

# Proving God without the Bible

August 24 – September 28, 2008

## *WEEK ONE – Setting the Course*

1. **Why teach such a course?**
  - a. Even though we believe in God, and the Bible as his inspired word, there are many other humans who have no knowledge of God or Jesus or many of the other things we hold dear.
  - b. An analogy would be a computer game I played as a young person where I woke up in a dark room not knowing who I was or how I got there. By slowly working my way around “feeling” things I discover I am in a room with walls and a small bed. By taking one step at a time, I eventually found the light to the room and ended up on a space ship to other planets. When I first woke up, I knew nothing. As I began to “know” things through personal observation I discovered (and came to believe) in the world around me. It was a step by step process. A person who has never been introduced to the concept of God is similar to this person waking in a dark room.
  - c. We are challenged to take the message into all the world (including the people in the dark room). Mark 16:15 “Jesus said to them, ‘Go throughout the whole world and preach the gospel to all mankind. Whoever believes and is baptized will be saved; whoever does not believe will be condemned.’” The Ethiopian eunuch would be another good example.
  - d. Paul said we need to meet people where they are (get reference from Mike Newman about “being all things to all people” (1 Corinthians 9:19-23) and Paul arguing with the Socratics (Acts 17:16-33))
  - e. We need to be prepared to explain why we believe what we believe – I Peter 3:15.
  - f. As an advertisement for Josh Hower (and God in the process). If you would have told me 7 years ago I would have been here teaching this course I would have told you that you were crazy but I am here because I feel this is where God wants me. I am an accountant. A scientist by background. A doubting Thomas who does not like speaking in public but I feel this is where God wants me so I am giving it my best shot. Josh is giving each person in this room and in our church body that same opportunity to find out what talents God has given you and then offer you the opportunity to use those talents to further the kingdom of God. How cool is that! What an opportunity. What a responsibility.
2. **The Foundation – Truth** To begin our proof of God, we first must agree on the subject of “Truth”.
  - a. We demand truth in just about every aspect of our lives: money, marriages, safety, and health.
  - b. Why would we not also demand it on matters related to faith?
  - c. Truth is “telling it like it is” or “that which describes an actual state of affairs”.

- d. If something is true, it is true for all people, at all times, in all places. All truth claims are absolute, narrow and exclusive. All truths exclude their opposites. Even religious truths.
  - i. Truth is discovered, not invented.
  - ii. Truth is trans-cultural.
  - iii. Truth is unchanging even though our beliefs about truth may change. (e.g. flat earth belief)
  - iv. Beliefs cannot change a fact, no matter how sincerely they are held.
  - v. Truth is not affected by the one professing it.
  - vi. All truths are absolute truths.
  - vii. In short, contrary beliefs are possible but not contrary truths.
  - viii. Add Discussion: What does our world say about this today?
- 3. Our society will often try to say that “truth does not exist” or “truth cannot be known”. Discuss the analysis below. How do you react to points a-f?
  - a. These are self defeating statements.
  - b. They use a “truth statement” to prove “truth does not exist”.
  - c. With the statement “there is not truth” we need to ask “Is that true?”
  - d. With the statement “Truth cannot be known” we need to ask “How do you know that is true?”
  - e. If there is no truth, why learn anything at all?
  - f. We demand truth in our marriages, in our banking relationships, when we go to a doctor. Why not demand it when we discuss God?
- 4. **A side note in this course:** Evidence cannot convince the unwilling.
  - a. Analogy of “guy who thought he was dead”.
  - b. Question we need to ask “If we showed beyond a reasonable doubt that God existed would you believe?”
  - c. If no, then it is a problem with “will” not “intellect”.

