-christianity-supported-the-growth-of-science/>

[<back to text>](#)

Section 3: Proof Christianity is true

Section 3 - Proof Christianity is True

In this section I will show proofs that specifically prove Christianity true. These will begin by showing that Christianity has the only answer to the problem of evil.

Then I will use foundational, coherence and evidential arguments to show that the Bible is inspired.

I will show that Christ is the central theme of the Bible and that the resurrection of Christ is only plausible explanation for the rise of Christianity. If Christ be raised, then He is who the God-man and the Bible is the authoritative record of His message to humanity.

14 The necessity of God as the reference frame for morals – God is necessarily just.

In [chapter 3](#), I wrote that Naturalistic philosophies were incapable of producing a coherent reference-frame for morals. Materialism could only produce material objects; in this scheme, murders were just as real as the laws against murder. Because Naturalism in all of its forms lacks a transcendent reference-frame, even non-Materialist interpretations do not have a good way to separate moral principle for instances of violation; both are equally natural events.

Subjective attempts to construct a reference frame for morals also fails. Subjects whose ontology is inferior to absolute truth simply carry no authority to serve as a genuine reference frame for morals; attempt to build moral systems on those reduce morals to anthropology and sociology and are not true moral systems.

Because God is absolute truth, transcendent, and has a subjective domain, He can be an adequate reference frame for morals. Moral categories are a subset of all personal categories, and personal categories can be seen as the subset of the entire set of categories that God has. God is the ground and reference-frame of all well-defined^{[14:1](#)}categories.

If God does not have personal categories then nothing in the creation could have personal categories. It is entirely possible to begin with a God that has personal categories and end with a creation that does not have personal categories but it is impossible to begin with a God who does not have personal categories and end with even one created being who possesses even one personal category.

This also applies to specifically moral categories:

If God does not have moral categories then nothing in the creation could have moral categories. It is entirely possible to begin with a God that has moral categories and end with a creation that does not have moral categories but it is impossible to begin with a God who does not have moral categories and end with even one created being who possesses even one moral categories or a single moral notion.

We have a means of testing whether God has moral categories. If we know even a single example of such categories existing anywhere in the universe then it follows that God has moral categories. While there are certain deranged people who are described in the Bible as having “...*a conscience seared with a hot iron...*” But are called in modern jargon sociopaths, everyone else has moral notions. When I say that people have moral notions I am not saying that they are ‘living right’ or that the moral notions they have are necessarily right but only that they are aware that thoughts and actions have moral implications. For example

most people, regardless of their religious background or lack thereof, believe that murder is not merely inconvenient for society but **morally wrong**. They believe that there exists a moral code which outlaws murder—even if their world-view says that such a code should not exist.

If people have moral notions then they have moral categories. If people have moral categories then they derived the definition for these categories from God. Therefore God has moral categories. The conclusion that God has moral categories is reached in much the same way as the conclusion that God is a Person. It is undeniable that my personhood exists. Even if everything I conceive and perceive as a person is an illusion I must exist as a real person in order to experience the illusion.

If I exist as a real person then my personhood is derived from God. That is possible only if God is a Person. God is a Person with moral notions. It has been established elsewhere that God is Absolute Truth. This means that His moral notions are always true. This is the only sure foundation for morals.

Why God is necessarily just

If God is Absolute Truth, then God is infallible. If God has moral notions and those moral notions are infallible then God cannot endorse moral notions that are false. This also means that God cannot contradict Himself in regard to morals. God must oppose sin and evil.

When the Bible speaks of God being necessarily opposed to evil it uses Greek and Hebrew word that translate as the word HOLY or HOLINESS. Holiness means not merely being right but also SEPARATED from sin and wrong.

Man was created by default in harmony with God in regard to both holiness and love. Because God of necessity always keeps His Word Man was given freedom to either remain in harmony or rebel. When man rebelled God was presented with a dilemma. God's nature demands that He always be consistent with Himself. He cannot contradict Himself or go back on His Word.

As seen previously God has committed Himself to several things which came into tension when man rebelled. God committed Himself into creating a race of beings who would enter into relationship with Him freely on the basis of mutual love. God also committed Himself to uphold Absolute Holiness.

The Holiness of God is portrayed throughout the Bible from cover to cover. God demonstrated His holiness when He evicted Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden after they sinned. In Revelation 22 we read everything that sins or is sinful is barred from the New Jerusalem and consigned to the Lake of Fire. God's Holiness means that He cannot have a relationship with sinful man until the sin nature and sins are dealt with.

Chapter 14 References

1. A well defined category is any category that can be described by an affirmative definition rather than merely a negation of another category or mere label for a negation of another. The category 'person' is a well-defined category; 'non-person' is not because it is merely the negation of 'person.' The category 'Good' is well-defined, but 'evil' is not because it is simply another label for 'not-good.'[<back to text>](#)

15 Freedom and the answer to the Logical Problem of Evil

Christian philosopher Alvin Plantinga presented an argument that is generally conceded by even skeptical philosophers as an adequate response to the Logical Problem of Evil. It is called The Free Will defense^{[15:1](#)}; this chapter seeks to explain this argument

Plantinga's argument shows conclusively that the existence of evil and the existence of a good God are not contradictory. He presents four possible worlds in which there is no contradiction between the existence of God and evil. These possible worlds are represented by **W₁**, **W₂**, **W₃**, and **W₄**.

W_1 is logically possible and, as we shall see, coherent. Plantinga posited that W_1 is the actual world in which we live. The Genesis account gives this presentation of how evil came into the world.

Possible World 1 – W_1

- *God creates persons with morally significant free will;*
- (b) God does not causally determine people in every situation to choose what is right and to avoid what is wrong; and*
- (c) There is evil and suffering in W_1 .*

W_2 is obviously coherent. God creates only creates creature that are pre-programmed. Because He is good, they are programmed to only do good, resulting in a world in which no evil is possible. W_2 , however, fails to describe the actual world in which there is suffering and evil.

Possible World2 – W_2

- (a) God does not create persons with morally significant free will;*
- (b) God causally determines people in every situation to choose what is right and to avoid what is wrong; and*
- (c) There is no evil or suffering in W_2*

W₃ is logically impossible. Premise (a) contradicts premise (b). If God causally determines every action, then people are not really free. The logical impossibility of **W₃** is critical to Plantinga's Free Will Defense. If free will and determinism are compatible, then free will is weakened as a defense of God's goodness.

Possible world 3 – **W₃**

- (a) God creates persons with morally significant free will;*
- (b) God causally determines people in every situation to choose what is right and to avoid what is wrong; and*
- (c) There is no evil or suffering in **W₃**.*

W₄ is logically possible. **W₄** describes the ideal world where a good God creates creatures who have freedom where freedom can be used for or against Him. In **W₄**, people always use their freedom in good ways. This is the world that would have actually existed if Adam, Eve, and their descendants had actually obeyed God.

Possible World 4 –**W₄**

- (a) God creates persons with morally significant free will;*
- (b) God does not causally determine people in every situation to choose what is right and to avoid what is wrong; and*
- (c) There is no evil or suffering in **W₄**.*

The impossibility of **W₃** is critical to Plantinga's Free Will Defense. If Free will and determinism were logically compatible, then free will could not be a defense of God's honor. Plantinga affirms libertarian free will, which is the idea that freedom isn't really freedom unless it allows for the logical possibility of taking contrary action.

Both premises (a) and (b) are identical in **W₁** and **W₄**, but result in different conclusions (c). In both **W₁** and **W₄**, God does the same things – so God is not culpable. In both **W₁** and **W₄**, there are free creatures – so the existence of freedom is not culpable. The difference is that the free creatures made different specific decisions, which resulted in different moral conditions for **W₁** and **W₄**. The culpability for evil is not God nor freedom, but it is the free creatures who made the wrong choices that are culpable.

Plantinga's Free Will defense is generally regarded as solving the Logical Problem of Evil. That is, Plantinga's argument proves that the existence of an omnipotent, good God and the existence of evil are not contradictory. The only thing Plantinga needed to prove is that is at least one possible world in which God and evil can co-exist without God being culpable for the evil; Such proof would show that the existence of an all-powerful, good God and the existence of evil are not contradictory. Plantinga's proof does not tell us, and it wasn't designed to tell us, which world is the actual world.

The next chapter will demonstrate that God actually created a good world where man was given free will (Consistent with **W₁** and **W₄**). God

did this because freedom is an essential attribute of the highest possible good – love.

Chapter 15 References

1. A scholarly exposition of Plantinga's Free Will Defense can be found at The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy

<http://www.iep.utm.edu/evil-log/#H4> <back to text>

7.

16 Love is the answer to the Evidential Problem of Evil

When God created man, He made us ontologically hybrid. We were given categories otherwise unique to God: reason, intentionality (free will), and consciousness. He embedded these categories into humanity. These are not merely static categories, but embedded as functions that people can use in various combinations in any manner consistent to their free will.

These function are embedded to a creation that has been created ex nihilo. Humanity is not absolute truth, and as such, is not constrained by the logical constraints that are part of absolute truth. This means humanity can use these functions in a fallacious way or use the freedom of these to engage in rebellion against God. Why did God allow this

possibility. He did it because such freedom is an essential property of love. Love cannot exist without freedom. It isn't really love if one cannot do anything different. This remainder of this chapter will show the necessity of love

The necessity of love

Plantinga's free will defense, which I analyzed in the last chapter, proved that the existence of God and the existence of evil in the same world were not contradictory. Plantinga's argument does not prove, and it was not designed to prove, which world is the actual world. In this chapter, we will show why God would create a world in which God created "*creatures with morally significant free will*^{16:1}" and where "*God does not causally determine people in every situation to choose what is right and to avoid what is wrong*^{16:2}." The answer is that such free will is an essential attribute of love. Love isn't love if it is not freely given.

Whereas the Logical Problem of Evil is concerned with whether the existence of God and evil in the same world are logically compatible, the Evidential problem of evil concerns itself with the question of whether a good God would actually create a world where it would be possible for evil to exist. **The answer to this question turns on the moral status of love. Is love the highest good?**

What is love? There are many attributes that can be attributed to love. There are, in fact, diverse types of love. There are three core, unifying

attribute to all of these values.: freedom, the transcendent pursuit to value someone else, and the endowment of transcendent value to someone else

Love has to be freely given to be love.

All forms of love involve using one's intentionality or free will to invest a value into the object of that love. By this definition, all people have love for something.

In the examination of love we see, that among the many kinds of love that exist, a peculiar type of love: sacrificial love. Jesus said this as the greatest love, saying "***Greater love has no one than this: to lay down one's life for one's friends.***(John 15:13)."

True sacrificial love could also be thought of as altruism. This type of love exhibits a quality that cannot be explained in terms of naturalistic religion or philosophy. It cannot be well explained by deistic conceptions of God.

Materialism is the idea that matter/energy is the ultimate reality. Most of the objects that people love would be strictly speaking delusions in a materialistic world-view. If my wife is just a collection of atoms and molecules, then how can I conceive of her as her. When one considers that not one single atom that was in a person's body when they are born remains until adulthood. Individual identity is not defined by atoms and molecules, but by non-physical constructs that are not explained within the scope of materialism.

Much, if not all of, our experience of love is with constructs that defy materialistic explanations. These constructs are products of and defined by consciousness rather than material processes.

Unlike Materialism, Pantheism can account for consciousness. However, Pantheism does not provide an adequate basis for love either. Because pantheism contends that all of reality is self-existent god. If everything is self-existent, then everything necessarily exists. There are no temporal or contingent events - leading to the idea that most of our observations about reality are delusions. If our perceptions are delusional, then we cannot have any certainty that anyone else or anything else exists or that we even exist as a distinct individual. Without the knowledge that the self exists or that there are other selves that exist, there is simply no basis for love and no explanation for our experience of love.

The closest scientific descriptions to what we know as consciousness can be found in quantum mechanics and biosemiotics (see [chapter 11](#) and [chapter 12](#)). Both of these involve non-material explanations:

Quantum mechanics posits that quantum states collapse into classical states or material reality whenever an un-entangled observer conducts a measurement on a system. At the cosmic level, an observer must exist outside of the physical universe to cause the wave-function collapse that created the Big Bang.

Biosemiotics posits that DNA contains semantic information that requires a non-material explanation. It has been discovered that DNA operates on a quantum mechanical level^{16:3}. Who is measuring the

system? The interactions of this observer on the DNA in a body of an advanced creature like humanity, particularly the activity inside of brain cells, is what produces the phenomena of personhood: reason, free will, etc. The best inference is that the consciousness of the individual is interacting with DNA as a quantum system. It is this un-entangled consciousness, often called the spirit or the soul, that is the subject of the pursuit of love.

Love as a transcendent pursuit

If this un-entangled consciousness, often called the spirit or the soul, is the subject of the pursuit of love; then love is a transcendent pursuit to value someone that is outside of the self. When we love people, we are not seeking merely to love the atoms and molecules that may be in front of us or to love a set of facts, but we are seeking to transcend those things to reach another individual. Having categories to define such a pursuit or any active engagement in such a pursuit is utter non-sense in any Naturalistic world-view. In existentialism^{16:4}, this is called absurdity. Absurdity is the tension that modern man is in because his naturalistic world-view has no room for things like love, values, and meaning, but the yearnings of his heart long for these very things. Francis Schaeffer has written extensively about this tension. In *The God Who is There*, Schaeffer describes modern man as having an incoherent, fractured view of reality^{16:5}. He describes this thinking using the imagery of a two story house that can be represented something like this.

Pursuit of Love, meaning, and values as mysticism

Naturalistic science leaves no room for love, values, or meaning

Throughout this book, I have written about the logical inconsistencies in Naturalism that afflict its Materialist and Pantheist interpretations. In the area of love, however, it is not merely an intellectual issue; it is an issue that cuts to the core of who we are as humans. We cannot think, live and love in wholeness within a Naturalistic view of life.

In a theistic worldview, however, there simply is no tension found in the existence of love. We were created to love. The fact that we have categories of love indicate that God also has these categories. God has category of love – of the pursuit of the transcendent. This raises the question of how can a transcendent God can pursue anything transcendent – outside of Himself. This would be impossible if God is a unitarian God. If God is Trinitarian^{16:6}, then this is not a problem. If there are a diversity of persons who possess the same divine substance but presiding over diverse properties, then the transcendent pursuit to value someone “outside of the self” is possible with God. The three persons of the Godhead were/are/will be loving each other throughout all time and all eternity (See [chapter 10](#)).

God is love and He created humanity with categories of love. These were created because he wanted humanity for a love relationship. The relational categories are not limited to social interaction among humans. A growing body of research is showing that religion and supernatural bias are hard wired into people^{16:7}.

Love is endowing transcendent value to someone else

The fact that people are programmed to engage in a transcendent pursuit to value others and enter into relationship with others implies that persons have transcendent value. When the bible teaches that

humanity is created in the image of God, it is saying that people have transcendent value that goes beyond the value of material stuff. Both people and things have transcendent value when they are assigned a value that increases by virtue of relationship – value that goes beyond the ontological properties that a person or thing may have.

Love is certainly the highest good.

The three core attributes of all love, freedom, transcendent pursuit of relationship, and endowment of transcendent value on the objects of love, permeate everything anyone does. A proper and morally coherent pursuit of love is the highest good that anyone can do. Because freedom is a core attribute of love, there is the possibility of evil.

Not only is love the highest good, but history has shown that instances of the highest form of love are at the root of so many of our blessings. We have our political freedom because thousands love political liberty enough to die for it. We have our religious liberty because thousands of people loved religious liberty enough to die for it. We have our intellectual liberty because thousands of people loved intellectual liberty enough to die for it. We have personal freedom because thousands loved personal freedom enough to die for it. We have the economic freedom that has powered so much of the entrepreneurship and prosperity because thousands of people loved economic freedom enough to die for it.

We have access to the gospel of Jesus Christ because hundreds of thousands loved the Lord Jesus enough to die proclaiming His message. Foundational to many [16:8](#) of these decisions to sacrifice self are rooted in an understanding that God loves people enough to deem them worthy

of political, religious, intellectual, personal, and economic freedom. This understanding is not merely theoretical, but rooted in a narrative that is focused around the most selfless life ever lived. This person committed the only totally altruistic act ever done in human history. This person, Jesus Christ, died upon the cross to save humanity from eternal destruction.

Love as the reason for creation

Humanity was created for love. Because love requires free will, then that requires the free creatures be capable of using their to either pursue God or act against God. God created us with categories for love and for worship of Him because He created us to have a love relationship with Him and a love relationship with others. The moral high ground for the Creator is not found in avoidance of evil, but in creating a world where love exists and expressing that love in a way that includes redemption in the event that evil entered the world. This process of redemption will be explained in the next several chapters. I will show the necessity of Christianity being true.

