REASONABLE TRUST

To God be the Glory! This handout is free and is intended for encouragement and educational purposes.
For more information and free handouts like this please to: 1T3Life.org

1

A *Brief* Way to Demonstrate the Reasonable Trustworthiness and truth of Christianity:

A reasonable trust would be the type of trust it would take to get into a hot air balloon with an honest and trustworthy certified licensed hot air balloon pilot who has thousands of hours' worth of safe flight time taking others up in a hot air balloon. It would be reasonable then to trust this pilot to take you safely on a flight in a hot air balloon.

There are different ways to demonstrate the reasonable trustworthiness and the truth of Christianity. The following is an only an *outline* of one way:

1. There are self-evident truths:[1]
   a. The Law of Identity: X is X, in the same time and sense
   b. The Law of Non-contradiction: Not (X & not X), in the same time and sense[2]
   c. The Law of Excluded Middle: X or not X, in the same time and sense

2. These Laws of Logic are absolute[3]

3. These Laws of Logic apply to reality[4]

4. Then you need to answer the question:

   What is an adequate test for truth <u>between</u> worldviews[5] (ultimate views of reality)?
   All of the following fail:
   Skepticism, Agnosticism, Relativism/Perspectivism, Rationalism, Presuppositionalism, Fideism, Experientialism, Pietism, Traditionalism/Historicism, Evidentialism, Pragmatism, Combinationalism

What then is an adequate test for truth between world views?
Actual[6] Unaffirmability[7] as a Test for Falsity
What does actual unaffirmability mean?
It comes from:
   un – not
   affirm – to declare to be true[8]
   -able – capable, having sufficient ability or resources

---

[1] For more information see "First Principles" in *The Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics* by Norman L. Geisler (Grand Rapid, MI: Baker, 1999) . Also, especially see *Epistemology* by L. M. Regis (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959).

[2] Epistemologically meaning, it is not the case that X can both be true and not true in the same time and sense. Ontologically meaning, that it is not the case that X has being (that which is) and does not have being (that which is) in the same time and sense, or it is not the case that X is Being (that which is) and is not Being (that which is) in the same time and sense. For more information see: L. M. Regis, *Epistemology* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959), 377-390; and Richard Purtill, "principle of contradiction," in *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, gen. ed. Robert Audi (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 644.

[3] See Norman L. Geisler, Christian Apologetics, (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1976).

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Actual as opposed to hypothetical.

[7] For the sake of this packet, we will be using the term actual unaffirmability as merely a description of the "process" by which one realizes certain assertions/propositions/statements to be false. However, actual unaffirmability can also be termed self-defeating, self-refuting, self-destructing, self-referential inconsistent, and self-referential incoherence. For more information on this see: Joseph Boyle, "Self-Referential Inconsistence, Inevitable Falsity, and Metaphysical Argumentation," *Metaphilosophy* 3 (January 1972): 25-42; George Mavrodes, "Self-Referential Incoherence," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 22 (January 1985): 65-72; William Hasker, "self-referential incoherence," *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, gen. ed. Robert Audi (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 752; J. P. Moreland, *Scaling the Secular City* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1987), 91-92; and Joseph M. Boyle, Jr., Germain Grisez and Olaf Tollefsen, *Free Choice: A Self Referential Argument* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976), Ch. 5.

[8] Boyle, Jr., Grisez and Tollefsen, 124, make the following statements about what it means to affirm: "To affirm is not primarily to perform an act of communication, but to perform a propositional act, an act which one seeking truth prefers one proposition to its contradictory. Whether one wishes to gain agreement with his affirmation or not, *whether he even expresses it in speech*, the conditions necessary for making it must obtain. Insofar as a rational affirmation depends upon a rationality norm, the act of rationally affirming a proposition can succeed only if the norm is in force"(emphasis added).