**Discuss where our culture might be today when it comes to wanting to know if there really is a God. What other key issues and questions do people have when it comes to proving God’s existence? Why is this important today?**

## ***WEEK TWO – A. Rocking the Boat***

5. Our society wants everyone to practice “religious tolerance”.
  - a. Religious intolerance is dangerous. Our country was founded on religious tolerance and we have seen how extremists can take religious intolerance to a level where they feel they have to right to kill others for their beliefs.
  - b. However, religious tolerance in the US no longer means treating people with different beliefs respectfully and with civility. It now means we are supposed to accept every belief as true. In a religious context this is called pluralism – the belief that all religions are true.
  - c. All religions do have much in common in recognizing that we have a problem and that we want to live in “paradise” or in some improved way. But there are many points beyond that where they directly contradict each other.
  - d. While different religions do have “some similarities” the differences are significant and contradictory. On an individual basis this has profound implications. At each point of difference, one is false and one is true. If Christianity is true, then it is dangerous to your eternal destiny not to be a Christian. If Islam is true, then it is dangerous not to be a Muslim. Give examples of what differences there are in some world religions. How does each system work? Ask people if they know—to get them talking. Discuss the uniqueness of Christianity: the SAVIOR (Acts 4:12, Isaiah 43:11).
  - e. The claim that “you ought not to question someone’s religious beliefs” is itself a religious belief of pluralists. This belief is just as “exclusive” and “intolerant” as any Christian or Muslim belief. Pluralists want everyone to agree with them and to see things the way they see things.
  - f. Christians are “commanded” to question other religions beliefs (Duet. 12:1-5, I John 4:1, Gal 1:8, II Cor 11:13). Since we Christians have that belief, the pluralists, by their own standards – should accept this Christian belief as well but they don’t.
  - g. While we should respect the rights of others to believe what they want, we are foolish and unloving to tacitly accept every religious belief as true. What an immeasurable insult to the finished work of Christ on the cross if we preach all paths to God are the same. Affirming such error might keep them on the road to damnation.
  - h. The best way to “prove” truth in religious thought is to use philosophy “in the classic sense” where it means finding truth through logic, evidence, and science. (Socratic method)
6. Why do people believe things in the first place?
  - a. Sociological – parents, friends, society.
  - b. Psychological – comfort, peace of mind
  - c. Religious – scripture, pastor/priest, Imam, Church
  - d. Philosophical – consistency, coherence, completeness (best fit to the evidence).
7. Truth is not a subjective matter of taste; it is an objective matter of fact.

## ***WEEK TWO – B. The Rules***

8. To find truth, one must be willing to give up subjective preferences in favor of objective facts. Facts are discovered through logic, evidence, and science.
9. To begin our proof of God we need to come to agreement on a few basic principals.
  - a. Truth exists and we can know truth.
  - b. The law of non-contradiction (a self evident law of logic called a first principle – you don't learn them, you just know them) – In short it means whatever is not true is false.
  - c. Self defeating statements such as “truth does not exist” or “we cannot know truth” are easily defeated with the truth statements on which they are based. Is the first statement true? How do they know truth does not exist is true? ☺
  - d. We use the law of non-contradiction (and other first principles) as tools to discover all other truths.
10. A logical argument is our next tool in “proving God”.
  - a. A logical argument is comprised of at least two premises that lead to a conclusion.
  - b. If both premises are true, the conclusion naturally follows as true.
  - c. For example:
    - i. All humans are mortal.
    - ii. Mike Newman is a human.
    - iii. Therefore, Mike Newman is mortal.
  - d. This works as long as both premises are true.
  - e. If either premise is false we have the following:
    - i. All humans are cold blooded reptiles.
    - ii. Mike Newman is a human.
    - iii. Therefore, Mike Newman is a cold blooded reptile.
  - f. Excluding humorous pastor jokes, we know this not to be true because one of the premises is false.

## ***WEEK TWO – C. Getting to Know God***

11. How do we discover truth?
  - a. We draw conclusions by observing the world around us.
  - b. Drawing general conclusions from specific observations is called “induction” (we equate this to the scientific method).
  - c. The process of lining up premises in an argument and arriving at a valid conclusion is called deduction but the process of discovering whether a premise is true usually requires induction.
  - d. Most conclusions based on induction (observation) cannot be considered absolutely certain but only highly probably. (Are you 100% certain all men are mortal? No, but all men you have observed have died.)