Chapter 16 References

1. A scholarly exposition of Plantinga's Free Will Defense can be found at The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy

<http://www.iep.utm.edu/evil-log/#H4> <back to text>

2. *ibid* [<back to text>](#)

3. Quantum entanglement between the electron clouds of nucleic acids in DNA,

Elisabeth Rieper¹, Janet Anders² and Vlatko Vedral^{1,3,4}

1 Center for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, Republic of Singapore

2 Department of Physics and Astronomy, University College London, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom

3 Atomic and Laser Physics, Clarendon Laboratory, University of Oxford, Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PU, United Kingdom and

4 Department of Physics, National University of Singapore, Republic of Singapore,

(Dated: February 24, 2011)

<http://arxiv.org/pdf/1006.4053v2.pdf>

[<back to text>](#)

4. Existentialism is a philosophical movement whose aim is neither the creation of a coherent world-view nor the provision of answers to the “big questions.” instead, the focus is on discovering personal meaning. Much of Existential thought is focused on navigating the tension, called absurdity, between the logical implications of Materialism and the human experience of love, values, and personal meaning. [<back to text>](#)

5. *The God Who is There*, Francis Schaeffer, 1968 [<back to text>](#)

6. Any concept of God that posits a diversity of personalities (sets of relational attributes) that share the same substance or essential attributes would satisfy the necessary conditions for relational categories such as the eternal and necessary existence of love. The Trinity, however, is the best fit on both philosophical grounds and orthodoxy. [<back to text>](#)

7. Hardwired for religion. [<back to text>](#)

8. The point of this passage is not to assert the proposition that Christianity is at the root of every blessing, but that every blessing we have exists because others loved sacrificially – even to the point of death. I do believe that Christianity has made a disproportionately positive contribution to blessing humanity, and that part of the reason for this is that Christianity has the most coherent concept of love – affording Christians the opportunity to be the best equipped to live lives of love. [<back to text>](#)

17 The fall of man and the corruption of creation

The bottom line is that humanity did not remain in perfect love and goodness. Mankind rebelled against God., resulting in both the corruption of human nature and the corruption of creation.

The corruption of human nature

Adam was created in the image of God. He was created in relationship to God. This connection to God meant that Adam had access to God's goodness in his thoughts and decisions prior to the fall. God, through this connection, was foundational to Adam's thoughts and decisions before the fall. When Adam rebelled against God, he became separated from God. Adam set up self as foundational rather than God. Once self was set up as autonomous from God, then there was no way to restore the original condition, because everything Adam did was based on self.

Because Adam did not have a connection with God and a human nature that was hostile to anything other than self, He could not pass on to his descendants an uncorrupted human nature. All of Adam's descendants would be born corrupted with self-centeredness. Adam's sin brought moral evil into the world.

The Corruption of Creation

Because Adam was also a physical being, his sin involved his body. When he ate the forbidden fruit, that act pitted his body against God. This act brought contradictions into physical reality.

The contradictions that Adam's sin brought into physical reality brought elements contrary to the truth into the physical universe. Thus Adam's sin diluted the truth value or ontology of the physical universe. The

increasing mix of truth and falsehood resulted in ontological decay. This process of decay brought death into the world. Adam's sin also brought natural evil into the world.

Adam's sin brought both moral and natural evil into the world. In the Covenant of Creation, God created man and nature to coexist in harmony and free of death (see). Adam's sin changed all of that. A God who is justice and love faces a trilemma. God's justice demands that sin be destroyed, his love demands that humanity remain free so that love may be freely given, and His love demands that humanity be saved from the just punishment for sin. How will God resolve this? The next chapter will answer that question.

18 God's Trilemma

When man rebelled a dilemma was created which sets up this tension. God is obligated by justice to destroy evil. He has also obligated Himself by His love to continue with man. If God wipes out the human race, then He has contradicted His purpose and therefore contradicted Himself. If God's purpose in creating man is a freely expressed love relationship, then this purpose requires that God's answer preserve free will; if God fails to preserve free will, then He has repudiated His purpose. If God is love then He must uphold His love. If His creation of beings of love fails then God stands condemned. Nothing is at stake if only certain members of this race fail, but if all fail then God condemns himself by

contradicting His purpose– contradicting Himself. If God contradicts Himself, He falsifies himself.

As God is absolute truth, it is impossible for Him to falsify or contradict himself. Because it is impossible for God to be falsified (condemned) there must exist an answer that exonerates God's love and His purpose in creating a race of beings of love, and yet–uphold His standards of Absolute Holiness.

Because the basic problem is a corrupted human nature, it is impossible for humans to resolve this problem from within their human nature as any action of their human nature simply replicates the corruption.

Attempts to come to God directly meet with failure because these attempts are ultimately based on self. Self based actions are ultimately contrary to God based reality. The only solution is the death of that self. Alone that means DOOM, however; if the self becomes bundled with another then there is the possibility that the self can be restored to the original condition or even better.

The sinful human nature cannot be rehabilitated. Sinful human nature is necessarily self based and naturally oriented which puts it in direct opposition to God as a supernatural and self existent foundation of all reality.

There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. – Romans 8:1–8

What makes man evil is not that the self is evil but that the self exists within a nature that makes the self the foundation for everything. In reality the universe does not revolve around self but God. The self was created in the image of God but became separated from God by the tainted human nature.

Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden underfoot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? – Hebrews 10:29

Your lamb shall be without blemish, a male of the first year: ye shall take it out from the sheep, or from the goats:

- Exodus 12:5

The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. - John 1:29

But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: - 1 Peter 1:19

God must create an entirely new human nature within these boundaries:

1. God must create a new human nature and provide the existing human race access to this new nature.
2. Because the plan of salvation must preserve human free will, it must involve God communicating to man the knowledge necessary to connect to this new human nature.
3. The mean of interface or connection to the new human nature must be designed so that the corrupt human nature is destroyed rather than the new human nature contaminated.

19 The Answer to God's Trilemma

Human sin corrupted human nature, which set up a Trilemma for God. God's love compels God to save humanity while His justice requires judgment against sin. In the last chapter, I wrote that "God must create an entirely new human nature within these boundaries:

1. "God must create a new human nature and provide the existing human race access to this new nature.
2. "Because the plan of salvation must preserve human free will, it must involve God communicating to man the knowledge necessary to connect to this new human nature.
3. "The mean of interface or connection to the new human nature must be designed so that the corrupt human nature is destroyed rather than the new human nature contaminated.

In this chapter, I will show how this is fulfilled in history.

God created a new, untainted human nature when He sent Jesus Christ to earth. Christ was conceived when the holy spirit came upon Mary. The DNA contribution of the mother was from Mary, but the DNA from the father was created ex nihilo by the Holy Spirit. Christ is human with body, soul, and spirit like other humans. The Spirit who lives within Christ, however, is the very divine Spirit of God. Christ, then, is all man

and all God in one. Because He is completely God, He can stand in the place of God and wield the authority of God as the foundation for our lives. Because He is completely man, we can identify and connect with Him .

Jesus Christ's death on the Cross and Resurrection from the dead provide the only answer to the problem of evil. His death takes away sin and His resurrection gives new life.

The only way for the self to be saved is to become bundled with an untainted human nature. Jesus has an untainted human nature. His humanity is connected to God. Through Jesus Christ and Jesus Christ alone we can have access to the life of God.

Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost.

- Matthew 1:18

But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost.

- Matthew 1:20

And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased. - Luke 3:22

And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. - 1 Corinthians 15:45-50

Jesus is the source of life because His breath of life is not the tainted puff of the breath of life that came from Adam; the breath of life that is in Jesus is the Holy Spirit Himself.

Roman 6 describes what happens when we are saved. We become united with the body of Christ. When Christ died we died—and the sin nature died with us. When Christ was raised we also was raised—free from sin.

What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin. Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him: Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. – Romans 6:1–10 KJV

When this gospel is preached we have a choice to accept or reject; after all, the preservation of God's love implies that humanity still be able to **FREELY** enter the love relationship. otherwise it would not be love. If we begin to accept and then continue to accept this gospel God places us into the body of Christ and keeps us in Christ.

“Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord. Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and

your members as instruments of righteousness unto God. For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace. What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid. Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness? – Romans 6:11–16 KJV

The necessity of a decision to repent means that we must hear the gospel. Salvation that is based on God means that we must hear the Word of God. Hearing the Word implies that we have access to the Word of God. The Word of God has been revealed and preserved in the Bible. The requirement that God speak an inspired message to humanity about His plan is foundational to that redemption and the solution to God's trilemma.

20 Proving Inspiration of Scripture

The requirement that God speak an inspired message to humanity about His plan is foundational to that redemption and the solution to God's dilemma. Where, specifically is this message located. In the establishment of proof or justification of any knowledge claim, there are three basic approaches: Foundationalism, coherence, and evidentialism.

Foundationalism is the establishment of first principles as necessary truths required to establishing other truths. These first principles are known as self-evident truths, axioms, postulates, and presuppositions.

Foundationalism seeks to establish these principles and reason from them to derive other principles of knowledge. Many of the proofs in this book are rooted in a foundationalist approach to knowledge.

It is my contention that inspiration of Scripture is foundational. An inspired message containing instructions on responding to God's answer to His trilemma and His plan for our salvation. As I will show, the Bible is the only sacred book that has this answer. I will also show that the Bible uniquely presupposes philosophical answers compatible to the foundational truths that God has revealed in general revelation of mathematics and logic.

Coherence is rooted in the law of non-contradiction; diverse truths will not contradict each other. Coherence requires that the essential parts of a narrative be compatible with each other.

Coherence, as applied to discerning the actions of God in history, also means that these actions have a common pattern. While God may say and do rather diverse things in diverse contexts, because God is a rational God acting rationally and systematically there will be a coherent pattern. I will show that the conceptual structure of the gospel is presented throughout the Old Testament from beginning to end in diverse covenantal contexts. I will also show that Christ is predicted and indicated in every covenantal context. These two proofs will show that there is a consistent voice of God that is present throughout Scripture.

Evidentialism is the method of empirical inquiry or examination of evidence gathered through the physical senses. Science and history are evidential enterprises. Evidential approaches involve the use of methodologies that analyze data and make inferences from that data.

The Evidentialist method relates to proving inspiration in that it examines the historical reliability of the inspired documents to answer the question of whether it is more likely or not that they are historically reliable.

21 The Inspiration of the Bible is Foundational

The inspiration of Scripture is foundational to the answers God has given in the general. There are two things that we should expect that will show this. If the Scriptures are inspired by the same God who hard-wired basic truths into the structure of logic and mathematics, then we should expect those Scriptures to give compatible answers to those same issues when it speaks to those issues. We should also expect Scripture to give a specific answer to God's dilemma and include in that answer enough details to allow humanity an opportunity to receive the redemption that God provides as the answer to His own dilemma.

The Bible has presuppositions compatible with general revelation

The Bible makes philosophical statements that are uniquely compatible with the general revelation arguments made in this book that are rooted in mathematics and logic. Some of the arguments made in this book include

- 1.The necessity of a personal ground of being.
- 2.The necessity of a reality that includes both supernatural and natural domains.
- 3.The fact that God created the universe in a rational way and established natural law.
- 4.The necessity of God as the reference–frame for morals.
- 5.God’s trilemma
- 6.The solution to God’s trilemma.

The first two eliminate most of the religions and philosophies. After the first three, one is left with Christianity, Deism, Islam, and Judaism. By the time you get to #5, only Christianity and Judaism are left, and Christianity is the only religion that correct answers #6. Of all of the sacred books, only the Bible has answers that agree with the results of general revelation that God has revealed through logic and mathematics.

The Bible describes how Christ answers God’s dilemma in a way that works only if the Bible is God’s infallible word.

This must be the very first principle. If the Bible is revelation from an infallible God who is absolute truth, then one would expect that it is infallible. This means infallible, inerrant autographs (original documents). One should also expect a sufficient providential intervention in the subsequent history of the distribution to assure that there is continued access to God's message. This does not require miraculous transmission to assure that every copy is identical and every translation is perfect; it simply requires intervention to be at a level sufficient to allow access to God's intended message by means of a critical study of the texts.

God's Dilemma requires that God reconcile his love for man and His justice in such a way that it eliminates sin, preserve human life and preserves free will. The Passion of the Christ is the only sequence of events in all of human history that satisfies these parameters. The preservation of free will requires access to an account of this Passion. As it is written in Romans Rom 10:6-17

" But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above:) 7 Or, Who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead.) 8 But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach; 9 That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. 10 For with the heart man believeth unto

righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. 11 For the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. 12 For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. 13 For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. 14 How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? 15 And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things! 16 But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaiassaith, Lord, who hath believed our report? 17 So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.”– Rom 10:6–17

What this means is that if man is saved by agreeing in faith with the Passion of the Christ, he must have access to this knowledge. One is unable to agree with that of which they do not know.

If man’s basic problem is a corrupted human nature that contradicts the truth concerning God’s sovereignty and His foundational position in reality, a nature that posits self as the foundation of all decisions; then any view of the Bible as anything other than the Word of God is altogether insufficient. These views ultimately and necessarily make man the supreme judge over the Bible, denying that God is sovereign and denying his foundational position in the revelation of the plan of salvation. If the Bible merely “contains” the Word of God, or is merely

“man’s interpretation” of the Word of God, then man is on the throne – deciding which parts are deemed the Word of God. The self would then **necessarily** remain the foundation in rebellion to God’s true role. We would be in bondage to the self-centered nature. Only if the Bible is indeed the Word of God is it possible for a God-based message to be spread that can be accompanied by man’s agreement in faith.

22 Coherency as Proof of Divine Inspiration as evidenced by Covenants

Because God’s plan involves reconciliation with man in such a way that God is foundational and yet human free will involves creating arrangements in which God will and man’s will come into agreement. These agreements are called covenants reveal a distinct, identifiable pattern of thought that ties together all of God’s action in history.

In the Old Testament, there are five major covenants: Creation, Noahic, Abrahamic, Mosaic, and Davidic. These covenants reveal patterns in the plan of God that find their consummation in Jesus Christ.

The Covenant of Creation

The beginning of God’s story is the Creation. The story of Genesis 1 is that God would create nature in a rational orderly fashion. God’s purpose was to perform supernatural action to create a nature that was governed by natural laws. The Creative work of God in the six Genesis

days would consist of two parts – the supernatural proclamation of God’s Word and the instantiation of a natural process in obedience to the supernatural Word of God.

Throughout the creation narrative, God speak in a passive voice, commanding natural forces to exist or begin action. God commanded natural forces to act–producing life according to the parameters set by his Word. God creative process allowed limited evolution that occurred **WITHIN** the parameters of His supernatural Word. God initiated action from outside of the natural laws to construct natural laws that would sustain the creation. By speaking natural law into existence, God – through Christ – would “sustain all things by the word of His power.” (Colossians 1:16–17).

v3 “Let there be light”

v6 “Let there be a vault between the waters to separate water from water.”

v9 “Let the water under the sky be gathered to one place, and let dry ground appear.”

v11 “Let the land produce vegetation: seed-bearing plants and trees on the land that bear fruit with seed in it, according to their various kinds.”
And it was so.

v12 The land produced vegetation: plants bearing seed according to their kinds and trees bearing fruit with seed in it according to their kinds. And God saw that it was good.

14 And God said, "Let there be lights in the vault of the sky to separate the day from the night, and let them serve as signs to mark sacred times, and days and years, 15 and let them be lights in the vault of the sky to give light on the earth." And it was so. 16 God made two great lights—the greater light to govern the day and the lesser light to govern the night. He also made the stars. 17 God set them in the vault of the sky to give light on the earth, 18 to govern the day and the night, and to separate light from darkness. And God saw that it was good. 19 And there was evening, and there was morning—the fourth day.

v 20 And God said, "Let the water teem with living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth across the vault of the sky." 21 So God created the great creatures of the sea and every living thing with which the water teems and that moves about in it, according to their kinds, and every winged bird according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.

v24 And God said, "Let the land produce living creatures according to their kinds: the livestock, the creatures that move along the ground, and the wild animals, each according to its kind." And it was so. 25 God made the wild animals according to their kinds, the livestock according

to their kinds, and all the creatures that move along the ground according to their kinds. And God saw that it was good.

When God created man, He acted in a different way. God command did not merely define and invoke a natural process. God's Word involved God's direct, special intervention in the creation of humanity. God created man into His image. "*The Lord God formed a man[d] from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living being.*(Genesis 2:7)."

⁶ Then God said, "Let us make mankind **in our image**, in our likeness, so that **they may rule** over the fish in the sea and the birds in the sky, over the livestock and all the wild animals,^[a] and over all the creatures that move along the ground."²⁷ So God created mankind in his own image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them.

God created man **to rule**. The rest of creation is defined as following natural law and behaving according to natural law. Humanity is not defined according to natural law. While natural law constrains human behavior, it does not determine human behavior.

The basis of humanity's ability to rule is the condition of being created in the image of God. Because we are created in the image of God, we have attributes of rationality and intentionality (the ability to direct

thought to a goal) that are pre-requisites to free will. Quantum mechanics, specifically the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle, asserts that there is a limited degree of uncertainty at the smallest levels of space. The physical universe is porous enough to be an open system that allows interaction from outside. Natural law cannot determine with certainty the precise outcome of everything to the smallest levels. This results in a limited degree of uncertainty and probability into the fabric of the universe and allows for an open door for free will agents to influence events in the universe. (For more information, See Quantum Mechanics – God’s signature.)

Because humanity has both free will and the ability to use that freedom to control events in the physical universe, humanity or any subset of humanity in the form of individuals or groups can be a party to a covenant with God.

The covenant of creation is a simple covenant. God’s provision was that humanity, together, was to rule the earth and that all plant life was given for food. Humanity was given one condition: They were not to eat from the tree of knowledge of good and evil. The most important provision of the covenant was both a blessing and a command: Be fruitful and multiply. Adam and Eve were to replicate human nature through numerous descendants.

The fact that God provided and mandated for humanity to multiply means that human nature is replicated through sexual reproduction. What this means is if there is any corruption of human nature, that corruption is transmitted through sexual reproduction. When Adam sinned, he corrupted his own human nature which was then transmitted to any of his descendants who were fathered after the corruption of Adam's human nature. Amongst the Old Testament saints, King David understood this best. He knew that it was not enough to deal with particular sins, but that it was necessary to deal with the corrupt heart. This is what David referred to when he says the following:

"5 Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, And in sin my mother conceived me. ⁶ Behold, You desire truth in the inward parts, And in the hidden part You will make me to know wisdom.