To God be the Glory! This handout is free and is intended for encouragement and educational purposes.
For more information and free handouts like this please to: 1T3Life.org

2

REASONABLE

Actual Unaffirmability, therefore means that a particular statement/proposition/assertion is not actually capable of being declared as true. It "does not mean that a view is unsayable or unstateable. Even complete nonsense can be said or stated. For example, one can state that there are square triangles even through the statement has no [philosophical] meaning. One can state: "the sound of the music is the color red" but this too is nonsense."[9]
Therefore:
1. *Not everything sayable is philosophically meaningful (i.e., gibberish and nonsense are sayable/stateable but they are not philosophically meaningful).*
2. *Some sayable things are actually unaffirmable. Some are directly actually unaffirmable and some are indirectly actually unaffirmable.*

Direct Actual Unaffirmability:
-"Direct actual unaffirmability occurs when the statement itself provides the information to defeat itself."[10]
Meaning the very act of its declaration provides the data for its own self-destruction.
> *Example: "I cannot express anything in words."*

Indirect Actual Unaffirmability:
-There are two types of indirect actual unaffirmability:
1. *Any statement where the very process by which the statement was derived self-refutes the thought expressed in the statement.*
   Example: "I came to the conclusion I know everything intuitively."
2. *"Any statement which negates the only basis on which it can make its affirmation (or denial) is indirectly self-defeating."[11]*
   Example: "I know that one cannot know anything about reality."

Actual[12] Undeniability[13] as a Test for Truth
What is actually unaffirmable is false and what logically follows from this is, that what is actually undeniable is true.
What does undeniability mean?
> *un – not*
> *deny – to declare untrue*
> *-able – capable, having sufficient ability or resources*

Therefore, actual undeniability means that a statement is not actually capable of being declared untrue. Because in the process of denying it one is assuming its truth in order to deny it.

Two types of actual undeniability:

1. Actual Definitional Undeniability:
"The affirmation "triangles must have three sides" is undeniably true. But this does not mean that there is in fact any such thing as a triangle. It means only that if there were a triangle it would in fact have three sides. Or, there is no other meaningful way to define a triangle than as a three-sided figure for that is what we mean by triangularity."[14]
> *Examples: All bachelors are unmarried men. All circles are round.*

---

[9] Norman L. Geisler, *Christian Apologetics*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1976), 141.
[10] Ibid., 142.
[11] Ibid., 143.
[12] Again, actual as opposed to hypothetical.
[13] Actual Undeniability is merely a description of the "process" by which we realize certain statements/propositions to be true. Kordig, 207, describes this "process" as self-validating.
[14] Ibid., 143.

To God be the Glory! This handout is free and is intended for encouragement and educational purposes.
For more information and free handouts like this please to: 1T3Life.org

3

   2. Actual Existential Undeniability:

"*Existence, at least my existence, is actually undeniable. I must exist in order to make the denial. Nonexistents do not affirm or deny; they are not and they speak not. Whenever I attempt to deny my existence, I catch myself existing in the process of making the denial. So at least something is actually undeniable, namely, my own existence.*"[15]

"1. Something exists, (e.g. I exist)
   1.1 For in the very attempt to deny my existence I affirm that I exist, otherwise I could not make the denial.
   1.2 But what is affirmed in the very attempt to deny it is actually undeniable.
   1.3 And whatever is actually undeniable is true.
   1.4 Therefore, it is [actually] undeniably true that I exist."[16]

Principles that can be demonstrated to be true using actual undeniability:[17]

1. Being Is (B is) [= That which is, is] = *The Principle of Exi*stence.

2. Being is Being (B is B) [= That which is, is that which is] = *The Principle of Identity*.

3. Being is Not Nonbeing (B is Not Non-B) [= That which *is* cannot be that which *is not* in the same time and sense] = *The Principle of Noncontradiction*.

4. Either Being or Nonbeing (Either B or Non-B) [= Either that which is, is; or that which is, is not] = *The Principle of Excluded Middle*.

5. Nonbeing Cannot Cause Being . . . [= That which *is completely NOT* cannot cause that which *is*] = *The Principle of Causality*.

6. Contingent Being Cannot Cause Contingent Being . . . [=That which is, which can cease to exist cannot ultimately be the sustaining cause of the existence of that which is, which can cease to exist] = *The Principle of Contingency* (or Dependency).