- e. If not 100% certain, can these observations be trusted. Yes, but to varying degrees.
  - f. We make life and death decisions in court based on facts being “beyond a reasonable doubt”.
  - g. We can use this same probability test to find truth.
12. How do we discover truths about God?
- a. We use induction the same way we use it to investigate other things we cannot see – by observing their effects. (e.g. effects of gravity, effects of the human mind)
  - b. From these effects we make rational inferences to the existence of the cause.
  - c. We assume that a book is the effect of a human mind. Observation tells you the book is an effect from a pre-existing intelligence (e.g. an author). We never saw anyone write the book but we infer that it had a least one author.
  - d. To come to a conclusion about truth, our natural reasoning puts observation, induction and deduction together.
  - e. As we stated previously, a logical, deductive argument looks like this:
    - 1. All books have at least one author.
    - 2. The Purpose Driven Life is a book.
    - 3. The Purpose Driven Life has at least one author.
  - f. We know the argument is valid because of deduction and you now know the argument is true because the premises are true. (Which you have verified through observation and induction.)
13. What are general beliefs about God?
- a. Most of the world religions fall into one of three categories with respect to God.
    - i. (God made) Theist – believe in a personal God who created the universe. (Christians, Jews, and Muslims)
    - ii. (God is) Pantheist – an impersonal God who is the Universe. (Hinduism, some Buddhists, and some New Age)
    - iii. (No God at all) Atheist – does not believe in any type of God. (Religious humanists)
    - iv. Agnostics are not sure what they believe about God.
    - v. For discussion purposes in this course I will use several terms interchangeably; atheist, Darwinist, evolutionists. The last two terms will be used more frequently as we get into the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> proof.
14. We will use four logical arguments to prove God.
- a. The Cosmological argument.
  - b. The Teleological argument.
  - c. The Irreducible Complexity argument.
  - d. The Moral argument.

### ***WEEK THREE – Arguing for God***

15. The Cosmological Argument
  - a. The deductive argument goes like this:
    - i. Everything that had a beginning had a cause.
    - ii. The universe had a beginning.
    - iii. Therefore, the universe had a cause. (or a causer or beginner)
  - b. The first premise is based on the “Law of Causality” which is the fundamental principal of Science”. Everything that has a beginning has a cause. Science is the search for “causes”. Observation has told us over and over and over again that “things do not happen without a cause” so we have comfort knowing the premise number one is true.
  - c. Is Premise #2 true? The universe had a beginning.
  - d. Now this may not seem like a strange statement to make but at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century most scientists believed the universe to be eternal. That is until someone named Albert Einstein came up with a formula called the “Theory of Relativity –  $E=MC^2$ ” which lead to our current day “big bang” theory.
  - e. Einstein’s calculation pointed to a “beginning” and this did not please him at all because he had long believed the Universe to be eternal. So he did what many of us would do when we face what appears to be a fact and it differs from a long held belief. He “fudged” his results. He put in a “cosmological constant” which always pointed out to an eternal universe.
  - f. There was only one problem. Truth is true for all people, everywhere, all the time and the truth kept popping up around Einstein.
  - g. There were 5 main “observations” that caused Einstein to have to re-assess his position.
    - i. The first and second law of thermodynamics. The first law says there is a finite amount of energy in the universe. The second law is that energy is being used up in the universe. I don’t understand how they know this but these two laws are some of the most proven laws in all of science and they point to a beginning of the universe. (use the analogy of a running car) An expanding universe. It was predicted at the time Einstein produced his theory but never observed until the Hubble space telescope and at that point we were able to “observe” the fact that bodies in space a flying away from each other as if they started from an explosion. (support for the big bang) If you run a video backwards the universe goes back to a single point.
    - ii. If the big bang was real, we would expect to see a background radiation emitted from the explosion. About 40 years after Einstein’s theory it was accidentally discovered by two Bell Scientists.
    - iii. Small variations in temperature in space were also predicted which would allow galaxies to form. In 1989 a Nasa probe proved this.