⁷ Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; Wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow. ⁸ Make me hear joy and gladness, That the bones You have broken may rejoice. ⁹ Hide Your face from my sins, And blot out all my iniquities. ¹⁰ Create in me a clean heart, O God, And renew a steadfast spirit within me. ¹¹ Do not cast me away from Your presence, And do not take Your Holy Spirit from me.

12 Restore to me the joy of Your salvation, And uphold me by Your generous Spirit. 13 Then I will teach transgressors Your ways, And sinners shall be converted to You."

- Psalm 51:5-13 NKJV

David understood that he was born with a corrupt human nature. He knew that he needed God to cleanse him (vs7-9), create in him an new, uncorrupted human nature (v10), and restore his connection to God(v11). David understood the need to replicate this new nature to sinners for the purposes of changing their heart.

While David best understood that it was necessary to deal with the fundamental issue of the corrupt human heart or corrupt human nature, this issue resonates throughout the Old Testament in numerous passages that address the corruption of the human heart as the problem or prescribe a renewed heart as the answer

Genesis 6:5; 8:21; Exodus 7:3; 7:12-14; 7:22-23; 8:1; 8:19; 8:32; 9:7; 9:12-14; 9:34-35; 10:1; 10:19-21; 10:27; 11:10; 14:3-8; 14:7-9; 14:17; Numbers 15:38-40; Deuteronomy 5:29; 6:4-5; 10:12-13; 13:2-4 ; 30:5-20; Joshua 22:5; 24:23; 1 Samuel 2:35; 7:3; 12:20,24; 13:4; 16:7; 2 Chronicles 15:15; 16:9; 19:3,9; 30:18-20*; 31:21; 34:27-32; Ezra 7:10; Psalm 7:10; 9:1; 10:3,6,11,13; 12:2; 24:4; 28:3; 32:11; 33:15; 33:21*; 36:10; 37:30-31; 39:1-3; 40:6-10; 119:11; Proverbs 23:7; Jeremiah 31:31-33; Ezekiel 18:31; 36:26*

According to the Genesis account, Adam rebelled before he fathered any children. His corrupted human nature was transmitted to every one of his descendants. Sexual reproduction became a transmitter of corruption, and because God is infinitely and totally holy, humanity was no longer acceptable to God. Humanity still bore the image of God and therefore was still an object of Divine love. Because every action springing from this corrupt human nature was based on a nature in rebellion against God – a nature that denied God as the foundation – there was nothing that corrupted humans could do to be reconciled to God. It became necessary for God to create a new human nature that was fully human but not corrupt.

A hint of that God was going to re-create the human race is found in Genesis 3:15. God told Satan (the serpent) that “***And I will put enmity Between you and the woman, And between your seed and her Seed; He shall bruise your head, And you shall bruise His heel.***” Children have, for thousands of years, generally been referred to as the seed of the man. This is because sexual reproduction was seen in terms of an agricultural metaphor. As the farmer plants his seed into fertile soil, so the man plants his seed into the fertile woman. Even today, different words are often used to refer to reproductive disability: Men are called impotent while women are called infertile.

In this context, a reference to the Seed of the Woman hints that there would emerge a human who did not emerge through sexual

reproduction. He would receive human DNA from the woman but not from a human father. Jesus received Eve mitochondrial DNA through Mary but God supernaturally created the father's DNA. Jesus Christ is the Seed of the Woman.

God's answer was the incarnation of Jesus Christ. Christ was not conceived through sexual reproduction, so His humanity was not the transmission of the corrupt human nature of Adam. Christ maternal DNA was taken from Mary and set apart by the Holy Spirit as the maternal contribution. The DNA of the father was created ex nihilo by the Holy Spirit and woven together with Mary's contribution. Because of Jesus unique conception, he was not a child of Adam, but a second Adam. Christ had an uncorrupted human nature and a divine nature as the foundation of his life. Those who become connected with His human nature become rooted the divine nature as the foundation for their life.

Romans 5:12–20 reveal to us that Jesus Christ is the second Adam (also 1 Corinthians 15:45–49). In the same way that Adam's corrupted humanity brought death and decadence directly to all his descendant and indirectly to the rest of creation, so Christ's perfect human nature will bring life directly to Christ's descendants.

For centuries, the church has historically viewed The fall of man, i. e. Adam's transgression, as the cause of moral and natural evil. At least since the days of Augustine, this was the dominant view of the church in

the West. While the Roman Catholics refer to this as the doctrine of Original Sin and Reformed Protestantism referred to it in terms of Total Depravity, most Evangelicals are more comfortable referring to this as the Fall of Man. One of the passages that was used to defend this idea was Romans 5:12–21.

In recent years this doctrine has come under heavy attack. In no small part, this is motivated by a desire to make the Bible compatible with the speculative inferences and assumptions of Old Earth theories and Evolutionary theory. If it is a fact that the earth is old (millions to billions) or if it is a fact that evolution is the authoritative narrative of natural history, then it follows that animal death has been around for a long time before the fall. This comes into direct conflict with traditional teaching concerning the fall of man.

At stake in this issue is the nature of God and the nature of morality. The standard Christian answer to the problem of evil is that Satan's – then man's – rebellion introduced evil into the world. If death existed before Adam and if death was an original part of creation, then it follows that either God is not good (He would be a masochist), or Judeo-Christian morality is not an accurate way to view moral issues.

Those who seek to conform the Bible to scientific speculations have sought loopholes in the passages. They allege that the traditional view cannot be right because:

-1 If Adam's sin caused corruption in creation or death to animals, then the atonement must apply to animals. (straw man).

-2 Death in Romans 5 can only mean spiritual death. (In this quasi-Gnostic view, God is not interested in the body, only the spirit).

In this article, I will focus on the exegesis of Romans 5:12–21 and compare it to the bigger picture presented in chapters 6–8. I will show that:

-1 Adam's sin directly made all of his descendants sinner – and with that brought spiritual and physical death.

-2 As a consequences of bringing physical death to man, the entire eco-system was infected with death.

-3 Jesus Christ reverses the curse of Adam on humanity.

-4 As a consequence of applying the redemption of humanity to the physical bodies of believers, the creation is restored to a pristine state that is free of death.

With that in mind, here is the verse-by-verse commentary, starting with Romans 5:12.

12 Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all people, because all sinned

—

This is introducing the concept that Adam's sin made all of his descendants sinners. Verse 19 explains this explicitly.

13 To be sure, sin was in the world before the law was given, but sin is not charged against anyone's account where there is no law. 14 Nevertheless, death reigned from the time of Adam to the time of Moses, even over those who did not sin by breaking a command, as did Adam, who is a pattern of the one to come.

Paul is giving a proof that those between Adam and Moses were sinners. Because the Law was not yet given, there was no basis for specific charges of command-breaking (One must first be commanded before one can be guilty of breaking them). These people, however, possessed a human nature that was corrupted by Adam's transgression – a nature that was biased towards command-breaking the moment a command was given. Paul uses death as a proof that these people were sinners. If death was limited to spiritual death, then Paul's statement is not falsifiable – and therefore useless as proof. If death was already normative in the eco-system, then humans would have likely died from exposure to that eco-system regardless of whether they sinned – Paul's statement would be useless as proof. Physical death, however, is falsifiable. Paul use of death is proof only works if death includes physical death and death is introduced into a system relatively free of death before the fall. While the focus is man, this idea also has implications for creation. Genesis 3 confirms that Adam's sin affected creation when it is written that God cursed the ground for man's sake. With that curse came death to the rest of creation.

15 But the gift is not like the trespass. For if the many died by the trespass of the one man, how much more did God's grace and the gift that came by the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, overflow to the many! 16 Nor can the gift of God be compared with the result of one man's sin: The judgment followed one sin and brought condemnation, but the gift followed many trespasses and brought justification. 17 For if, by the trespass of the one man, death reigned through that one man, how much more will those who receive God's abundant provision of

grace and of the gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man, Jesus Christ!

This is simply saying that Christ reversed the curse of Adam.

18 Consequently, just as one trespass resulted in condemnation for all people, so also one righteous act resulted in justification and life for all people. 19 For just as through the disobedience of the one man the many were made sinners, so also through the obedience of the one man the many will be made righteous.

This is comparing the universal scope of Adam's sin upon his descendants to the universal scope of Christ upon the redeemed. The universality of both of these is relative. Adam's corruption was passed on only to his descendants through sexual reproduction; Christ perfect human nature was replicated only to believers through spiritual reproduction that occurs when the word of God is mixed with faith. All other effects of either are indirect.

20 The law was brought in so that the trespass might increase. But where sin increased, grace increased all the more, 21 so that, just as sin reigned in death, so also grace might reign through righteousness to bring eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Paul is comparing the power of sin to the power of grace. sin reigned through death, while grace reigns through righteousness to eternal life.

Chapters 6–8 continues the theme of human redemption. Chapter 6:1–10 instruct us in how the corrupt human nature is destroyed and replaced with a perfect human nature. Chapter 7 begins with an illustration from marriage to show that our relation with Christ is a

marriage whose purpose is for use “to bear fruit unto God.” This fruit is the result of mixing the Word of the gospel with our faith, resulting in good works (Ephesians 2:8–9; Romans 1:16–17, etc.) The latter part of chapter 7 shows the futility of trying to live the Christian life in the power of the flesh.

Chapter 8 begins with instruction that the functioning of this new nature, called the law of the Spirit of life, is actually the Holy Spirit working inside the believer. The difference between the regenerated person and the unregenerate is the leading and work of the Holy Spirit. The connection to the Holy Spirit is the difference between the new nature and the old.

Starting in verse 18, the text instructs us on the redemption of the bodies of believers. Unlike Gnosticism and quasi-Gnostic theories where God is interested in only the spiritual, the Judeo-Christian God is also interested in the body. We are instructed that the restoration of creation is tethered to the redemption of the body.

18 I consider that our present sufferings are not worth comparing with the glory that will be revealed in us. 19 For the creation waits in eager expectation for the children of God to be revealed. 20 For the creation was subjected to frustration, not by its own choice, but by the will of the one who subjected it, in hope 21 that[h] the creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the freedom and glory of the children of God.

22 We know that the whole creation has been groaning as in the pains of

childbirth right up to the present time. 23 Not only so, but we ourselves, who have the firstfruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly as we wait eagerly for our adoption to sonship, the redemption of our bodies. 24 For in this hope we were saved. But hope that is seen is no hope at all. Who hopes for what they already have? 25 But if we hope for what we do not yet have, we wait for it patiently. – Romans 8:18–25

How do we connect with Christ. We come to Christ through faith (John 3:16; John 6; Rom3–4; Romans 10:9; Ephesians 2:8–9). When God's Word is combined with faith, a new child of God is created in Christ (Rom 7:1–4; 1 Peter 1:23; Hebrews 4:3). Whereas Adam reproduced through sexual reproduction of the flesh, Christ reproduces through the union of the word of God and faith.

When we come to Christ by faith, we are united with Him in his death, which destroys the corrupt human nature. We are also united with the human nature of Christ in Christ's resurrection. The result is that the corrupt human nature is put down by means of the new nature of Christ becomes alive in us.

Noahic Covenant

The story of Noah begins with a damning indictment of an almost totally corrupt human race. The narrative bluntly assert that corrupt humanity

has “filled the earth with violence.” The only thing left for a just God to do was to execute judgment.

⁵ Then the Lord^[b] saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every intent of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. ⁶ And the Lord was sorry that He had made man on the earth, and He was grieved in His heart. ⁷ So the Lord said, “I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth, both man and beast, creeping thing and birds of the air, for I am sorry that I have made them.”

- Genesis 6:5-7

Noah stood out as a grand exception to this indictment. Noah is portrayed as a just and righteous man in the midst of a crooked generation. Noah’s righteousness is framed here in terms of finding grace from God. Noah found grace with God and walked with God. God was the foundation and center of Noah rather than self.

⁸ But Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord. ⁹ This is the genealogy of Noah. Noah was a just man, perfect in his generations. Noah walked with God. ¹⁰ And Noah begot three sons: Shem, Ham, and Japheth. - Genesis 6:8-10

Because Noah found grace, he was the recipient of deliverance. God told him to build an ark and gave instruction on how to save his family and 2 or 7 of every major animal group.

¹¹ The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence. ¹² So God looked upon the earth, and indeed it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted their way on the earth. ¹³ And God said to Noah, “The end of all flesh has come before Me, for the earth is filled with violence through them; and behold, I will destroy them with the earth.

¹⁴ Make yourself an ark of gopherwood; make rooms in the ark, and cover it inside and outside with pitch. ¹⁵ And this is how you shall make it: The length of the ark shall be three hundred cubits, its width fifty cubits, and its height thirty cubits. ¹⁶ You shall make a window for the ark, and you shall finish it to a cubit from above; and set the door of the ark in its side. You shall make it with lower, second, and third decks. ¹⁷ And behold, I Myself am bringing floodwaters on the earth, to destroy from under heaven all flesh in which is the breath of life; everything that is on the earth shall die.

¹⁸ But I will establish My covenant with you; and you shall go into the ark —you, your sons, your wife, and your sons' wives with you. ¹⁹ And of every living thing of all flesh you shall bring two of every sort into the ark, to keep them alive with you; they shall be male and female. ²⁰ Of the birds after their kind, of animals after their kind, and of every creeping thing of the earth after its kind, two of every kind will come to you to keep them alive. ²¹ And you shall take for yourself of all food that is eaten, and you shall gather it to yourself; and it shall be food for you and for them.” – Genesis 6:11–21

There are two concepts concerning God's dealing with Noah that exist coherently across both Testaments. There was a vessel for deliverance of a remnant and there was an ending of the world by judgment.

The ark was the vessel for deliverance from the end of the ancient world brought about by the global flood. In the same way that the ark preserved those in it, Christ preserves those in Him when judgment comes upon the earth at his Second Coming. **Noah's Ark is a type for Christ.**

¹⁹ by whom also He went and preached to the spirits in prison, ²⁰ who formerly were disobedient, when once the Divine longsuffering waited ^[a] in the days of Noah, while the ark was being prepared, in which a few, that is, eight souls, were saved through water. ²¹ There is also an

antitype which now saves us—baptism (not the removal of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), through the resurrection of Jesus Christ,²² who has gone into heaven and is at the right hand of God, angels and authorities and powers having been made subject to Him. – 1 Peter 3:19–22

The coming of the flood in the days of Noah resulted in an abrupt end to all civilization that was extant upon the earth. Noah and the seven that were with him had to rebuild another civilization to replace the one that was destroyed in judgment. In the same way the Second coming of Jesus Christ will bring an abrupt end to the kingdoms of this world and replace them with the Kingdom of God upon the earth. **The flood is a type for the Second Coming of Christ.** Christ Himself makes this connection. He paint a picture of the Second coming as disrupting normal pattern of civilized life:

³⁶ “But of that day and hour no one knows, not even the angels of heaven,^[e] but My Father only. ³⁷ But as the days of Noah were, so also will the coming of the Son of Man be. ³⁸ For as in the days before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered the ark, ³⁹ and did not know until the flood came and took them all away, so also will the coming of the Son of Man be. ⁴⁰ Then two men will be in the field: one will be taken and the other left. ⁴¹ Two women will be grinding at the mill: one will be taken and the other left. ⁴² Watch therefore, for you do not know what hour^[f] your Lord is coming. ⁴³ But know this, that if the master of the

house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched and not allowed his house to be broken into.⁴⁴ Therefore you also be ready, for the Son of Man is coming at an hour you do not expect. – Matthew 24:36–44

Abrahamic Covenant

Beginning with Abraham, God began to set apart for Himself a people. God taught a proto-gospel to Abraham. While this gospel is missing biographical information about Jesus Christ, it contains the key elements of the gospel: justification by faith, substitutionary atonement, a special descendant through which all families of the earth will be blessed, and an everlasting priesthood to mediate between man and God.

The doctrine of Justification by Faith, which is a cornerstone of the gospel message presented by Paul the apostle, is a very old doctrine. Genesis 15:6 instructs us that Abraham “*believed in the Lord, and He accounted it to him for righteousness.*” In Romans 4, Paul develops this concept into the doctrine of Justification by Faith that is a cornerstone of New Testament Christianity.

On one occasion God tested Abraham. He told Abraham to sacrifice Isaac (Genesis 22). God was not really interested in receiving Isaac’s blood as atonement, but God was testing Abraham and revealing a great truth concerning human redemption. When the altar was set up but no sacrifice was available, Isaac asked Abraham about what was going to be

used for the sacrifice. Abraham replied with a great prophetic truth. “***My son, God will provide for Himself the lamb for a burnt offering*** (Genesis 22:8).” This is the essence of the gospel message. God has provided the Lamb that takes the sins of the world: Jesus Christ.

God, when he calls Abraham, gives him a special promise, that through his seed all of the nations of the earth shall be blessed. Genesis 22:15–19, which contains this promise, reads like a national covenant. The descendant of Abraham shall become a mighty nation that shall number “***as the stars of the heaven and as the sand which is on the seashore,***” ***possess the gate of their enemies,*** and be a blessing to all nations.

¹⁵ Then the Angel of the Lord called to Abraham a second time out of heaven, ¹⁶ and said: “By Myself I have sworn, says the Lord, because you have done this thing, and have not withheld your son, your only son—¹⁷ blessing I will bless you, and multiplying I will multiply your descendants as the stars of the heaven and as the sand which is on the seashore; and your descendants shall possess the gate of their enemies.