7. Only Necessary Being Can Cause a Contingent Being . . . [= Only that which is, which cannot cease to exist can be the sustaining cause of that which can cease to exist] = *The Positive Principle of Modality*.

8. Necessary Being Cannot Cause a Necessary Being . . . [= That which is, which cannot cease to be or come to be cannot cease to be or come to be] = *The Negative Principle of Modality*.

9. Every Contingent Being Is Caused by a Necessary Being . . . [=All that which is, which *can* cease to exist, is being sustained by that which is, which cannot cease to exist] = *The Principle of Existential Causality*.

10. Necessary Being exists . . . [= If that which is, is that which *cannot* cease to exist and *cannot* come to exist, exists, then that which is, which cannot cease to exist and cannot come to exist, exists] = *The Principle of Existential Necessity*.

11. Contingent being exists . . . [= If that which is, is that which *can* cease to exist and *can* come to exist, is existing, then it is that which is, which *can* cease to exist and *can* come to exist, and is existing] = *The Principle of Existential Contingency* [Dependence].

12. Necessary being is similar to similar contingent being(s) it causes [= That which is, which *cannot* cease to exist and *cannot* come to exist, is similar to that which is, which *can* cease to exist and *can* come to exist, and is caused to exist by that which is, which *cannot* cease to exist and *cannot* come to exist] = *The Principle of Analogy* [by Intrinsic Attribution].

---

[15] Ibid., 143.

[16] Norman L. Geisler, *Syllabus on Christian Apologetics*. (Mundelein, IL: 1978), 6.

[17] Adapted (the sections in brackets have been added to the original for clarification purposes, however, please see the original for even further clarification) from Norman L. Geisler's, "First Principles," in the *Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics*, 3rd printing (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1999), 250.

To God be the Glory! This handout is free and is intended for encouragement and educational purposes.
For more information and free handouts like this please to: 1T3Life.org

4

5. The following worldviews are all actually unaffirmable:[18]
Deism
Pantheism
Panentheism
Finite Godism
Polytheism
Henotheism
Atheism

6. Theism is the only worldview that is not actually unaffirmable and is actually undeniable.[19]

Using the first principles as described earlier, one can demonstrate that Theism is actually undeniable by the following:

1. Something exits (e.g. I do) (no. 1).
2. I am a contingent being (no. 11).
3. Nothing cannot cause something (no. 5).
4. Only a Necessary Being can cause a contingent being (no. 7) [Only that which is, which cannot cease to exist can be the sustaining cause of that which can cease to exist].
5. Therefore, I am caused to exist by a Necessary Being (follows from nos. 1-4).
6. But I am a personal, rational, and moral kind of being (since I engage in these kind of activities).
7. Therefore, this Necessary Being must be a personal, rational, and moral kind of being, since I am similar to this Necessary Being by the Principle of Analogy (no. 12).
8. But a Necessary Being cannot be contingent (i.e. not-necessary) in its being which would be a contradiction (no. 3).
9. Therefore, this Necessary Being is personal, rational, and moral in a necessary way; not in a contingent way.
10. This Necessary Being is also eternal, uncaused, unchanging, unlimited, and one, since a Necessary Being cannot come to be, be caused by another, undergo change, be limited by any possibility of what it could be (a Necessary Being has no possibility to be other than it is), or to be more than one Being (since there cannot be two infinite beings).
11. Therefore, one necessary, eternal, uncaused, unlimited (=infinite), rational, personal, and moral being exists.
12. Such a Necessary Being is appropriately called "God" in the theistic sense, because this Necessary Being possesses all the essential characteristics of a theistic God.
13. Therefore, a theistic God exists.[20]
For a more in-depth demonstration for God's existence see chapter 13 in the book *Christian Apologetics* and chapter 9 in the book *Philosophy of Religion*[21].