- iv. Last but not least we come back to the theory of relativity itself which has now been proven to 5 decimal places and it points to an absolute beginning of time, matter and space.
- v. As the universe expands it is not expanding into empty space but space itself is expanding.
- vi. At one point there was nothing. At the next point there was something (our entire universe).
- vii. Nothing is NO THING.
- viii. Aristotle said that “nothing is what rocks dream about”.
- ix. Everything that has a beginning has a cause. The universe has a beginning. Therefore the Universe had a cause (or a causer or a beginner.)
  - x. Atheists would tell you that nothing made something out of nothing.
  - xi. Theists would tell you “something” made something out of nothing.
  - xii. These two things are diametrically opposed. One is true. One is false.

**Discussion: What is your reaction to this argument? What are strengths and weaknesses in this argument? How does “Intelligent Design” fit here? Does the “something” in this argument have to be God?**

- 16. The second proof is the Teleological Argument.
  - a. This is the argument that looks at the “precision” with which the universe exploded into being.
  - b. The argument goes like this:
    - i. Every design has a designer.
    - ii. The universe has a design.
    - iii. Therefore, the universe has a designer.
  - c. The universe is specifically tweaked (finely tuned) to enable life on earth – a planet with scores of improbable and interdependent life-supporting conditions (anthropic constants) that make it a tiny oasis in a vast and hostile universe.
  - d. Insert the Apollo 13 analogy here. The earth is an oasis like the space capsule was for the crew.
  - e. There are 122 anthropic constants so far identified.
  - f. Five of those are:
    - i. Oxygen at 21% of the gas mix. Too much causes fires, too little we suffocate.
    - ii. The degree of transparency of the atmosphere. Too much, and solar radiation would kill us. Too little and we would freeze to death.
    - iii. Moon-Earth gravitational attraction. If too much, the tidal affects would be too severe and too little orbit changes would cause dramatic climate instabilities.

- iv. CO2 levels – too high of a level of CO2 and a runaway greenhouse effect would burn us up. Too little and plants cannot produce food. They would die and we would die.
- v. Gravity – if our gravitational force changed up or down 10-37 power our sun would not exist.
- g. There are 122 anthropic constants identified to date.
- h. Astrophysicist Hugh Ross calculated the probability that all 122 could have happened on earth by chance at 10 to the 138<sup>th</sup> power. He then points out that his calculation shows that there are only 10 to the 70<sup>th</sup> power total atoms in the universe. In other words, it is mathematically impossible for it to have happened by chance.
- i. Insert analogy about the two astronauts landing on Mars.
- j. Several good quotes from the book “IDHEFTBAA” would go well here.
- k. Again, every design has a designer. As verified by the anthropic principal, we know beyond a reasonable doubt the universe was designed. Therefore, we know the universe had a designer.

**Discussion: What is your reaction to this argument? What are the strengths and weaknesses? Use the “Expelled” movie as a discussion starter.**