¹⁸ In your seed all the nations of the earth shall be blessed, because you have obeyed My voice.” ¹⁹ So Abraham returned to his young men, and they rose and went together to Beersheba; and Abraham dwelt at Beersheba. – Genesis 22:25–19

The promise is given to Abraham’s seed as a collective singular. Gen 21 provides qualifications to this. This is not being automatically given to everyone who receives ancestral DNA from Abraham. A specified

singular seed is in view here, with other descendant of Abraham receiving the promise only by virtue of their relationship to the specified seed. In 21:12, we are instructed that “*in Isaac your seed shall be called.*” This meant that Isaac held the rights that pertain to the descendants of Abraham and was the source of other descendants’ claim to the inheritance of Abraham. This unique set of privileges can be thought as the birthright and the blessing/sceptre. These privileges were passed down from father to son, who was seen as the unity of the entire family and nation. Jacob took both the blessing and birthright from Esau. When Jacob pronounced his blessings on his sons before he died, he says something of special importance concerning Judah. Jacob splits the blessing between Joseph and Judah. Joseph gets the birthright and Judah gets the blessing, which is renamed the sceptre (1 Chronicles 5:2).

⁸ “Judah, you are he whom your brothers shall praise; Your hand shall be on the neck of your enemies; Your father’s children shall bow down before you.⁹ Judah is a lion’s whelp; From the prey, my son, you have gone up. He bows down, he lies down as a lion; And as a lion, who shall rouse him?¹⁰ The scepter shall not depart from Judah, Nor a lawgiver from between his feet, Until Shiloh comes; And to Him shall be the obedience of the people.

Judah was given the right to rule “until Shiloh comes.” Shiloh is a person as he is the beneficiary of “obedience of the people.” As the descendants of Abraham possess “the gate of their enemies,” meaning that they will rule over their enemies, this promise is fulfilled in Shiloh. Shiloh is the seed of Abraham who holds the sceptre, blessing, and birthright. The

seed of Abraham is then to be reckoned as Shiloh. In Galatians 3:15–18, Paul the apostle makes the argument that the promise to Abraham was to a single seed of Abraham. Shiloh is known in the New Testament as Jesus Christ. Christ is the seed of Abraham.

When Abraham looted those who looted Sodom, he paid tithes to Melchizedek. He is identified as King of Salem (king of peace) and priest of God Most High. The priesthood of Melchizedek is one of two priesthoods mentioned in the Bible; the other is the Levitical priesthood. Melchizedek was the deliverer of the promise of God to Abraham. This blessing was the basis of every right possessed by the children of Abraham, including the rights of the Levitical priesthood.

⁸ Then Melchizedek king of Salem brought out bread and wine; he was the priest of God Most High. ¹⁹ And he blessed him and said: "Blessed be Abram of God Most High, Possessor of heaven and earth," ²⁰ And blessed be God Most High, Who has delivered your enemies into your hand." And he gave him a tithe of all.

It is widely believed amongst Bible scholars, including this author, that Melchizedek is a theophany. A theophany is an Old Testament appearance of Christ. What we do know is that Christ is a high priest in

the order of Melchizedek, which is based on an indestructible life of the priest. The fact that the priesthood of Melchizedek is to be an enduring priesthood was prefigured in the Psalms. Psalm 110 begins with a word given in Psalm 2, which is God's promise to His son that He would rule all nations with a rod of iron as the King of the whole earth. This King will also be an eternal priest.

"The LORD said to my Lord, "Sit at My right hand, Till I make Your enemies Your footstool." 2 The LORD shall send the rod of Your strength out of Zion. Rule in the midst of Your enemies! 3 Your people shall be volunteers In the day of Your power; In the beauties of holiness, from the womb of the morning, You have the dew of Your youth.

4 The LORD has sworn And will not relent, "You are a priest forever According to the order of Melchizedek." 5 The Lord is at Your right hand; He shall execute kings in the day of His wrath. 6 He shall judge among the nations, He shall fill the places with dead bodies, He shall execute the heads of many countries. 7 He shall drink of the brook by the wayside; Therefore He shall lift up the head."- Psalm 110 NKJV

Hebrews explains how Christ is the High Priest in the priestly order of Melchizedek. The Levitical priesthood was based on ancestral connection to Aaron, Moses brother. The Levitical priesthood was weaker in that death ended the priesthood of a priest. The priesthood in the priestly

order of Melchizedek is based on an indestructible life, and as such cannot end.

For this Melchizedek, king of Salem, priest of the Most High God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings and blessed him, 2 to whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all, first being translated “king of righteousness,” and then also king of Salem, meaning “king of peace,” 3 without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like the Son of God, remains a priest continually.

4 Now consider how great this man was, to whom even the patriarch Abraham gave a tenth of the spoils. 5 And indeed those who are of the sons of Levi, who receive the priesthood, have a commandment to receive tithes from the people according to the law, that is, from their brethren, though they have come from the loins of Abraham; 6 but he whose genealogy is not derived from them received tithes from Abraham and blessed him who had the promises. 7 Now beyond all contradiction the lesser is blessed by the better. 8 Here mortal men receive tithes, but there he receives them, of whom it is witnessed that he lives. 9 Even Levi, who receives tithes, paid tithes through Abraham, so to speak, 10 for he was still in the loins of his father when Melchizedek met him.

11 Therefore, if perfection were through the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law), what further need was there that

another priest should rise according to the order of Melchizedek, and not be called according to the order of Aaron? 12 For the priesthood being changed, of necessity there is also a change of the law. 13 For He of whom these things are spoken belongs to another tribe, from which no man has officiated at the altar.

14 For it is evident that our Lord arose from Judah, of which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning priesthood. 15 And it is yet far more evident if, in the likeness of Melchizedek, there arises another priest 16 who has come, not according to the law of a fleshly commandment, but according to the power of an endless life. 17 For He testifies: "You are a priest forever According to the order of Melchizedek.

- Hebrews 7:1-17

In verse 9, we read that the Levitical priesthood is dependent on the Melchizedek priesthood. Levi did not literally pay tithes to Melchizedek, but the Levitical priesthood depended on Abraham receiving the blessing, and Abraham depended on Melchizedek as the means by which God fulfilled his promise to Abraham. Melchizedek spoke the blessing on Abraham God had promised. Therefore the validity of the Levitical priesthood depended on the validity of the priesthood of Melchizedek, which is a never-ending priesthood. By the inclusion of the account of the Melchizedek blessing upon Abraham in the books of the Torah Law, the Levitical priesthood recognizes the superior authority of the priesthood of Melchizedek, of which Christ is High Priest forevermore.

Mosaic Covenant

Four hundred and thirty years after God appeared to Abraham, the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the Israelites, are slaves in Egypt. God raises up Moses to deliver them from bondage. Moses delivers the Israelites to the land God promised to Abraham. Moses then mediates a covenant between God and the new nation of Israel.

There are two distinct features of the Mosaic Covenant. The Mosaic Covenant is uniquely breachable, and those perfectly faithful receive a New Covenant with God.

Jesus was faithful to the Mosaic Covenant at the same time that Israel breached the Covenant. Faithful recipient of New Covenant. Deuteronomy 28–29 contains the sentence for breaching the Mosaic Covenant. The sentence was being removed from the land AND scattered amongst all nations. This happened between 70–135 AD. The last straw in Israel's disobedience was ruthless murdering God's son who was sent to be her Messiah. Christ Himself pronounced judgment upon Israel for rejecting Him

37 "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, the one who kills the prophets and stones those who are sent to her! How often I wanted to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, but you were not willing! 38 See! Your house is left to you desolate; 39 for I say to you,

you shall see Me no more till you say, 'Blessed is He who comes in the name of the LORD!' "

Then Jesus went out and departed from the temple, and His disciples came up to show Him the buildings of the temple. 2 And Jesus said to them, "Do you not see all these things? Assuredly, I say to you, not one stone shall be left here upon another, that shall not be thrown down."

- Matthew 23:37-24:2

At the same time that Israel was breaching the covenant, there was one who was faithful as a Son in God's house. Jesus Christ lived a sinless life in obedience to God while on this earth (2 Corinthians 5:20-21, Romans 8:3; Hebrews 4:14-15). There is a provision on the Mosaic Covenant that allows the faithful to be joined to the Lord in a covenant community not subject to the barrier imposed by the Mosaic Covenant. Under the Mosaic covenant in numerous other places, only the Levites (descendants of Levi, a son of Jacob) could be priests, but under a provision on Exodus 19:5-6 all who are faithful can receive membership in a royal priesthood that does NOT depend on their physical descent from Levi.

⁵ Now therefore, if you will indeed obey My voice and keep My covenant, then you shall be a special treasure to Me above all people; for all the earth is Mine. ⁶ And you shall be to Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.' These are the words which you shall speak to the children of Israel."

- Exodus 19:5-6

Because Christ was faithful, he received this promise. He became a nation of kings and priests while the rest of Israel was cut off for breaching the Mosaic Covenant. Because Christ was faithful, those who are in Christ become kings and priests in a New Covenant (1 Peter 2:9; Revelation 1:6; chapters 4-5).

Because Jesus was faithful in God's household, He received the rights of covenant community that stand independent of the Mosaic Covenant. He is similar to Moses in that He, like Moses, is authorized to create a covenant community. The Mosaic Covenant anticipated that such a person would exist. In Deuteronomy 18:15-19, Moses instructs the people that the Lord told him that He would raise up another Prophet like Moses. The people were to give Him unconditional obedience or suffer the consequences.

¹⁵ "The Lord your God will raise up for you a Prophet like me from your midst, from your brethren. Him you shall hear, ¹⁶ according to all you desired of the Lord your God in Horebin the day of the assembly, saying, 'Let me not hear again the voice of the Lord my God, nor let me see this great fire anymore, lest I die.'

¹⁷ "And the Lord said to me: 'What they have spoken is good. ¹⁸ I will raise up for them a Prophet like you from among their brethren, and will put My words in His mouth, and He shall speak to them all that I

command Him. ¹⁹ And it shall be that whoever will not hear My words, which He speaks in My name, I will require it of him. –Deuteronomy 18:15–19

Acts discloses that Jesus is the Prophet like unto Moses

¹⁹ Repent therefore and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, so that times of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord,
²⁰ and that He may send Jesus Christ, who was preached to you before,
²¹ whom heaven must receive until the times of restoration of all things, which God has spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began. ²² For Moses truly said to the fathers, ‘The Lord your God will raise up for you a Prophet like me from your brethren. Him you shall hear in all things, whatever He says to you.’ ²³ And it shall be that every soul who will not hear that Prophet shall be utterly destroyed from among the people.’ ²⁴ Yes, and all the prophets, from Samuel and those who follow, as many as have spoken, have also foretold these days.
²⁵ You are sons of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying to Abraham, ‘And in your seed all the families of the earth shall be blessed. – Acts 3:19–25

Mosaic Covenant expresses the concept of substitutionary atonement at great length. Substitutionary atonement is necessary because sin carries with it the consequence of death. The theme of Ezekiel 18 is that “*the*

soul that sins shall die.” how shall the sinner be spared death. In the Mosaic Covenant, animals were slaughtered in the place of sinners. Leviticus 17:10–14 explains why animals are slaughtered to atone for sin. The Bible explains that the life is in the blood, and that the blood is given for atonement. The animal’s life is taken by the shedding of its blood in place of the blood of the sinner.

¹⁰ ‘And whatever man of the house of Israel, or of the strangers who dwell among you, who eats any blood, I will set My face against that person who eats blood, and will cut him off from among his people.

¹¹ For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement for the soul.’ ¹² Therefore I said to the children of Israel, ‘No one among you shall eat blood, nor shall any stranger who dwells among you eat blood.’

¹³ “Whatever man of the children of Israel, or of the strangers who dwell among you, who hunts and catches any animal or bird that may be eaten, he shall pour out its blood and cover it with dust; ¹⁴ for it is the life of all flesh. Its blood sustains its life. Therefore I said to the children of Israel, ‘You shall not eat the blood of any flesh, for the life of all flesh is its blood. Whoever eats it shall be cut off.’– Leviticus 17:10–14

Animals, however, were not an adequate substitute because animals are not equal to humanity. There was the necessity of a perfect human. Isaiah 53 describes such a human whose suffering made atonement for sin.

⁴ Surely He has borne our griefs
And carried our sorrows; Yet we
esteemed Him stricken,
Smitten by God, and afflicted.⁵ But He
was wounded for our transgressions,
He was bruised for our
iniquities; The chastisement for our peace
was upon Him, And by His
stripes we are healed.⁶ All we like sheep
have gone astray; We have
turned, every one, to his own way;
And the Lord has laid on Him the
iniquity of us all.

⁷ He was oppressed and He was afflicted,
Yet He opened not His
mouth; He was led as a lamb to the slaughter,
And as a sheep before its
shearers is silent, So He opened not His
mouth.⁸ He was taken from
prison and from judgment,
And who will declare His generation?
For He was cut off from the land of the
living; For the transgressions of My
people He was stricken.⁹ And they made
His grave with the wicked—
But with the rich at His death,
Because He had done no violence,
Nor was any deceit in His mouth.

¹⁰ Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him;
He has put Him to grief. **When
You make His soul an offering for sin,
He shall see His seed, He shall
prolong His days,** And the pleasure of
the Lord shall prosper in His
hand.¹¹ He shall see the labor of His
soul, and be satisfied. By His
knowledge My righteous Servant shall
justify many, For He shall bear
their iniquities.¹² Therefore I will
divide Him a portion with the great,
And He shall divide the spoil with the
strong, Because He poured out His soul

unto death, And He was numbered with the transgressors, And He bore the sin of many, And made intercession for the transgressors. – Isaiah 53:4–12

Isaiah 53 prefigures both the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ. This suffering servant who dies shall “**shall see *His* seed, He shall prolong *His* days,**” implying that God raises Him from the dead. Where animals could never take away sins, but merely cover until a sufficient act of atonement and redemption could be accomplished. What animals could not do through repeated sacrifices, Christ did once and for all through the sacrifice of Himself.

For the law, having a shadow of the good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with these same sacrifices, which they offer continually year by year, make those who approach perfect.² For then would they not have ceased to be offered? For the worshipers, once purified, would have had no more consciousness of sins.³ But in those sacrifices there is a reminder of sins every year.⁴ For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats could take away sins...

⁸ Previously saying, “Sacrifice and offering, burnt offerings, and offerings for sin You did not desire, nor had pleasure in them” (which are offered according to the law),⁹ then He said, “Behold, I have come to do Your will, O God.” He takes away the first that He may establish the second.¹⁰ By that will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.¹¹ And every priest stands ministering daily and offering repeatedly the same sacrifices, which can

never take away sins. ¹² But this Man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down at the right hand of God, ¹³ from that time waiting till His enemies are made His footstool. ¹⁴ For by one offering He has perfected forever those who are being sanctified. – Hebrews 10:1–4,8–14

Christ fulfills the seven feasts God gave to Israel through the Mosaic Covenant. The Mosaic Covenant in Leviticus 23 prescribes seven feasts that Israel was to observe. While these feasts are defined in the Mosaic Covenant, they are fulfilled in the New Testament. A study of these will show that Passover, Unleavened Bread, First Fruits, and Pentecost have already been fulfilled during the year that Christ rose from the dead through His actions and the birthing of the church; **the Feast of Trumpets is about to be fulfilled in the context of contemporary events**, followed by the Day of Atonement and the Feast of Tabernacles.

The Seven Feasts

“These are the Lord’s appointed festivals, the sacred assemblies you are to proclaim at their appointed times:

[– Leviticus 23:4 NIV](#)

Passover is seven days long. The first and the seventh days are sabbaths and sacred assemblies. Jesus was crucified during passover, which was the first day sacred assembly ([Luke 22–23](#)). After the Passover meal, they would celebrate the **Feast of Unleavened Bread**. Christ was buried during the first several days of this time.

The Lord's Passover begins at twilight on the fourteenth day of the first month. On the fifteenth day of that month the Lord's Festival of Unleavened Bread begins; for seven days you must eat it made without yeast. On the first day hold a sacred assembly and do no regular work. For seven days present a food offering to the Lord. And on the seventh day hold a sacred assembly and do no regular work."

[- Leviticus 23:5-8 NIV](#)

First Fruits is celebrated when the first sheaves are harvested. The first sheaf was to be dedicated at the temple. This represented the beginning of the harvest. Leviticus 23:11 established this date as the "day after the sabbath" of Passover. This could fall as early as the second day of the Passover week or it could fall as late as six days later; it fell on the third day when the special sabbath or "high sabbath" of day one fell before a regular sabbath day. This was the case the year Jesus was crucified. Christ rose from the dead on first fruits to represent the very first human being to partake in the resurrection and ascend into heaven. ([Luke 24](#)).

The Lord said to Moses, "Speak to the Israelites and say to them: 'When you enter the land I am going to give you and you reap its harvest, bring to the priest a sheaf of the first grain you harvest. He is to wave the sheaf before the Lord so it will be accepted on your behalf; the priest is to wave it on the day after the Sabbath. On the day you wave the sheaf, you must sacrifice as a burnt offering to the Lord a lamb a year old

without defect, together with its grain offering of two-tenths of an ephah of the finest flour mixed with olive oil—a food offering presented to the Lord, a pleasing aroma—and its drink offering of a quarter of a hin of wine. You must not eat any bread, or roasted or new grain, until the very day you bring this offering to your God. This is to be a lasting ordinance for the generations to come, wherever you live.

[- Leviticus 23:9-14 NIV](#)

Feast of Weeks, called **Pentecost** by Hellenistic Jews, is a celebration of the harvest. From the day of first fruits, including the day of first fruits, fifty days are counted. Jews call this “*counting the omer*.” A grain offering is offered each of these days. On the day of Pentecost, two loaves of bread that are baked with yeast from the harvested grain of the first fruits, are waved before the Lord. This bread was to be presented along with the grain that was presented each “day of the omer,” seven lambs, a male goat, and two young lambs.