[18] For further development of the inadequacy of world views other than Theism see the *Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics*, 3rd printing (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1999) and the selected readings at the end of each section.
[19] See Chapter 13 in *Christian Apologetics* and the selected readings at the end of the chapter.
[20] This is a direct quote from: Ibid., "First Principles", 253.
[21] Norman L. Geisler, *Christian Apologetics*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1976) and Norman L. Geisler, *Philosophy of Religion*, second printing (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1975).
To God be the Glory! This handout is free and is intended for encouragement and educational purposes.
For more information and free handouts like this please to: 1T3Life.org

5

7. What is an adequate test for truth *within* an overall worldview?
Answer: Systematic Coherence[22]
Three types of Systematic Coherence Tests:
1. *Consistency – the proposed view within this worldview is logically consistent*
2. *Empirical Adequacy – the proposed view within this worldview fits all the know evidence*
3. *Experiential Relevance – the proposed view within this worldview can be consistently lived out*

8. In a theistic universe miracles are possible.[23]

9. Historical events are knowable in a theistic universe.[24]

10. The New Testament is historically reliable.[25]

11. The New Testament affirms that Jesus claimed to be God.[26]

12. The Resurrection of Jesus is the most plausible explanation of the facts (See *Cold Case Christianity* by J. Warner Wallace and *The Case for Christ* by Lee Strobel for starters).
Items to be taken into consideration when testing a historical hypothesis:
"(1) The hypothesis, together with other true statements, must imply further statements describing present, observable data.
(2) The hypothesis must have greater *explanatory scope* (that is, imply a greater variety of observable data) than rival hypotheses.
(3) The hypothesis must have greater *explanatory power* (that is, make the observable data more probable) than rival hypotheses.
(4) The hypothesis must be more *plausible* (that this, be implied by a greater variety of accepted truths, and its negation implied by fewer accepted truths) than rival hypotheses.
(5) The hypothesis must be *less ad hoc* (that is, include fewer new suppositions about the past not already implied by existing knowledge) than rival hypotheses.
(6) The hypothesis must be *disconfirmed by fewer accepted beliefs* (that is, when conjoined with accepted truths, imply fewer false statements) than rival hypotheses.
(7) The hypothesis must so exceed its rivals in fulfilling conditions (2) through (6) that there is little chance of a rival hypothesis, after further investigation, exceeding it in meeting these conditions. "[27]
For an example of how the evidence for the resurrection of Jesus fits this criteria see William Lane Craig's chapter entitled "Did Jesus Rise from the Dead?" in *Jesus Under Fire* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1995).

13. Jesus rose from the dead, therefore, he fulfilled his prediction that he would rise from the dead and verified his claim to be God.[28]

---

[22] For a further development of this see *Christian Apologetics* chapters 8 through 13, and Yandell, Keith. *Christianity and Philosophy* Downers Grove, Ill.: Eerdmans, 1984), Chap. 8.
[23] See Chapter 14 in *Christian Apolgetic*s; Chapter 5 in *Jesus Under Fire,* gen. editors Michael J. Wilkins and J.P. Moreland, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1995); Geivett, R. Douglas and Gary R. Habermas. *In Defense of Miracles: A Comprehensive Case for God's Action in History* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1997).
[24] See Chapter 15 in *Christian Apolgetics*. and Chapter 5 in *Reasonable Faith*, by William Lane Craig. (Westchester, Ill.: Crossway, 1994); William H. Dray, *Philosophy of History* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964; Hans Meyerhoff, ed., *The Philosophy of History in Our Time* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Anchor Books, 1959); John Warwick Montgomery, *Where Is History Going?*, reprint ed., (Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, 1972); Sidney Hook, ed., *Philosophy and History: A Symposium* (New York: New York University, 1963).
[25] See Metzger, Bruce. *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Paleography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981); idem, *The Text of the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964); idem, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament.* 3rd ed. (London/New York: United Bible Societies, 1975); Bruce, F. F. *The New Testament Documents: Are They Reliable?* 5th ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960); Paul Barnett, *Is the New Testament Reliable? A Look at the Historical Evidence* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, Press, 1986); idem, *Jesus and the Logic of History* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997); Blomberg, Craig, *The Historical Reliability of the Gospels* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1987); Moule, C. F. D. *The Birth of the New Testament*, 3rd rev. ed. (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1981); idem. The Origin of Christology (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977); idem. *The Phenomenon of the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1967) and see Chapter 16 in *Christian Apologetics* and the selected readings at the end of the chapter.
[26] See Chapter 17 in *Christian Apologetics* and the selected readings at the end of the chapter.
[27] C. Behan McCullagh, *Justifying Historical Descriptions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 19.
[28] See Chapter 17 in *Christian Apologetics* and the selected readings at the end of the chapter.