## ***WEEK FOUR – Arguing for God, Pt. 2***

17. The third proof is the irreducible complexity argument.
  - a. We use the same logical argument to prove that the complexity of life on earth could not have happened by chance.
  - b. The argument is the same as above:
    - i. Every design has a designer.
    - ii. The complexity we find in life had to have been designed.
    - iii. Life was made by a designer.
  - c. Analogy of a box of alphabets falling on a table and the likelihood it would make a complete sentence. (information)
  - d. But if we came in and saw alphabets arranged so they spelled out the “message” “take out the garbage, mom”, we know an intelligence was behind it.
  - e. To suggest that “messages” can occur by chance shows someone is only playing with half a deck. Yet that is exactly what is taught to children everyday in our public school systems. They assert that life generated spontaneously from non-living chemicals by natural laws without any intelligent intervention. They also believe that all life evolved from this one cell “chance” life without any intelligent design. This is called “macroevolution” or from the goo, to you, via the zoo. That is difficult enough to explain but their real challenge is explaining the “first life”.
  - f. In a one cell amoeba, even Richard Dawkins, ardent Darwinist/atheist, admits there is the equivalent of 1000 encyclopedias worth of messages/information inside that cell. We must emphasize this is not just the number of letters in 1000 encyclopedias but complete messages (sentences, paragraphs, chapters, etc.).
  - g. Atheists say that this information was assembled by chance. Theists say it was formed by intelligence. One is true, one is false. (Law of non-contradiction)
  - h. No human observed the origin of the first life. If we can’t “observe” it what scientific principal do we use to discover the cause of the first life? We use the same principals that our criminal justice system uses today – “forensic principles” – where we piece together evidence much like detectives piece together evidence from a murder.
  - i. The central principle of forensic science is the Principle of Uniformity, which holds that causes in the past were like causes that we observe today. We look at the Grand Canyon and we know it happened by chance. We look at Mt. Rushmore and we know it did not happen by chance.
  - j. Scientists have been unable to combine chemicals in a test tube to arrive at a DNA molecule, much less life but we are challenged to believe life happened by chance. Not only have these experiments failed but they also suffer from an illegitimate application of intelligence. We are asked to believe that the most brilliant minds in the world cannot create “simple” life but that mindless natural laws can. (great quotes on pg 15 of my notes)

- k. It is commonly believed that the so-called creation-evolution debate entails a war between religion and science, the Bible and science, or faith and reason. This perception is perpetrated by the media. As you can see it is not faith versus reason – it is reasonable faith versus unreasonable faith.
- l. Science is the search for causes. There are only two types of causes: intelligent and non-intelligent (i.e. natural causes). Grand Canyon, natural. Mt. Rushmore (intelligent design). Atheists (Darwinists) rule out intelligent causes before they even look at the evidence. (Do I want to explain materialists?)
- m. Some evolutionists are getting so frustrated trying to justify their positions that they have actually suggested aliens deposited the first life here. They did this after they calculated the probability of life arising by spontaneous generation as effectively zero. There is only one slight problem with this theory; “who created the aliens?”
- n. In essence, it is the Darwinists who are allowing their faith to overrule observation and reason. Creationists and Intelligent Design proponents are simply making a rational inference from the evidence. They are following the evidence exactly where it leads back to an intelligent cause.
- o. Unfortunately, Darwinists have been successful in convincing the public that the only bad science is that which disagrees with Darwinism (which really isn't science at all). ☺
- p. The scientific method is but one means of finding the truth. Philosophical laws, such as the laws of logic, help us discover truth as well. In fact, those laws are used by the scientific method.
- q. In fact, science is built on philosophy and is a slave to philosophy. Bad philosophy results in bad science and good science requires good philosophy. Why? Because:
  - i. Science cannot be done without philosophy. Pg 127 of book
  - ii. Philosophical assumptions can dramatically impact scientific conclusions.
  - iii. Science doesn't say anything – scientists do! Pg 128 of book
- r. Darwinists – who champion truth and reason – have made truth and reason impossible by ruling out possible outcomes on the front end of an inquiry.
- s. A world view is like a box top (of a puzzle). The correct box top allows you to place the many pieces of life's puzzle into a complete, cohesive picture. If you have the right box top, then all the pieces make sense in light of the complete picture. But what happens when you think you have the right box top and then you keep discovering pieces that don't fit. Common sense would tell you that you need to look for another (correct) box top. Darwinists refuse to do this. Their preconceived box top rules out intelligent design yet many of the pieces have the clear appearance of design. Rather than admit to having the wrong box top they will insist the pieces are not what they appear and they will work very hard to force the pieces to fit. In doing so, they discard the observational data which is the very essence of the scientific proof they supposedly champion.