All of the living things offered during this festival represent the great harvest of people into the kingdom of God. The grain represents those who were harvested during the great harvest of people into the kingdom of God. The living things that were destroyed through offering represent those who left the earthly life through the death of the earthly body. They will receive a resurrection body, but the earthly body was destroyed. Except for the loaves of the first fruits, all of the offerings involved the physical destruction of that offering.

The two loaves of the first fruits that were waved, however, became transformed by baking. Their earthly body did not become destroyed but transformed through the baking process. The believers represented by these two loaves will not suffer the destruction of their physical bodies, but will experience transformation of their bodies at the time of the general resurrection(1 Corinthians 15:51). Revelation 14:4 describes the 144,000 as the first fruits. They are “redeemed from the earth (vs 3).” The rapture/resurrection will redeem the people of God from the earth. Verse 4 describes condition of maturity: perfection in following Christ, perfection in integrity, perfection in lifestyle and holiness, and privileged access to the presence of God. There is a worship song that no one can learn except the 144,000. The 144,000 represent those who become living bodies become instantly transformed at the resurrection (1 Corinthians 15:51–53).

The church was born out of the sacred assembly of Pentecost. Jesus instructed them to wait in Jerusalem until they received power from God to be witnesses. [Luke 24:45–52](#) records that, after Jesus ascended into Heaven, that they went to the temple in Jerusalem and continuously praised God.

Then he opened their minds so they could understand the Scriptures. He told them, “This is what is written: The Messiah will suffer and rise

from the dead on the third day, and repentance for the forgiveness of sins will be preached in his name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. You are witnesses of these things. I am going to send you what my Father has promised; but stay in the city until you have been clothed with power from on high.”

When he had led them out to the vicinity of Bethany, he lifted up his hands and blessed them. While he was blessing them, he left them and was taken up into heaven. Then they worshiped him and returned to Jerusalem with great joy. And they stayed continually at the temple, praising God ([Luke 24:45–53](#)).

Acts 1 provides some additional information about the nature of the assembly. They met in an upper room of the place where they were staying and “*They all joined together constantly in prayer, along with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brothers* ([Acts 1:14 NIV](#)).”

On the day of Pentecost they were all gathered into one place – no doubt that would be the temple – as they were Jews. [Acts 2:1–4](#) records that on this day, the Holy Spirit was poured out, beginning the great harvest of souls for God.

“From the day after the Sabbath, the day you brought the sheaf of the wave offering, count off seven full weeks. Count off fifty days up to the day after the seventh Sabbath, and then present an offering of new grain to the Lord. From wherever you live, bring two loaves made of two-tenths of an ephah of the finest flour, baked with yeast, as a wave

offering of firstfruits to the Lord. Present with this bread seven male lambs, each a year old and without defect, one young bull and two rams. They will be a burnt offering to the Lord, together with their grain offerings and drink offerings—a food offering, an aroma pleasing to the Lord. Then sacrifice one male goat for a sin offering and two lambs, each a year old, for a fellowship offering. The priest is to wave the two lambs before the Lord as a wave offering, together with the bread of the firstfruits. They are a sacred offering to the Lord for the priest. On that same day you are to proclaim a sacred assembly and do no regular work. This is to be a lasting ordinance for the generations to come, wherever you live.

“When you reap the harvest of your land, do not reap to the very edges of your field or gather the gleanings of your harvest. Leave them for the poor and for the foreigner residing among you. I am the Lord your God.’ ”

[- Leviticus 23:15–22 NIV](#)

The first four feasts were fulfilled by Christ the year Christ rose from the dead. These feasts’ fulfillment was part of the former rain. The next three fulfillments are future, set to happen just before Jesus returns. A more detailed account of the significance of these feasts can be found in the last chapter, “[The Necessity of the Return of Christ.](#)”

Davidic Covenant

In Genesis 49, Jacob decrees that the sceptre shall not depart from Judah until Shiloh comes. As I wrote earlier concerning the Abrahamic Covenant and its fulfillment in Christ, This means Shiloh was a specific seed of Abraham who was to come out of the tribe of Judah.

While Israel began with a system of judges that ruled, the people eventually began to demand a king “like the other nations (1 Samuel 8).” God gave them a king. After the first king, Saul, was an epic failure, God sought out “a man after His own heart(1 Samuel 13:14).” David became king, and because he was faithful, God entered into a covenant with him to establish his dynasty as an everlasting dynasty that would rule all nations. David was promised to rule the world as God-king

The covenant was revealed to David through the prophet Nathan. The account is recorded in 2 Samuel 7:4–16. David, because of his faithfulness, is promised an eternally lasting dynasty. If David’s descendants sin, they would be chastised through judgments administered through men; this signified that Israel would undergo seasons of domination by foreign occupiers as judgment for national sin. David’s dynasty, however, would never suffer annihilation.

⁴ But it happened that night that the word of the Lord came to Nathan, saying, ⁵ “Go and tell My servant David, ‘Thus says the Lord: “Would you build a house for Me to dwell in? ⁶ For I have not dwelt in a house since

the time that I brought the children of Israel up from Egypt, even to this day, but have moved about in a tent and in a tabernacle. ⁷ Wherever I have moved about with all the children of Israel, have I ever spoken a word to anyone from the tribes of Israel, whom I commanded to shepherd My people Israel, saying, ‘Why have you not built Me a house of cedar?’” ⁸ Now therefore, thus shall you say to My servant David, ‘Thus says the Lord of hosts: “I took you from the sheepfold, from following the sheep, to be ruler over My people, over Israel. ⁹ And I have been with you wherever you have gone, and have cut off all your enemies from before you, and have made you a great name, like the name of the great men who are on the earth. ¹⁰ Moreover I will appoint a place for My people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own and move no more; nor shall the sons of wickedness oppress them anymore, as previously, ¹¹ since the time that I commanded judges to be over My people Israel, and have caused you to rest from all your enemies. Also the Lord tells you that He will make you a house.

¹² “When your days are fulfilled and you rest with your fathers, I will set up your seed after you, who will come from your body, and I will establish his kingdom. ¹³ He shall build a house for My name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. ¹⁴ I will be his Father, and he shall be My son. If he commits iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men and with the blows of the sons of men. ¹⁵ But My mercy shall not depart from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I removed from before

you. ¹⁶ And your house and your kingdom shall be established forever before you. ^[b] Your throne shall be established forever.”” – 2 Samuel 7:4–16

The prophecy that was delivered to David was not very specific. It only promised an eternal dynasty; it did not specify whether there would be an infinite series of mortal kings or whether there would be a final descendant of David who would reign eternally. It did not provide any information about whether this descendant would be mortal or a God-king. Other passages in Scripture provide additional information that reveals that there is a coming Son of David who would be a God-king.

In Isaiah, there is additional information about the Son of David who would rule eternally. This passage specifies that He is to be a God-King. He is called “Mighty God” and “Everlasting Father.” These are titles that imply deity.

For unto us a Child is born, Unto us a Son is given; And the government will be upon His shoulder. And His name will be called Wonderful, Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace.⁷ Of the increase of His government and peace There will be no end, Upon the throne of David and over His kingdom, To order it and establish it with judgment and justice From that time forward, even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this. – Isaiah 9:6–9

God is presented throughout Scripture as a jealous God who will not share His glory with another. Such titles would not be used on a mere mortal king. Psalm 45 is a Psalm of praise and worship to the King; **this**

Psalm directs people to worship the King. Such worship would be a command to commit idolatry and worship strange gods if this King is not truly God. Verses 6–7 presents this king as a God–King. Verse 6 address Him as eternal God. Verse 7 identifies Him as a God–Man. He is identified as one who is anointed **“With the oil of gladness more than Your companions,”** classifying Him as the greatest amongst humanity. He is also clearly identified as God in a way clearly understood in the New Testament. He is identified as God who is also the son/servant of God. When the passage asserts that **“Therefore God [the son], Your God [The heavenly Father],”** It is identifying the Heavenly Father/Son of God relation within the godhead.

My heart is overflowing with a good theme; I recite my composition concerning the King; My tongue is the pen of a ready writer.² You are fairer than the sons of men; Grace is poured upon Your lips; Therefore God has blessed You forever.³ Gird Your sword upon Your thigh, O Mighty One, With Your glory and Your majesty.⁴ And in Your majesty ride prosperously because of truth, humility, and righteousness; And Your right hand shall teach You awesome things.⁵ Your arrows are sharp in the heart of the King’s enemies; The peoples fall under You.

⁶ Your throne, O God, is forever and ever; A scepter of righteousness is the scepter of Your kingdom.⁷ You love righteousness and hate wickedness; **Therefore God, Your God, has anointed You With the oil of gladness more than Your companions.**⁸ All Your garments are

scented with myrrh and aloes and cassia, Out of the ivory palaces, by which they have made You glad.⁹ Kings' daughters are among Your honorable women; At Your right hand stands the queen in gold from Ophir.

¹⁰ Listen, O daughter, Consider and incline your ear; Forget your own people also, and your father's house;¹¹ So the King will greatly desire your beauty; Because He is your Lord, worship Him.¹² And the daughter of Tyre will come with a gift; The rich among the people will seek your favor.¹³ The royal daughter is all glorious within the palace; Her clothing is woven with gold.¹⁴ She shall be brought to the King in robes of many colors; The virgins, her companions who follow her, shall be brought to You.¹⁵ With gladness and rejoicing they shall be brought; They shall enter the King's palace.¹⁶ Instead of Your fathers shall be Your sons, Whom You shall make princes in all the earth.¹⁷ I will make Your name to be remembered in all generations; Therefore the people shall praise You forever and ever. – Psalm 45

Psalms 45 prophesies that there is coming a God-Man. The revelation that a God-Man will enter into history as a future Son of David. Psalm 110 begins with a verse that Jesus uses to confound the Pharisees who were wont to deny that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. Jesus asks "***David then calls Him*** [Christ] '***Lord,***' ***how is He his Son?*** (Matthew 22:41-45)." If

the Christ or Messiah is a mere human, it would make no sense for David to refer to a prophesied future descendant as "Lord." It only makes sense for David to call his Son Lord if his Son is a God-Man.

The Lord said to my Lord, "Sit at My right hand, Till I make Your enemies Your footstool."² The Lord shall send the rod of Your strength out of Zion. Rule in the midst of Your enemies!³ Your people shall be volunteers in the day of Your power; In the beauties of holiness, from the womb of the morning, You have the dew of Your youth.

⁴ The Lord has sworn and will not relent, "You are a priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek."⁵ The Lord is at Your right hand; He shall execute kings in the day of His wrath.⁶ He shall judge among the nations, He shall fill the places with dead bodies, He shall execute the heads of many countries.⁷ He shall drink of the brook by the wayside; Therefore He shall lift up the head. - Psalm 110

God is sending to the earth His Messiah - a God-Man - as the son of David to rule. This rule is not limited to Israel, but will include the whole earth. Christ will rule all nations.

Why do the nations rage, and the people plot a vain thing?² The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord and against His Anointed, saying,³ "Let us break Their bonds in pieces and cast away Their cords from us."⁴ He who sits in the heavens shall laugh; The Lord shall hold them in derision.⁵ Then He shall speak to

them in His wrath, And distress them in His deep displeasure:⁶ “Yet I have set My King On My holy hill of Zion.”

⁷ “I will declare the decree: The Lord has said to Me, ‘You are My Son, Today I have begotten You.’⁸ Ask of Me, and I will give You The nations for Your inheritance, And the ends of the earth for Your possession.⁹ You shall break them with a rod of iron; You shall dash them to pieces like a potter’s vessel.”¹⁰ Now therefore, be wise, O kings; Be instructed, you judges of the earth.¹¹ Serve the Lord with fear, And rejoice with trembling.¹² Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, And you perish in the way, When His wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all those who put their trust in Him. – Psalm 2

Jesus Christ is the son of David who is the God-Man. Christ was conceived of a virgin through the agency of the Holy Spirit. The father’s DNA was created ex nihilo by the Holy Spirit, and the mother DNA was that of Mary. Christ is related physically to David through Mary’s DNA, legally to David through Joseph, and metaphysically related to God through the DNA created ex nihilo by the Holy Spirit; The Spirit that animates his inner man is the Spirit of God. Because Jesus DNA is human, He is human, and because the spirit of Jesus is the Spirit of God, He is God. Jesus is the God-Man.

Conclusion

The entire Old Testament coherently points to Jesus Christ as the Messiah who came to be the Lord and Savior of the human race. This is seen from beginning to end and in every covenantal context. Jesus Christ is:

1. The Seed of the Woman
2. The Living Ark (Like Noah's ark)
3. The Lamb that God provided
4. The Seed of Abraham - Shiloh
5. The High Priest in the order of Melchizedek
6. The Prophet Like Unto Moses
7. The Son of David who rules as the God-King
8. The seven feasts given to Moses were/will be fulfilled in Christ.

The conceptual framework of the gospel was well established in the Old Testament. Concepts such as justification by faith, substitutionary atonement, corruption of human nature, and redemption are all contained the Old Testament. While the books of Scripture are written to address diverse contexts, God speaks his essential message through these with a clear and coherent voice. The Bible contains the voice of God.

23 How to Properly Approach Empirical Evidence.

In this chapter and the next, historical evidence supporting inspiration will be examined. What is in view here is whether the Scriptures accurately handle historical accounts.

There is a word of caution that applies to all empirical and evidentiary studies: We do not have all of the evidence; furthermore, we cannot have all of the evidence that could possibly exist. Because there are gaps in the knowledge that we gather through the senses, then there will be discrepancies when things are viewed at a microscopic level. This is a feature of every narrative and every world-view.

What this means is that the cherry-pick and proof-text approach to analysis of empirical data simply does not give a good picture. This is where one simply culls out of all the evidence only those points that are useful to one's biases. One can find difficulties in every world-view at a microscopic level by cherry-picking evidence out of its context. One can also by means of cherry-picking find evidence to support even the most asinine views.

A good analogy for understanding the limitations and proper value of the role of empirical evidence is that of an image. The image is made up of a finite number of points or pixels. When one zooms out to view the whole picture, a meaningful image emerges. If the image is of sufficiently high quality, then one can zoom in somewhat and get a more detailed look. No matter how high the quality of the picture, as long as it

has a finite number of pixels it is possible to zoom in far enough that the view becomes pixelated or blurry. When an image becomes pixelated or blurry, one ceases to view it as a meaningful image. Our knowledge of the image breaks down at the microscopic level.

The Scriptures address these epistemological limits to human knowledge. This issue is addressed in 1 Corinthians 13:9–12, which describes current limits of human epistemology.

“For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. 10 But when that which is perfect [complete] is come, then that which is in part shall be done away. 11 When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things. 12 For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.”

– 1 Corinthians 13:9–12

This passage says that we have partial knowledge of the things of God. This makes sense, as God is infinite and humans are finite. Humanity, in the current mortal flesh, cannot grasp exhaustively the knowledge of God in both its breadth and depth. Communication between an infinite person and finite persons created in the image of the infinite person is possible because the finite person has the same categories as the Infinite Person. The finite person, however, has neither the storage capacity and bandwidth to store all information, nor the infallibility to

guarantee integrity of the data. In other words, finite persons only have capacity to process a finite number of pixels. The Infinite Person is not only able to do those things, but is able to compensate for the weaknesses of the finite person in the communication process. Communication between the Infinite Person and the finite person involves a tradeoff: Completeness comes at the price of expressiveness and precision. Precise expressiveness comes at the price of completeness.

God chose completeness over precision at the cost of some ambiguity. He sought to communicate to us the big picture rather than attempt exhaustive communication. First Corinthians 13:12 says that “*we see through a glass, darkly.*” This dark glass Paul is referring to was a description of ancient mirrors. They lack the perfect and precise reflectivity of modern mirrors. Ancient mirrors were basically polished brass. These mirrors would do a good job of presenting a complete or whole image, but the image would be fuzzy, lacking precise expression of details. Images produced by these mirrors provided good knowledge of the big picture but were weak on some of the details.

God compensates for ambiguity at the level of microscopic or nano-scope detail by weaving the fullness of His Message into the Big Picture. Throughout these Bible studies, both narrative and points of doctrine have been supported by multiple passages in context and multiple contexts that are woven together in one meta-narrative. God has **embedded abundant redundancy** into his word to insure that his

message gets through. Uncertainties at a microscopic level concerning the integrity of a particular text or its meaning do not create uncertainty in the larger narrative anymore than a microscopic mole can defile a portrait.

There are formal proofs in physics and mathematics that prove the existence of uncertainties in small scales that do not do not create uncertainty in larger scales; we can be certain of the big picture in spite of the uncertainties on the microscopic scale. In physics, this principle is called the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle; and in mathematics, it is called Godel's Completeness and his two Incompleteness Theorems. These principles prove the epistemology that Paul laid out in 1 Corinthians 13:12 under inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

The Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle

The Heisenberg Principle states that it is impossible to measure with high precision both the position and momentum of particles. It is generally regarded by physicist as, not merely an uncertainty of measurements, but an actual uncertainty in the physical universe. Hyper Lab's description assert that "*Even with perfect instruments and technique, the uncertainty is inherent in the nature of things.*" Below is the following definition from HyperPhysics Lab at Georgia State University. [23:1](#)

“The position and momentum of a particle cannot be simultaneously measured with arbitrarily high precision. There is a minimum for the product of the uncertainties of these two measurements. There is likewise a minimum for the product of the uncertainties of the energy and time.

$$\Delta x \Delta p > h/2$$

$$\Delta E \Delta T > h/2$$

“This is not a statement about the inaccuracy of measurement instruments, nor a reflection on the quality of experimental methods; it arises from the wave properties inherent in the quantum mechanical description of nature. Even with perfect instruments and technique, the uncertainty is inherent in the nature of things.”

The Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle does not destroy certainty on the larger level. It is only at the subatomic level (Planck length) that uncertainty exists. We can be certain of the big picture view of things, but when we pursue precision at the subatomic level we lose some certainty. The Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle suggests that the universe is porous, allowing for some wiggle room at the smallest levels. If this be the nature of reality, then it follows that good interpretation of the Bible allow for wiggle-room at the smallest levels. What is gained by precision is lost in certainty

Godel's Completeness and Incompleteness Theorems

Godel's Completeness and Incompleteness Theorems describe the same scope of epistemology as 1 Corinthians 13:12. Godel's Completeness Theorem^{23:2} says that in a natural language or propositional logic, every valid argument can be constructed as a formal proof using the language of mathematics or mathematical logic. Godel's First Incompleteness Theorem^{23:3} states that every logically consistent formal system, meaning a system that describes proof using mathematical language or meta-language^{23:4}, has statements that are true but unprovable from within the system. Godel's Second Incompleteness Theorem^{23:5} states that no consistent formal system can prove its own validity from statements within the system. **Ambiguous, natural language has contained within it completeness, but the more precise, formal systems are necessarily incomplete.**

What formal systems gain by precision, they lose in completion. Even if gaps in one formal system are filled by appeal to another formal system, the second formal system would have gaps of its own. No finite number of formal systems can have complete knowledge. Only an infinite number of formal systems can attain formal completion, and only the mind of God can contain knowledge of an infinite "number" of formal systems.

Three things follow from these three theorems: A finite mind can find complete, but not exhaustive knowledge expressed in terms of

somewhat ambiguous natural language. This knowledge includes certainty about the big picture, but fuzzy on the details – just what Paul claimed in 1 Corinthians 13:12 (Godel’s Completeness Theorem). The second is that no formal system can account for all of reality (Both of Godel’s incompleteness theorems). The third is that no uncertainty caused by incompleteness or inconsistency can destroy the certainty that exists in natural language and logic. Godel’s incompleteness theorems do not contradict the Completeness Theorem.

No formal or formalized system can be both consistent and complete. Attempts to do result in discrepancies. These discrepancies, however, do not destroy our knowledge of the whole. These three theorems confirm the Pauline epistemology of 1 Corinthians 13:12. Uncertainties at the microscopic level do not destroy our knowledge of the message of God.

God has chosen to communicate His message in natural language. Natural language is complete and sufficient to convey His intended message. Because no formal system can be both consistent and complete, discrepancies from these systems or formalized systems (i. e. modern science) at the microscopic level are not valid objections to the main narrative. Reality exists in such a way that no finite mind can judge with certainty in both a complete and consistent way the smallest scales. The Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle establishes these limits as a matter of empirical or experiential observation, and Godel’s Theorems establish these limits as necessary mathematical truths. In the midst of

microscopic uncertainty is certainty and completeness concerning the big picture.

The Bible is consistent concerning the big picture or meta-narrative, and it uniquely and completely provides answer to some fundamental questions that are found nowhere else. God has built in massive redundancy into the Scripture, insuring that important doctrines are confirmed in context and in multiple places. Weakness in human knowledge at the microscopic level, whether it be matters of textual criticism or that of the most precise shade of meaning of a word in its original language, do not hinder the ability of the Holy Spirit to deliver God's intended message to man using human language.

A Holistic Approach to Empirical Evidence

Given the value and limitation of empirical evidence, evidence will be analyzed in a way that points to the most likely explanation. There are three classes of views on the historical nature of the Scriptures. One is the so-called historical-critical method - misnamed because it denies a priori (before the fact) the historical claims of the Bible. The historical-critical method assumes that the Scripture contradict each other and other historical facts, and therefore seeks to deconstruct the texts according to the view of the historian. The second method is that the Scriptures are a mystical books that makes no historical claims. This views the Scripture as speaking only to spiritual topics and relying heavily on allegory. The third view, and the view of this author, is called the grammatical-historical hermeneutic. In this view, the Scripture are to

be interpreted according to the rules of language, and historical claims are viewed as actual history.

In the following chapter, no attempt will be made to exhaustively answer every question. The focus will be on making some concise and powerful arguments that will show that the Scripture are reliable history and that the Bible is indeed the revelation that the foundational truths indicate must exist. The empirical argument will show that the other views are extremely unlikely explanations. The evidential arguments, when taken together with the foundational arguments and argument from coherence, present overwhelming proof of divine inspiration.

Scripture References

1 Corinthians 2:9–16; James 1:5–8

Chapter 23 References

5. HyperPhysics Lab at Georgia State University

<http://hyperphysics.phy-astr.gsu.edu/hbase/uncer.html>

[<back to text>](#)

6. Godel's Completeness Theorem

<http://www.princeton.edu/~achaney/tmve/wiki100k/docs/G>

[%C3%B6del_s_completeness_theorem.html <back to text>](#)

7. Godel's First Incompleteness Theorem

<http://mathworld.wolfram.com/>

[GoedelsIncompletenessTheorem.html](http://mathworld.wolfram.com/GoedelsIncompletenessTheorem.html) <back to text>

8. Metalanguage is language that describes language rather than signifying objects in an external real or virtual (imaginary) reality.

[<back to text>](#)

9. Godel's Second Incompleteness Theorem

<http://mathworld.wolfram.com/>

[GoedelsSecondIncompletenessTheorem.html](http://mathworld.wolfram.com/GoedelsSecondIncompletenessTheorem.html) [<back to text>](#)

24 Evidence Supporting the Action of God in History and Inspiration of the Bible

An analysis of the historical accounts found in Scripture will show that they should be taken as credible history. There are five lines of evidence that show this.

1. It is very unlikely that the church can be explained as the result of a resurrection hoax or resurrection hallucination. The best explanation of the church's trilemma is that it is resurrection history.

2. External Evidence that indicates that the New Testament is composed of eyewitness accounts of the Acts of Jesus Christ and his apostles and that these accounts were created and transmitted at great risk of life and limb.
3. External evidence that there was indeed a consensus in the early church concerning the Biblical canon.
4. External evidence of remarkable preservation of the New Testament manuscripts.

The Gospels as eye-witness accounts

The gospels are presented as eye-witness accounts. The gospels and Acts are not presented as mythology but as history. The writers wrote what they saw or constructed history based on eye-witness testimony of persons that they interviewed.

¹⁶ For we did not follow cunningly devised fables when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of His majesty. ¹⁷ For He received from God the Father honor and glory when such a voice came to Him from the Excellent Glory: "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." ¹⁸ And we

heard this voice which came from heaven when we were with Him on the holy mountain.- 2 Peter 1:16-18

Inasmuch as many have taken in hand to set in order a narrative of those things which have been fulfilled^[a] among us, ² just as those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word delivered them to us, ³ it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write to you an orderly account, most excellent Theophilus, ⁴ that you may know the certainty of those things in which you were instructed. - Luke 1:1-4

Ancient non-Christian sources confirm that the Church has believed that Jesus Christ is the Son of God from the beginning and did so in the context of persecution. This is significant because it has consequences that relate to the authenticity of the early witnesses. This is evidence that the early church had a consistent testimony from the beginning that glorified Christ as God in the midst of persecution. This fact has implications that effect the probabilities of the various classes of explanations for the New Testament record. This chapter will show that the most likely explanation for the New testament is that it is the true and authentic eyewitness testimony that it claims to be, and that the alternative explanations are simply not plausible

Below of several passages from secular sources that confirm that the early church believed that Jesus is “the Son of God” from the very

beginning, and that they held to this testimony at great risk of persecution and even death.

In AD 112, Pliny the Younger, governor of the Roman province in what is now Asia Minor, over an area that included the seven churches in revelation, wrote a letter to the Roman Emperor concerning what to do about the Christians. This letter was written about 17 years after John wrote Revelation. Pliny's letter confirms that the early Christians worshipped Christ as God.

They asserted, however, that the sum and substance of their fault or error had been that they were accustomed to meet on a fixed day before dawn and sing responsively a hymn to Christ as to a god, and to bind themselves by oath, not to some crime, but not to commit fraud, theft, or adultery, not falsify their trust, nor to refuse to return a trust when called upon to do so. When this was over, it was their custom to depart and to assemble again to partake of food—but ordinary and innocent food. Even this, they affirmed, they had ceased to do after my edict by which, in accordance with your instructions, I had forbidden political associations. Accordingly, I judged it all the more necessary to find out what the truth was by torturing two female slaves who were called deaconesses. But I discovered nothing else but depraved, excessive superstition^{[24:1](#)}.

Tacitus also wrote an account of the early Christians. Tacitus' account confirms that Christ was crucified at the time and place indicated in the Gospels. He was crucified during the reign of Tiberius and while Pilate was governor of Judea. This passage also confirms that Judea was ground zero for the initial spread of Christianity and that Rome was reached for the gospel at a very early date.

It should be noted that Tacitus confirms that Christians were universally hated in the Roman Empire. Tacitus phrase "*a most mischievous superstition*" may be a scornful reference to the teaching that Jesus is declared Son of God by resurrection.

Nero fastened the guilt and inflicted the most exquisite tortures on a class hated for their abominations, called Christians by the populace. Christus, from whom the name had its origin, suffered the extreme penalty during the reign of Tiberius at the hands of one of our procurators, Pontius Pilate, and a most mischievous superstition, thus checked for the moment, again broke out not only in Judaea, and the first source of the evil, but even in Rome, where all things hideous and shameful from every part of the world find their centre and become popular^{[24:2](#)}.

There is a rare entry in the Talmud concerning Christ. This passage confirms several details of Christ's life albeit termed in hostile language. The allegation that Christ "*practiced sorcery and enticed Israel to*

apostasy” is actually confirmation that Christ taught and did miracles. This passage is basically in agreement the biblical narrative concerning His death around the time of the Passover, notwithstanding any reference to a forty-day herald in the New Testament. The passage also recognizes Jesus royal position, confirming that Christ is indeed of the House of David. The passage says Christ was hanged – a reference to hanging by crucifixion. This passage is confirmation that Christ died.

On the eve of the Passover Yeshu (Jesus) was hanged. For forty days before the execution took place, a herald went forth and cried, “He is going forth to be stoned because he practiced sorcery and enticed Israel to apostasy. Anyone who can say anything in his favor, let him come forward and plead on his behalf.” But since nothing was brought forward in his favor he was hanged on the eve of the Passover!– Ulla retorted, “Do you suppose that he one for whom a defense could be made? Was he not a mesith [enticer], concerning whom Scripture says, Neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him? With Yeshu, however, it was different, for he was connected with royalty [or well-connected]^{24:3}.”

Lucian gives perhaps the most detailed non-Christian account of the early Christians. In the extended excerpt below, Lucian confirms that the early Christians worshipped Jesus as God and that Christ was crucified. Lucian portray the early Christians as unusually gullible to the wiles of con-artists. When one examines the probability of a counter-cultural group prevailing against the pre-dominant culture, gullibility to beng pluderred by con-artistry weighs against the probability – even the plausibility of success of such a group absent divine intervention.

It was now that he came across the priests and scribes of the Christians, in Palestine, and picked up their queer creed. I can tell you, he pretty soon convinced them of his superiority; prophet, elder, ruler of the Synagogue—he was everything at once; expounded their books, commented on them, wrote books himself. They took him for a God, accepted his laws, and declared him their president. The Christians, you know, worship a man to this day,—the distinguished personage who introduced their novel rites, and was crucified on that account. Well, the end of it was that Proteus was arrested and thrown into prison. This was the very thing to lend an air to his favourite arts of clap-trap and wonder-working; he was now a made man. The Christians took it all very seriously: he was no sooner in prison, than they began trying every means to get him out again,—but without success. Everything else that could be done for him they most devoutly did. They thought of nothing else. Orphans and ancient widows might be seen hanging about the prison from break of day. Their officials bribed the gaolers to let them sleep inside with him. Elegant dinners were conveyed in; their sacred writings were read; and our old friend Peregrine (as he was still called in those days) became for them “the modern Socrates.” In some of the Asiatic cities, too, the Christian communities put themselves to the expense of sending deputations, with offers of sympathy, assistance, and legal advice. The activity of these people, in dealing with any matter that affects their community, is something extraordinary; they spare no trouble, no expense. Peregrine, all this time, was making quite an income on the strength of his bondage; money came pouring in. You see, these misguided creatures start with the general conviction that

they are immortal for all time, which explains the contempt of death and voluntary self-devotion which are so common among them; and then it was impressed on them by their original lawgiver that they are all brothers, from the moment that they are converted, and deny the gods of Greece, and worship the crucified sage, and live after his laws. All this they take quite on trust, with the result that they despise all worldly goods alike, regarding them merely as common property. Now an adroit, unscrupulous fellow, who has seen the world, has only to get among these simple souls, and his fortune is pretty soon made; he plays with them^{23:4}.

In addition to all of this, volumes have been written by early Christians about the life of Christ and the ministry of the apostles that He sent. Concerning the basic historical facts of Christ's life and existence, they are in remarkable agreement. I will not spend a lot of detail citing the dozens of sources from early Christians that proclaim Jesus as God and that He rose from the dead. I would direct the reader to log on to Christian Classics Ethereal Library (CCEL) and study the writings of the early church that are filled with citations claiming that Jesus is God and that He raised from the dead^{24:5}. Even secular writers recognized that the early church believed this.

What is the likelihood that such a belief could gain momentum in the social context of the Roman Empire? I will first examine the significance of this claim and then use social analysis to show that the resurrection of Christ is the most plausible explanation for the successful emergence of Christianity.

The Son of God implies power over death in resurrection. The belief that Jesus is the Son of God is belief in the deity of Christ. Christ, as the Son of God, has the essence and nature of God. Claims to deity amongst the early Christians are to be understood in terms of the Hebraic concept of deity rather than the Pagan concept of deity. This plays out in the conflicts between the early Christians and Pagans. The Pagans were askance at the Christians belief that Jesus is the Son of God; the Pagan would not have had any problem with Christians proclaiming Jesus as a Pagan deity. The Pagans understood that a claim of a completely different order was being made that was not compatible with Pagan thought. Christ is not merely an instantiation of a natural principle, but a supernaturally existing Lord over all of nature.

If Christ is Lord over nature, then He has mastery over nature and its fundamental forces, including death. Such mastery over a nature by a God who is also man involves the conquest of death. This leads to testable, i.e. falsifiable, consequences

God has declared Jesus Christ the Son of God by resurrection from the dead.

Paul, a bondservant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated to the gospel of God 2 which He promised before through His prophets in the Holy Scriptures, 3 concerning His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who was

born of the seed of David according to the flesh, 4 and declared to be the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.- Romans 1:1-4

How does resurrection prove that Christ is the Son of God. First of all, this must be understood that this is the claim to be the one and only true God. Pagan claims of deity would not have been extraordinary, as paganism is ultimately a pantheistic view of reality that asserts that everything is divine. Christ denied the divinity of nature and opposed exalting natural forces as God. The gospel of Christ, then, asserts deity as that which is Lord over nature rather than a cosmic principle. The ultimate test of this is mastery over death. A man who is God is not under the power of death. He can refuse to die or die and rise from the dead. If Christ died and stayed dead, then the view that he is the Son of God is falsified.

Because the gospel denies the exaltation of nature as the ultimate reality, nature-based sources of “supernatural” or paranormal power are removed. The Christian faith has power if and only if Christ is the Son of God; otherwise Christianity has no power apart from what people put into it.

16 For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God to salvation for everyone who believes, for the Jew first and also for the Greek. 17 For in it the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith; as it is written, “The just shall live by faith.” – Romans 1:16-

The teaching that Christ is the Son of God and the Messiah is the central claim of the Christian faith. This claim depends on the resurrection of Christ. If Christ did not rise from the dead, there are consequences for the community of his followers. The church would be stripped of any supernatural power to counter any deficits that they would face in the natural world.

The answer to the question of whether Jesus rose from the dead has logical consequences that can be tested to demonstrate the historical authenticity of the New Testament narrative; The status of Jesus' resurrection has direct implications upon the church in her historical context that can be evaluated. I will show that, if Christ did not rise from the dead, some rather absurd conclusions follow. The church has her own trilemma: The early Christians were either reliable witnesses to Christ's resurrection, liars, or certifiably insane.

If Christ did not rise from the dead, then Christianity was started by a community of insane liars. If the early witnesses genuinely believed that they saw Christ risen from the dead when He had not, it would be no slight flight from reality, but a colossal hallucination. When one considers both the scale of the hallucination and its extreme effects on the lives of the early witnesses, causing them to obsess over it to the

point of suffering early death, then the only realistic conclusion to draw is that they were certifiably insane. The early Christians would have been, in fact, the nuttiest, most unstable group of people on the planet. It is absurd to think that such a group of people could have overcome all the persecution and eventually displace the existing culture.

If the early eyewitnesses of Christ's resurrection were simply lying – attempting to perpetrate a hoax, then the preaching of Christ would involve people dying for a lie, knowing it was a lie, with absolutely nothing to gain on an level by telling the lie. This alone is absurd, but this is not the end of the absurdity. While the liars were telling the lie, they would tell it in such a way that would cause the believers in the lie to become the most honest and passionate lovers of truth to ever walk the face of the earth. The early Christian stuck to their story even in the face of torture and death. Such a group of liars who would lie to the death without anything to rationally gain from the lie would also be certifiably insane.