14. Jesus also verified his claim to be God by his sinless life, the miracles he did, and his fulfillment of prophecy.[29]

15. Jesus therefore is God.

16. Jesus is God; therefore, whatever He teaches is true.[30]

17. Jesus taught that the 39 books of the Old Testament were the inspired Word of God.[31]

18. Jesus promised that the other New Testament books would be inspired after his death and resurrection.[32]

19. Therefore, the canonical books of the Old Testament and the New Testament are the inspired and true Word of God.[33]

20. New Testament Christianity is the most systematic coherent worldview of the Theistic worldviews.[34]

21. Therefore, New Testament Christianity is true.

---

[29] Ibid.

[30] Ibid.

[31] See Beckwith, Roger. *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism.* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986); Archer, Gleason L. *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction, Updated and Revised Edition* (Chicago: Moody, 1964, 1974, 1994); Bruce, F. F. *The Books and the Parchments* (Old Tappan, N.J.: Revell, 1984); Wenham, J. W., "Christ's View of Scripture," N. L Geisler, ed., *Inerrancy* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980); Geisler, Norman L. "Bible, Jesus' View of", Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999), 99-102 and see Chapter 18 in *Christian Apologetics* and the selected readings at the end of the chapter.

[32] See Chapter 17 and 18 in *Christian Apologetics* and the selected readings at the end of each chapter.

[33] See Chapter 17 and 18 in *Christian Apologetics* and the selected readings at the end of each chapter. See also Norman L. Geisler and William E. Nix, *A General Introduction to the Bible, Revised and Expanded* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1986) and Norman L. Geisler, ed., *Inerrancy* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1980).

[34] See *Christian Apologetics* and the selected readings at the end of each chapter.

To God be the Glory! This handout is free and is intended for encouragement and educational purposes.
For more information and free handouts like this please to: 1T3Life.org

7

WHY DO MOST PEOPLE TURN AWAY FROM GOD
AND FROM NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTIANITY?

1. Pride and/or immoral reasons

As one philosopher stated:

"I had motives for not wanting the world to have a meaning; consequently I assumed that it had none, and was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption. Most ignorance is vincible ignorance. We don't know because we don't want to know. It is our will that decides how and upon what subjects we shall use our intelligence. Those who detect no meaning in the world generally do so because for one reason or another, it suits their books that the world should be meaningless."[35]

As one Christian who was tortured for being a Christian witnessed:

"The communist torturers often said, 'There is no God, no hereafter, no punishment for evil. We can do whatever we wish.' I have heard one torturer even say, 'I thank God in whom I don't believe, that I have lived this hour when I can express all the evil in my heart.' He expressed it in unbelievable brutality and torture inflicted on prisoners."[36]

As one former persecutor of Christians stated:

"For although they knew God, they neither glorified him as God nor gave thanks to him, but their thinking became futile and their foolish hearts were darkened. Although they claimed to be wise, they became fools and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images made to look like mortal man and birds and animals and reptiles."[37]

2. They bought into a certain destructive philosophy (whether that be a philosophy of language, a philosophy of knowledge, philosophy of religion, a philosophy of history, etc.) by which they then interpret the evidence.[38]

As one survivor of the Holocaust concentration camp Auschwitz stated:

"If we present man with a concept of man which is not true, we may well corrupt him. When we present him as an automation of reflexes, as a mind machine, as a bundle of instincts, as a pawn of drive and reactions, as a mere product of heredity and environment, we feed the nihilism to which modern man is, in any case, prone. I became acquainted with the last stage of corruption in my second concentration camp, Auschwitz. The gas chambers of Auschwitz were the ultimate consequence of the theory that man is nothing but the product of heredity and environment—or, as the Nazis like to say, "of blood and soil." I am absolutely convinced that the gas chambers of Auschwitz, Treblinka, and Maidanek were ultimately prepared not in some ministry or other in Berlin, but rather at the desks and in lecture halls of nihilistic scientists and philosophers."[39]

As one former persecutor of Christians warned others:

"See to it that no one takes you captive through philosophy and empty deception, according to the tradition of men, according to the elementary principles of the world, rather than according to Christ."[40]

---

[35] Aldous Huxley, *Ends and Means* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1937), 312.