- t. Finding the right box top is not a matter of preference. It is a matter of objective fact and the Atheists (Darwinists) don't want to play by those rules.
- u. While we could take the irreducible complexity argument into the discussion of macroevolution we will quit here for now showing just the complexity of forming the "first" life.

**Discussion: What is your reaction? What are the strengths and weaknesses of this argument? What might be convincing to an unbeliever? How does this strengthen your confidence and faith?**

18. The forth ~~and final~~ argument or proof is the Moral argument and it goes like this:
  - a. Every law has a law giver.
  - b. There is a moral law.
  - c. Therefore, there is a moral law giver.
19. If the first and second premises are true, the conclusion follows. There can be no legislation unless there is a legislature. If there are moral obligations, there must be someone to be obligated to.
20. Is there really a moral law? Our founding fathers thought so. When Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence he wrote "nature's law is self evident". You don't use reason to discover it, you just know it. (we are using philosophy again ☺)
21. When people say "it is the right thing to do" they cannot explain why they have this feeling unless they appeal to a standard outside themselves. Without an objective standard of meaning and morality, everything is merely a matter of opinion. When we say a moral law exists we mean that all people are impressed with a fundamental sense of right and wrong (See Romans 1:18-20, 2:14-15). Everyone agrees that love is greater than hate and courage is better than cowardice. C.S. Lewis had a great quote in "Mere Christianity" – "think of a country where people were admired for running away in battle, or where a man felt proud of double-crossing all the people who had been kindest to him. You might just as well try to imagine a country where two and two made five."
22. There are basic principles of right and wrong that everyone knows, whether they will admit them or not. Killing innocent people is wrong. Some people may deny it and commit murder anyway, but deep in their hearts they know murder is wrong. An example of this is that when the Nazis first began killing Jews they tried to dehumanize them by calling the pigs and they would kill them by shooting them. After a while, the German soldiers could not do it anymore because they knew what they were doing was wrong so they moved to the gas chambers and set up walkways where they could not see the humanity walking into the chambers to their death.
23. If someone denies that a moral law exists or any real moral values you could yell at them "sit down you stupid egghead. Who wants to hear your opinion." And see what they do. They would object because they would claim to have a "right" to their opinion and a "right" to express it.

24. A student hands in a paper arguing there are no moral absolutes and thus no standards of right and wrong or justice and rightness. He states that justice and rightness is just a matter of opinion; you like chocolate, I like vanilla. The teacher gives him an F because he did not like the blue folder it came in. The student argued that was not “fair”. If you want to get relativists to admit there are moral truths, all you need to do is treat them “unfairly”. I may not feel like stealing is wrong but watch what happens when you steal from me.
25. Some people will argue that flying planes into buildings killing innocent people is wrong. Others might argue that Bin Laden followers felt it was right so there was no “moral right” but see what would happen if you fly a plane into one of their buildings where their innocent people would die. The moral law is not always the standard with which we treat others but it is the standard by which we expect others to treat us.
26. Without a moral law, there could be no human rights. In the US declaration of independence it states “they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights”. The founding fathers felt that human rights were God-given, universal and absolute. Discuss how moral law comes from God—and how it is related to God—why it points us to God. They felt they were rights for all people, in all places, at all times regardless of their nationality or religion. If there was no moral law there would be no difference between the acts of Mother Teresa and Hitler. There would be no difference between the statement “the meal was wonderful” and “the holocaust was wonderful”.
27. A professor of relativism would set up a problem as a moral dilemma to show there is no moral right and wrong. He tells his students there are 5 people on a life raft and one must be thrown overboard for them to survive. When the students reach disagreement he uses that as an example of morality being relative.
28. Just the opposite is really proved. If there was no moral right and wrong, throw them all overboard. What does it matter? The reason we struggle with it is that we know how valuable life is.
29. Some relativists point to the abortion controversy to demonstrate that morality is relative but just the opposite is true. Both sides think their moral position trumps the other: one says we need to protect life, the other says we need to protect liberty in allowing a woman to control her body. With the latter case, most will argue there is no human life until a certain point in the pregnancy rather than say liberty is more important than life.
30. Huckabee example: Joseline Elders thought the embryo was not human. He on the other hand thought it was a human life. One was very pro abortion. The other was pro life.
31. Darwinists will simply assert that morals have naturally evolved like man has evolved. No evidence to support it. They just make an assertion.