Could a group of certifiably insane people start a movement that completely displaces the mainstream culture of what was then one of the most powerful and advanced civilizations on the planet? It would depend on the context of the movement. There are three types of cultural movements that are defined based on the level of support a movement receives from the culture: normative, subversive, and countercultural.

A normative cultural movement is one that is fully supported by cultural norms. It may come from the establishment or from a new network that better represents the norms of a culture. National Socialism (Nazism) was a normative cultural movement, as all of its basic beliefs were drawn from the predominant culture. The two things that made Nazism distinctive; they willing to take these ideas closer to their logical conclusion than everyone else, and that they had a distinct way of weaving these ideas into a new narrative.

A subversive movement is not fully backed by cultural norms, but has support from a critical mass within the culture and can likely be defended in terms existing norms of the prevailing culture. The counter-culture of the 1960's was actually a subversive movement that had substantial support from within the culture. The major ideas of the "counter-culture," moral relativism, evolutionism, economic statism, and skepticism towards Judeo-Christian morality, were ideas that were already established in academia. The two-third of the young people who did not attend college were largely absent from this movement. Many of those who went to college did so because expanded Federal Student Aid made possible the financing of this opportunity - and the free time it allowed these young people to engage in political action. Many of those who participated did so with encouragement from professors who held to Marxism, moral relativism, and other views critical to Christianity.

A genuine counter-cultural movement is a movement that has little support from the surrounding culture and often hostility from the

mainstream culture. Christianity started as genuine countercultural movement. While there is some debate in academic circles concerning the level of persecution that early Christians faced, there is a consensus that the early church began her existence in the midst of a culture that was hostile to her existence. In the first three centuries of Christianity, adopting belief in the Christian faith carried with it the risk that the believer would become marginalized.

The question of whether a group of certifiably insane people could start and sustain a movement that completely displaces the mainstream culture turns on the issue of marginalization. While a normative movement could definitely be started by a community of certifiably insane people and while there exists a reasonable possibility of a subversive movement being started by the same, the idea of a genuinely counter-cultural movement being started by a community of certifiably insane people is simply not plausible.

If the non-resurrection of Jesus Christ implies that the success of the church against persecution is not plausible (because they are an insane community), then **the resurrection can be evaluated by evaluating the history and condition of the church.** If the non-resurrection of Jesus Christ means that the success of the church against persecution is not plausible, then evidence of such success falsifies the premise that Christ DID NOT rise from the dead. If the entire set of possibilities described in the statement 'Christ DID NOT rise from the dead' is false, then its antithesis - 'Christ DID rise from the dead' is true. **The success of the**

early church and the message that Christ conquered death against the persecution and marginalization of the surrounding culture proves that the source of her power could only come from Christ having risen from the dead.

In 1 Corinthians 15, Paul makes an argument that proves the resurrection of Christ in a similar fashion to argument I am making. The early church knew that the resurrection of Jesus Christ is central to the Christian faith. The church faced her own dilemma posed by the question of whether Jesus rose from the dead: Is the testimony of the church of Christ's resurrection a hoax, a hallucination, or history?

The centrality of the resurrection to the testimony of the early church is evidenced in the Biblical teaching that we are united with Christ in His death and resurrection (Rom 6:1–10). Our sins are killed in Christ's death, and His bodily resurrection enables Him to give life to us. If Christ is not raised from the dead He has not cannot conquer the power of death that operates in the body. We would still be separated from God, and without divine resources to deal with sin and do the work of God. First Corinthians 15 present several proofs of the resurrection.

But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. 1 Corinthians 15:13–14 KJV

The resurrection is so fundamental to the gospel that any preaching of Christ is useless if He has not risen. If Christ cannot exercise power in His dead body, raising it, then He cannot exercise power in our bodies to empower our faith or preaching. His power in our lives is linked to His power that raised His body from the dead. The denial of self-power and denial of the sufficiency of natural sources of power inherent in the gospel encourages dependence on God's supernatural power would contribute in dysfunctionality

Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. 1 Corinthians 15:15 KJV

Notice the text does not say only that they are false witnesses, but that they are FOUND false witnesses. If Jesus body was still in the that they would have been found to be false witnesses, If Jesus was still in the tomb. If Jesus was still in the tomb, then when the apostles preached that God raised Jesus from the dead the preaching have been quickly exposed as a hoax. The enemies of the gospel would have said something like this:

He has not risen. He was buried in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea. Go there and see that His body is still there.

The Jews came up with their own version of a 911 conspiracy theory to cover up the resurrection. They had the Roman guards say that the disciples stole the body while they slept. How would the Romans know

who stole the body if they were sleeping? Why would a Roman soldier commit suicide by saying they were sleeping on duty? (Sleeping at the post was a capital offense that would result in the entire troop being executed.) If a Roman troop was vigilantly guarding the tomb how could the disciples have entered to take the body without staging an armed rebellion, which would have drawn the wrath of Rome?. The Jews conspiracy theory designed to cover up the resurrection falls apart.

For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised: And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. – 1 Corinthians 15:16–17 KJV

Man's basic sin problem is that he is separated from God. This forces man to trust in the arm of the flesh, bring sin and a curse. Christ got rid of our sins by killing those sins on the cross. This opened the way for the life of God to enter man, eliminating the need to trust in the arm of the flesh. We can now trust God. If Christ has not risen from the dead, the life of God cannot enter us. We are then still forced to trust in the arm of the flesh—and still in our sins and bad habits reinforced by the action of our flesh. If Christ is not raised, then no one would miraculously overcome the habits of the flesh.

Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. 1 Cor 15:18–19 KJV

If Christ is not raised from the dead, nobody alive at that time would have anything to gain from perpetrating that hoax. The preaching of Christ drew deadly persecution from both the Jews and the Romans. There are two scenarios here, depending on whether the apostles were lunatics or liars. Both lead to impossible conclusions.

If the early eyewitnesses weren't liars or lunatics, then there is only one other logical possibility. They were really eyewitnesses of the resurrection. Not only did Jesus rise from the dead, but the experience of witnessing the resurrected Christ brought a glimpse of His resurrection power into the Church. This power energized the life, faith and preaching of the early Church. Because Christ was alive again His tomb was empty, and because the tomb was empty the enemies of Christ could not point to the dead body of Christ as an argument against the gospel. God's witnesses are not found false witnesses but true witnesses.

If Christ is indeed risen from the dead, then a number of implications follow that are directly relevant to the historical, theological, ecclesiastical, and spiritual authority of Scripture and of the church's role in its transmission.

If Christ is risen from the dead, it follows that Jesus Christ is who He claims to be: He is the Messiah, the God-Man, and Son of God. He is the authoritative, all-knowing, uncorrupted spokesman for God. Christ did

three specific things to promote the Scriptures as the authoritative Word of God: He confirmed the authority of the Old Testament, He established the church and sustained her through supernatural power, and He authorized the church to be witnesses to the New Covenant.

Christ confirmed the authority of the Old Testament. He taught a high view of Scripture. In John 10:35, He says that “The Scripture cannot be broken,” teaching a pre-cursor to the modern doctrinal formulation* of verbal plenary inspiration. In Matthew 5:17–19, Christ uphold the eternal scope of Scripture – specifically the Law. Christ’s affirmation of Scripture is inclusive of the entire Jewish canon as He uses the three-fold description of the OT canon that was common amongst the Jews of the time, who referred to the Old Testament as the “Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms” or simply “The Law and the Prophets.” (Matthew 7:11–13; Matthew 11:12–14; 22:39–41; Luke 16:13–15; 16:15–17; 24:43–45; John 1:44–46; Acts 13:14–16; 24:13–15; 28:22–24; Romans 3:21)

Christ established the church and sustained her through supernatural power. The New Testament presents not only the resurrection as a powerful event, but presents the event of witnessing the resurrected Christ as one that releases power to the initiated. Second Corinthians 3 speaks to this topic. Paul begins the chapter by describing a scene during the Israelites wandering in the wilderness where Moses had so much of the glory of the Lord that his face was literally lit up like a lamp. The sight of a human lamp so scared the people that they begged him to wear a veil over his face. Paul proceeds to argue that the glory of the

New Covenant was superior to the Old Testament. Paul then writes the following statement that connects the vision of this glory with the total transformation of man.

¹² Therefore, since we have such hope, we use great boldness of speech — ¹³ unlike Moses, who put a veil over his face so that the children of Israel could not look steadily at the end of what was passing away. ¹⁴ But their minds were blinded. For until this day the same veil remains unlifted in the reading of the Old Testament, because the veil is taken away in Christ. ¹⁵ But even to this day, when Moses is read, a veil lies on their heart. ¹⁶ Nevertheless when one turns to the Lord, the veil is taken away. ¹⁷ Now the Lord is the Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. ¹⁸ But we all, with unveiled face, beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into the same image from glory to glory, just as by the Spirit of the Lord.— 2 Corinthians 3:12–18

In verse 18, Paul concludes by saying that, as we look at the glory of the Lord, we are transformed into that same image. The apostles, when they viewed the resurrected Christ, were transformed. Those who saw the glory of God operating through the apostles would also, albeit to a lesser extent, be transformed. This transformation was essential to empowering them to endure the persecution and hostility that they endured and empowered to draw into the faith qualified people who laid the foundation for social transformation that occurred centuries later.

Christ authorized the church to be witnesses to the New Covenant. The empowerment that the eyewitness experience of the resurrected Christ provided a rational basis for apostolic authority. This eye-witness experience is cited in the New Testament as the credential necessary to stand as an apostle (Acts 1:15–26; 1 Corinthians 15:3–11; Galatians 1:11–2:10; 2 Peter 1:16–21).

If there is no plausible explanation for the success of the early church part from the resurrection, then it is the resurrection power that moves the church to action. The resurrection had such transformative power that it not only created witnesses, but made them witnesses who were faithful to the death. **The resurrection validate the credibility of these witnesses.** Such an impact of the resurrection implies that Christ consciously authorized the church to testify of him. **The Scriptures are the authorized records of this testimony.** It is no surprise, then, that the testimony of the apostles includes testimony that Christ sent out the early believers as witnesses.

¹⁸ And Jesus came and spoke to them, saying, “All authority has been given to Me in heaven and on earth.¹⁹ Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,²⁰ teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the age.” Amen. – Matthew 28:18–20

⁴ And being assembled together with them, He commanded them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the Promise of the Father, “which,” He said, “you have heard from Me; ⁵ for John truly baptized with water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days from now.” ⁶ Therefore, when they had come together, they asked Him, saying, “Lord, will You at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?” ⁷ And He said to them, “It is not for you to know times or seasons which the Father has put in His own authority. ⁸ But you shall receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you shall be witnesses to Me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the end of the earth.” – Acts 1:4–8

Christ empowered and sent out the early believers as certified witnesses to Him – witnesses certified through the resurrection power of Christ. These believers established the authoritative record of the gospel through the testimony of the first believers and then those who received that testimony and transmitted it to the next generation. In addition into the social transformation, they left an abundance of manuscript evidence that testify to the textual reliability of the New Testament* as well as evidence of an early consensus for the New Testament Canon.*

Bible Passages 1 Corinthians 15; Jer 17:5–8

Chapter 24 References

1. Pliny

<http://www9.georgetown.edu/faculty/jod/texts/pliny.html>

[<back to text>](#)

2. Tacitus, Annals XV:15, between 55–115 AD, Cited in Non-Christian References to the Trial of Jesus, University of Missouri–Kansas City School of Law

<http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/jesus/nonchristianaccounts.html>

[<back to text>](#)

3. Talmud, Sanhedrin 43a (Epstein), Cited in Non-Christian References to the Trial of Jesus, University of Missouri–Kansas City School of Law

<http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/jesus/nonchristianaccounts.html>

[<back to text>](#)

4. Lucian, The Death of Peregrine, pages 82–83,

<http://www.sacred-texts.com/cla/luc/wl4/wl420.htm>

[<back to text>](#)

5. Christian Classics Ethereal Library,

<http://ccel.org>

[<back to text>](#)

25 The Necessity of the Return of Christ

For those us who are Christians, the return of Christ is our blessed hope. The return of Christ is necessary to complete the answers to philosophical questions. There are also indicators from history and the contemporary scene that point to the return of Christ.

The return of Christ is Necessary to complete the solution to God's Trilemma

I wrote earlier that the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ reconciled the love of God and justice of God. God demonstrated both His love and justice on the cross and set up the means to access to preserve free will so that man could freely embrace the Lord in a love relationship. The resurrection of Christ meant death was conquered; the church received power to be witnesses to the gospel so that people could have information to make a free choice and the Holy Spirit could woo people towards God.

The cross was just the beginning of God's answer. God's love and justice were reconciled, but have not yet produced in history all of the consequences that are inherent in the concepts of love and justice.

The full expression of both God's love and his justice involve the full development of the lives of the redeemed. This requires both an interim

period between the beginning of the earth and a final sequences of events that will lead to Christ's return.

An interim period exists for two reasons: bringing into the family of God as many as possible and bring to full maturity of those who are redeemed. These two objectives require an interim period between Christ's ascension into heaven and his return. It is in this period that the church is active.

The Bible teaches that God does not want anyone to perish, but that everyone come to repentance. Because God sought to preserve human free will, this decision carried with it the possibility that some would reject God's offer. God's plan of redemption to save humanity, then, will save only some.

God do not simply communicate the bare facts and leave it to the sinner to decide. The fall of man due to Adam's disobedience resulted in sinners having biases that are hostile to the gospel. God's plan involves actively engaging people in their thought process.

Romans 8:28–29 instructs us that God has a plan in redemption. In verse 28 we are instructed that “all things work together for good to those who love God, to those who are the called according to *His* purpose.” What this means is that the plan God uses to draw people to him is optimized for the maximum benefit of those who love God; He will bring

into His kingdom the maximum number of people who can be saved and brought to maturity.

How does this plan work? Verse 29 instructs that “those whom He foreknew...” God has foreknowledge of people. God is infinite in knowledge. He not only knows everything that will happen, but everything that is possible. God can calculate every possible event and its consequences and from that knowledge create a plan that gives maximum benefit to those who love God. It is from this foreknowledge that Christ was able to determine that if the miracles done in Capernaum were done in Sodom, that the people of Sodom would have repented (Matthew 11:22–24).

The fact that Sodom could have been brought to repentance by the miracles Jesus raises the question of why Sodom was not converted to righteousness through miracles. Let me answer this by engaging in a bit of speculation that will illustrate the process God used. On my part it is speculative because I do not – and cannot – have access to the exhaustive knowledge necessary to say definitely. On God’s part it is not speculative because He has unlimited, exhaustive knowledge.

Why God chose not to do miracle in Sodom that would have converted them **could** be explained by the following:

Sodom is presented in Scripture as a prosperous city in Scripture. Lot chose Sodom because it afforded more economic opportunity, and it was

raided because of its wealth(). Ezekiel 23 instructs us that Sodom was destroyed because it had so much prosperity that the people had abundance of free time to pursue immoral perversions. Abraham chose to live in a less prosperous place and while there acquired wealth that rivaled that of the Canaanites tribes whose descendants were later driven out by the Israelites. It is likely that, had Sodom not been destroyed in the days of Abraham, that it could have become the primary power in the area instead of the Philistines and that their presence would have changed the dynamic in a way that would not be as advantageous to the big plan of God as the situation that actually unfolded.

While I have analyzed the “what-if” speculatively, God’s foreknowledge analyzes these exhaustively and infallibly. God has analyzed every possible scenario and has calculated the optimum course of event that will maximize redemption. Such a plan, when executed, will result in a history where some will be persuaded to come to faith and others will not. Sometimes the same antecedents will have opposites effect on different people. When I was a teen, I was in an environment where misuse of church authority was a problem in the church. That issue drew me closer to the Bible, but it drove a friend of mine who was in that same environment away from God altogether. Similar circumstances have opposites effect on the two of us because we had distinct wills and distinct ways of processing the world in which we lived – differences which resulted in different decisions. It is a good plan in which God exercises sovereign control of election of believers in such a way that preserves free will on the part of believers. It is good because it

maximizes redemption; it is good because it gives people freedom (and responsibility) for their decisions.

God has planned on both saving as many as possible and bringing believers into full maturity as believers. First Peter 3:8–10 instructs us that the Lord delays His return so that as many as possible can be saved.

⁸ But do not forget this one thing, dear friends: With the Lord a day is like a thousand years, and a thousand years are like a day.⁹ The Lord is not slow in keeping his promise, as some understand slowness. Instead he is patient with you, not wanting anyone to perish, but everyone to come to repentance.

¹⁰ But the day of the Lord will come like a thief. The heavens will disappear with a roar; the elements will be destroyed by fire, and the earth and everything done in it will be laid bare.

– 1 Peter 3:8–10 NIV

God is taking time to gather people to Him before Christ returns. He wants to do much more, however, than just put people “inside the pearly gates.” He wants people to develop in the full maturity of who they are in Christ (Eph 4:11–16; Rev 14:14–16). When Christ return, He is returning for a mature people.

¹⁴ Then I looked, and behold, a white cloud, and on the cloud sat One like the Son of Man, having on His head a golden crown,

and in His hand a sharp sickle. ¹⁵ And another angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to Him who sat on the cloud, “Thrust in Your sickle and reap, for the time has come for You^[i] to reap, for the harvest of the earth is ripe.” ¹⁶ So He who sat on the cloud thrust in His sickle on the earth, and the earth was reaped.