**Discussion: What is your reaction to this argument? What are the strengths and weaknesses? How does this help you show God exists? How does it build your confidence?**

***WEEK FIVE – Another Argument and a Summary***

32. In summary:
- a. Truth exists and we can know truth.
  - b. What ever is not true is false. (law of non-contradiction)
  - c. When people make claims there is no truth or we cannot know truth these are self-defeating claims which try to prove truth does not exist by using a truth statement. ☺
  - d. There are five proofs for God:
    - i. Cosmological – where there is a beginning there is a cause. The universe has a beginning; therefore the universe has a cause (God).
    - ii. Teleological argument – Where there is a design, there is a designer. The life allowing conditions around the earth (anthropic constants) show design. Therefore, the life allowing conditions around earth were designed (by God).
    - iii. The irreducible complexity argument – Again, where there is design there is a designer. Life has “information” encoded into it. A single cell has equivalent to 1000 encyclopedias worth of information in it. Just like we know an “intelligence” causes a message like “take out the garbage –mom” written in alphabets, we know that 1000 encyclopedias had to have had intelligence (a designer) behind it. (God)
    - iv. The moral argument. Where there is a law there is a law giver. We have a moral law inside of us. We know it is wrong to kill people or there is something wrong if we say the holocaust was good. Therefore there is a moral law giver (God).
33. **Insert the Historical Argument for Jesus here – Jesus’ existed as the miraculous Son of God who died and rose again: documentation, evidence both secular and sacred, etc. Give some good resources to people – your book recommendations included. Discuss if group is interested in a second course on “proving Jesus”. ☺**

i.

**Discuss: What have these weeks proven? How might this impact others? Why isn’t this discussed more in our world? How can you grow in mastering this thought?**

## *WEEK SIX – Conclusion and Next Steps*

34. Back to our reasons for giving this course.
  - a. There are people who believe that religion and science are at odds and the two will be forever separated. You can now tell them there is more real “scientific” evidence for your belief in God than there is for someone who does not believe in God. Before you proceed you need to ask them “if I am able to prove God beyond a reasonable doubt, would you believe?” If no, then you are not dealing with a proof issue but a will issue.
  - b. For those who are honestly asking the God question, you can show a tremendous amount of proof for God outside the Bible. Even the Bible alludes to this (include passages here) As Paul says, we need to be all things to all people (within the confines of our faith).
  - c. Once we prove God, it is a step by step process, looking at the true evidence that will prove Jesus. We can show 300 prophecies that point to him. The mathematical probability that any one person could meet all of these predictions and not be the person it was predicted to be is “mathematically impossible”. Jesus filled all 300. We can prove Jesus was a true historical figure. We can prove he lived, he died and he was seen alive again. From there it is a short step of faith to accept him as our Lord and Savior. ☺ Discuss how knowledge and conversion work.
  - d. God gives us each gifts and he wants us to do things outside the walls of Concordia. Seven years ago, if you would have told me I would be doing this I would have told you that you were crazy. God has given me certain (gifts – desires – passions) and they all pointed at this. They also pointed me at AFC. I don’t tell you this to brag. I tell you because you too have different, but just as real passions (we are all parts of the same body) and Christ is challenging you to use your gifts to further his kingdom. I ask you to pray about it and work with Josh Hower and the other pastors here to see where God wants you. You won’t regret it. May God bless you.