–Revelation 14:14–16

During this process, which has been going on for almost two thousand years, the people of God have lived on the earth alongside those who refuse to come to Christ. Christ, in the parable of the Wheat and the Tares, explains why this is. God did not uproot the unrepentant prior to harvest time because there was an unacceptable risk of uprooting the wheat. This is because that there are some of those who are unrepentant are actually potential believers who may repent if God’s plan is allowed to unfold in a patient, timely manner. Prematurely terminating the plan would result in people dying lost when the optimum plan could save them. God patiently works His plan – not initiating the harvest until the right time. While this may seem strange, it seems that God is not only wanting believers to become mature, but unbelievers as well. The maturation of both means that just before the return of Christ there will be a Great polarization between believers in Christ and those who reject Christ that leaves no middle ground. Whereas Revelation 14:14–16 describes the maturity of believers, verses 17–20 describe the maturity and judgment on unbelievers.

¹⁷ Then another angel came out of the temple which is in heaven, he also having a sharp sickle.¹⁸ And another angel came out from the altar, who had power over fire, and he cried with a loud cry to him who had the sharp sickle, saying, "Thrust in your sharp sickle and gather the clusters of the vine of the earth, for her grapes are fully ripe."¹⁹ So the angel thrust his sickle into the earth and gathered the vine of the earth, and threw it into the great winepress of the wrath of God.²⁰ And the winepress was trampled outside the city, and blood came out of the winepress, up to the horses' bridles, for one thousand six hundred furlongs.

– Revelation 14:17–20

The final act of maturity of believers will be to experience the transformation of their bodies from the corrupted mortal bodies to incorruptible, resurrection bodies. Such a change to the physical nature believers bodies will usher in a plan to restore the creation. In fact, the full reconciliation of God's love and His righteousness requires a restoration of the earth.

Philosophically speaking, when Adam sinned, he used his body to introduce into the physical world elements contradictory to God. This has consequences not only for man but for creation in general. This is why the Genesis account reads that the ground was cursed for Adam's sake.

Creation has been subjected to decay and must wait for the redemption of the bodies of God's people. According to verse 19, the restoration of creation is a consequence of the redemption of the bodies of believers. In God's program, this phase begins with the general resurrection of believers accompanied by an uprooting from the earth all that is evil; after this creation can be restored (see also Matthew 13:40–43).

The necessity of God's judgment against all evil.

When will the end times begin? As I wrote earlier, the end-times program involves two phases. The first phase was an interim period between the first revival and the return Christ. The interim period ends when there is a fullness of both people coming into the kingdom of God and a fullness of people being confirmed into the kingdom of darkness, resulting in a polarization of the human race into believers in Christ and haters of Christ. When this phase reaches fruition, then the process of uprooting of evil from the earth will begin.

This uprooting of evil from the earth is an essential part of preparing the creation for restoration. Revelation 8:1–6 presents imagery that cross references with both the feast of trumpets and the Day of Atonement.

When He opened the seventh seal, there was silence in heaven for about half an hour. ² And I saw the seven angels who stand before God, and to them were given seven trumpets. ³ Then another angel, having a golden censer, came and stood at the altar. He was given much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all the saints upon the golden altar which was

before the throne. ⁴ And the smoke of the incense, with the prayers of the saints, ascended before God from the angel's hand. ⁵ Then the angel took the censer, filled it with fire from the altar, and threw it to the earth. And there were noises, thunderings, lightnings, and an earthquake.⁶ So the seven angels who had the seven trumpets prepared themselves to sound.

- Revelation 8:1-6

The image is, that in heaven prayer were offered up with incense before God. This has a parallel with the proper procedure that the High Priest was required to follow on the Day of Atonement. When the High Priest bring in the sacrifice, but before he offers it, he was to offer incense.

¹¹ “And Aaron shall bring the bull of the sin offering, which is for himself, and make atonement for himself and for his house, and shall kill the bull as the sin offering which is for himself. ¹² Then he shall take a censer full of burning coals of fire from the altar before the Lord, with his hands full of sweet incense beaten fine, and bring it inside the veil.

¹³ And he shall put the incense on the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of incense may cover the mercy seat that is on the Testimony, lest he die. - Leviticus 16:11-13

There was a two-fold purpose to the offering up of incense. It protected the High Priest from being killed by the glory and holiness of God. It also

inaugurated the administration of the atonement. The casting of the fires of incense to the earth means that the earth is the subject of this atonement; the inclusion of prayers in the incense means that the cleansing of the earth is the ultimate answer to all of the prayers of the saints.

God will pour out judgment that break the nations and prepare the earth for his return. When Christ returns, He “***will send out his angels, and they will weed out of his kingdom everything that causes sin and all who do evil***([Matthew 13:36–43 NIV](#)).” Evil will be eradicated, and God will set up a utopia on earth where there will no more death, no more injustice, and peace amongst all creation.

There shall come forth a Rod from the stem of Jesse,
And a Branch shall grow out of his roots.
² The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him,
The Spirit of wisdom and understanding,
The Spirit of counsel and might,
The Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord.

³ His delight is in the fear of the Lord,
And He shall not judge by the sight of His eyes,
Nor decide by the hearing of His ears;
⁴ But with righteousness He shall judge the poor,
And decide with equity for the meek of the earth;

He shall strike the earth with the rod of His mouth,
And with the breath of His lips He shall slay the wicked.

⁵ Righteousness shall be the belt of His loins,
And faithfulness the belt of His waist.

⁶ “The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb,
The leopard shall lie down with the young goat,
The calf and the young lion and the fatling together;
And a little child shall lead them.

⁷ The cow and the bear shall graze;
Their young ones shall lie down together;
And the lion shall eat straw like the ox.

⁸ The nursing child shall play by the cobra’s hole,
And the weaned child shall put his hand in the viper’s den.

⁹ They shall not hurt nor destroy in all My holy mountain,
For the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord
As the waters cover the sea.

Isaiah 11:1–9

Appendix A: End Time Feasts.

Appendix A: End Time Feasts.

The Feast of Trumpets was celebrated on the first day of the seventh month. Numbers 10:1–10 lists the designated uses for trumpets. Trumpets were to be used for

1. Calling people to assembly (v2)
2. Signaling when the camp is to move (v2)
3. Convene Sacred Assemblies (v10)
4. Call to battle when you are under oppression; God will deliver you. (v9)

The Lord said to Moses: “Make two trumpets of hammered silver, and use them for calling the community together and for having the camps set out. When both are sounded, the whole community is to assemble before you at the entrance to the tent of meeting. If only one is sounded, the leaders—the heads of the clans of Israel—are to assemble before you. When a trumpet blast is sounded, the tribes camping on the east are to set out. At the sounding of a second blast, the camps on the south are to set out. The blast will be the signal for setting out. To gather the assembly, blow the trumpets, but not with the signal for setting out.

“The sons of Aaron, the priests, are to blow the trumpets. This is to be a lasting ordinance for you and the generations to come. When you go into battle in your own land against an enemy who is oppressing you, sound a blast on the trumpets. Then you will be remembered by the Lord

your God and rescued from your enemies. Also at your times of rejoicing—your appointed festivals and New Moon feasts—you are to sound the trumpets over your burnt offerings and fellowship offerings, and they will be a memorial for you before your God. I am the Lord your God.”

- Numbers 10:1–10 NKJV

The feast of Trumpets occurs in close proximity to the Day of Atonement (Yom Kippor). The Day of Atonement is where the land is cleansed of sin. The atonement involves two phases. The first is the offering of a blood sacrifice as the recipient of the justice against sin, and the second phase is the removal of sin. In the ritual defined in Leviticus 16, the killing of the bullock was the blood sacrifice, and the confessions of the sins of the people upon the goat and the removal of the goat into a faraway land accomplish the removal of sin. The rituals in Leviticus had no real power over sin; the robbing and raping and maiming and murdering that occurs before the sacrifice continued to occur afterward. The Day of Atonement ritual was a picture that pointed to the actions of Christ. The shedding of the blood of Christ was the blood sacrifice that has real power to take away sins of those who trust Him. The removal of sins from the land is to be accomplished at His Second Coming, when He comes He *“will send out his angels, and they will weed out of his kingdom everything that causes sin and all who do evil.”*[\(Matthew 13:36–43 NIV\)](#)

The Lord said to Moses, “Say to the Israelites: ‘On the first day of the seventh month you are to have a day of sabbath rest, a sacred assembly

commemorated with trumpet blasts. Do no regular work, but present a food offering to the Lord.”

The Lord said to Moses, “The tenth day of this seventh month is the Day of Atonement. Hold a sacred assembly and deny yourselves, and present a food offering to the Lord. Do not do any work on that day, because it is the Day of Atonement, when atonement is made for you before the Lord your God. Those who do not deny themselves on that day must be cut off from their people. I will destroy from among their people anyone who does any work on that day. You shall do no work at all. This is to be a lasting ordinance for the generations to come, wherever you live. It is a day of sabbath rest for you, and you must deny yourselves. From the evening of the ninth day of the month until the following evening you are to observe your sabbath.”

[- Leviticus 23:23-32 NIV](#)

In this context, The Feast of Trumpets is both a call to Sacred Assembly and a call to battle. The New Testament Fulfillment of the Feast of Trumpets will occur just before the End-times judgement of God and the return of Christ. during this period, both Israel and God’s people of all nations will be undergoing unprecedented distress

The Lord said to Moses, “Say to the Israelites: ‘On the first day of the seventh month you are to have a day of sabbath rest, a sacred assembly commemorated with trumpet blasts. Do no regular work, but present a food offering to the Lord.’”

[- Leviticus 23:23-25 NIV](#)

The call to sacred assembly that Joel 2 describes is a call to the sacred assembly of the Feast of Trumpets that will occur during a time of trial for Israel just before the second coming of Jesus Christ. Israel would be surrounded by armies from the north threatening disaster. There would also be a growing movement to inflict persecution on all of God's people all over the world. In addition there would be ecological, financial, and other calamities that would grip much of the globe on an increasingly apocalyptic scale. According to the Bible, the pandemic sinfulness of the world is the root problem. Because of these impending dangers, God instructs all of his people to repent—seek Him in sacred assembly.

“Now, therefore,” says the Lord, “Turn to Me with all your heart, With fasting, with weeping, and with mourning.” So rend your heart, and not your garments; Return to the Lord your God, For He is gracious and merciful, Slow to anger, and of great kindness; And He relents from doing harm. Who knows if He will turn and relent, And leave a blessing behind Him— A grain offering and a drink offering For the Lord your God?

Blow the trumpet in Zion, Consecrate a fast, Call a sacred assembly; Gather the people, Sanctify the congregation, Assemble the elders, Gather the children and nursing babes; Let the bridegroom go out from his chamber, And the bride from her dressing room. Let the priests, who minister to the Lord, Weep between the porch and the altar; Let them say, “Spare Your people, O Lord, And do not give Your

heritage to reproach, That the nations should rule over them. Why should they say among the peoples, ‘Where is their God?’”

Then the Lord will be zealous for His land, And pity His people. The Lord will answer and say to His people, “Behold, I will send you grain and new wine and oil, And you will be satisfied by them; I will no longer make you a reproach among the nations. “But I will remove far from you the northern army, And will drive him away into a barren and desolate land, With his face toward the eastern sea And his back toward the western sea; His stench will come up, And his foul odor will rise, Because he has done monstrous things.” – [Joel 2:12–20 NKJV](#)

God’s people will be Rescued from Destruction. Why would Israel be instructed to pray Spare thy people, O LORD, and give not thine heritage to reproach, that the heathen should rule over them: wherefore should they say among the people, Where is their God? (Joel 2:17) It can only mean that Israel is facing an extreme crisis. Israel is at risk of destruction or at least loss of sovereignty to the ‘heathen’. At this same time, there is great danger to Christians all over the world. Persecutions of Christians is increasing worldwide. Even in the so-called free world, there is danger of discrimination and imprisonment.

God’s answer is recorded in [Joel 2:19–27](#). God sends deliverance and prosperity. In particular He will ‘...*remove far off from you the northern army...*’ (Joel 2:20) God will deliver His people.

God gives the Final Great Awakening. Joel 2:28–32 is quoted in [Acts 2](#) as the explanation for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. Joel's prophecy predicts both a former and a latter rain of revival. The outpouring of the Holy Spirit that started the church was the first fulfillment of Joel's prophecy – the former rain. The context of the prophecy indicates that the **complete fulfillment** includes a latter rain revival and final harvest that will occur in the end times.

“And it shall come to pass afterward That I will pour out My Spirit on all flesh; Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, Your old men shall dream dreams, Your young men shall see visions. And also on My menservants and on My maidservants I will pour out My Spirit in those days.” And I will show wonders in the heavens and in the earth: Blood and fire and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, And the moon into blood, Before the coming of the great and awesome day of the Lord. And it shall come to pass That whoever calls on the name of the Lord Shall be saved. For in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem there shall be deliverance, As the Lord has said, Among the remnant whom the Lord calls. – [Joel 2:28–32 NKJV](#)

In the book of Acts, the Holy Spirit was poured out, resulting in people exercising miraculous and prophetic gifts. The prophecy in Joel also included signs in the heavens and earth involving fire, blood, and smoke and involving the darkening of the sun and moon. These signs in the heavens did not occur in Acts. This indicates that yet remains a fulfillment of the prophecy in Joel 2:28–32. context clues indicate that this revival occurs near the end of history as a Final Great Awakening that occurs just before the trumpet judgments and before the Great Day of the Lord.

Blow the trumpet in Zion, And sound an alarm in My holy mountain! Let all the inhabitants of the land tremble; For the day of the Lord is coming, For it is at hand: A day of darkness and gloominess, A day of clouds and thick darkness, Like the morning clouds spread over the mountains. A people come, great and strong, The like of whom has never been; Nor will there ever be any such after them, Even for many successive generations. A fire devours before them, And behind them a flame burns; The land is like the Garden of Eden before them, And behind them a desolate wilderness; Surely nothing shall escape them...

They run to and fro in the city, They run on the wall; They climb into the houses, They enter at the windows like a thief. The earth quakes before them, The heavens tremble; The sun and moon grow dark, And the stars diminish their brightness. The Lord gives voice before His army, For His camp is very great; For strong is the One who executes His word. For the day of the Lord is great and very terrible; Who can endure it?

- [Joel 2:1-3,9-11 KJV](#)

“For behold, in those days and at that time, When I bring back the captives of Judah and Jerusalem, I will also gather all nations, And bring them down to the Valley of Jehoshaphat; And I will enter into judgment with them there On account of My people, My heritage Israel, Whom they

have scattered among the nations; They have also divided up My land.- [Joel 3:1-2 NKJV](#)

Joel 2:15-32 within the context of [Joel 2-3](#) which includes Joel 2:1-3,9-11 and Joel 3:1, which describes the battle of Armageddon. This times that final fulfillment or latter rain revival as occurring in the time immediately before the return of Jesus back to the earth. The prophecy of supernatural prosperity, God's deliverance from the coming ten horned Islamist empire, and the Final Great Awakening-which is the complete outpouring of God's Spirit that began in [Acts 2](#), will occur just before the great day of God's wrath at Armageddon.

The Feast of Tabernacles is defined in the Mosaic Law, in Leviticus 23:33-36. Scripture, however, makes it plain that this feast is universal to God's program. Zechariah 14 records the institution of this as an international holiday. The first four verses of this passage are a clear description of the return of Jesus Christ, who will return to the Mount of Olives or Olivet in the same way that He left it for heaven ([Acts 1:9-12](#)).

Behold, the day of the Lord is coming, And your spoil will be divided in your midst. For I will gather all the nations to battle against Jerusalem; The city shall be taken, The houses rifled, And the women ravished. Half of the city shall go into captivity, But the remnant of the people shall not be cut off from the city. Then the Lord will go forth And fight against those nations, As He fights in the day of battle. And in that day His feet will stand on the Mount of Olives, Which faces Jerusalem on the east. And the Mount of Olives shall be split in two, From east to

west, Making a very large valley; Half of the mountain shall move toward the north And half of it toward the south. – Zechariah 14:1–4 NKJV.

Following the return of Jesus Christ and the completion of the transformation of His rule to be both spiritual and physical, the Feast of Tabernacles is mandated as an international holiday. Every nation on earth observes this feast and sends a delegation each year to worship King Jesus in Jerusalem. If any nations refuses, then rain for the following year will be withheld.

And it shall come to pass that everyone who is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem shall go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the Feast of Tabernacles. And it shall be that whichever of the families of the earth do not come up to Jerusalem to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, on them there will be no rain. If the family of Egypt will not come up and enter in, they shall have no rain; they shall receive the plague with which the Lord strikes the nations who do not come up to keep the Feast of Tabernacles.¹⁹ This shall be the punishment of Egypt and the punishment of all the nations that do not come up to keep the Feast of Tabernacles.

– [Zechariah 14:16–19 NKJV](#).

If The Feast of Tabernacles will become an international feast during the Millennium (and beyond), then it follows that it has an enduring significance that transcends the specific context of the Mosaic Covenant. The remainder of this article will be an exposition of the definition of this feast and then case examples of this feast being observed in real life situations.

The Feast of Tabernacles is defined in Leviticus 23. The point of the Feast is to celebrate God's manifest Presence amongst the people. It is specifically a remembrance of the condition of the Israelites dwelling in tabernacles or booths during the trip through the wilderness. During this time they experienced the manifest presence of God as a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night (For more info, see the book of Exodus).

Then the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, "Speak to the children of Israel, saying: 'The fifteenth day of this seventh month shall be the Feast of Tabernacles for seven days to the Lord. On the first day there shall be a holy convocation. You shall do no customary work on it. For seven days you shall offer an offering made by fire to the Lord. On the eighth day you shall have a holy convocation, and you shall offer an offering made by fire to the Lord. It is a sacred assembly, and you shall do no customary work on it.

- [Leviticus 23:33-36 NKJV](#)

The Feast of Tabernacles will find its complete fulfillment in Revelation 22 when God makes his residence with humanity. The cycle of love will be complete.