[36] Richard Wurmbrand, *Tortured for Christ* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1967), 34.

[37] Paul of Tarsus, Romans 1:21-23.

[38] See chapters eight through eighteen in the book by Dr. Norman L. Geisler entitled *Christian Apologetics*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1976). In addition, for an explanation and a critique of many of these positions see: Alvin Plantinga, *Warranted Christian Belief* (NewYork/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); William Lane Craig and J.P. Moreland, eds., *Naturalism a Critical Appraisal* (Routledge, UK: 2000); L. M. Regis, *Epistemology* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1964), 7-108; Robert Flint, *Agnosticism* (Edinburgh/London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1903); Mortimer J. Adler, Ten Philosophical Mistakes (New York: Macmillan, 1985); Etienne Gilson, *The Unity of Philosophical Experience* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937); Etienne Gilson, *Being and Some Philosophers* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1952); William Lane Craig, *Reasonable Faith*, revised ed. (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1994), 128-191; James Collins, *God in Modern Philosophy* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1960);

[39] Viktor Frankl, *The Doctor and the Soul: Introduction to Logotherapy* (New York: Knopf, 1982), XXI.

[40] Paul of Tarsus, Colossians 2:8.

The Issue of Evil:

The Scriptures state in 1 John 1:5-7 the following:

"**5** This is the message we have heard from Him and announce to you, that God is Light, and in Him there is no darkness at all. **6** If we say that we have fellowship with Him and *yet* walk in the darkness, we lie and do not practice the truth; **7** but if we walk in the Light as He Himself is in the Light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanses us from all sin."

Notice several things about this text of Scripture:
First, the statement that "God is Light, and in Him there is no darkness at all." Notice how in this statement the ontological [dealing with being/that which is] idea of EVIL is the privation (lack of) GOOD. Darkness is the absence (lack of) Light. Thus, God is GOOD and in God there is no EVIL (lack of GOOD).

Second, notice how the ontological analogy above informs the following moral statement that "If we say that we have fellowship with Him and *yet* walk in the darkness, we lie and do not practice the truth." Thus, if we choose *not* to "practice the truth" (*the thing we morally ought to do, way things ought to be*) then we are choosing *a deviation from the way things out to be* ("darkness"/Evil*).* Therefore, by walking in "darkness" we are living out *a deviation from the way things out to be* and as a result we cannot be in "fellowship" with God living this way.

Third, what God created "is good." Thus, there is nothing in creation that is neutral in its *being/that which is*. It was all created good. *That which is created* is good and it is through the fall that sin corrupts *that which has goodness*. Some illustrations:
1. Take a piece of metal/steel lying on some rocks. This piece of metal/steel is not neutral because *it has goodness*. However, if this piece of metal/steel has rust spots on it then it lacks being perfectly good steel. It is still good it is just lacking in goodness. But if the rust spreads and *completely* eats away all the metal/steel there is no longer a piece of metal/steel.
2. A good piece of metal/iron can be used in a moral/good way (*the way things ought to be*) or an immoral/evil way (*a deviation from the way things out to be*). If an individual (that has the ability to make a moral choice) takes this good piece of metal/iron and uses it to beat a living, breathing day-old child for "the fun of it" then this individual is taking a good thing and using it in an immoral/evil way. Thus, if a created thing (which has goodness) is used *the way it ought to be* then it is being used in a moral/good way and if a created thing (which has goodness) is used in *a deviation from the way it out to be* used then it is used in immoral/evil way.

What then is Evil?

A. When speaking of the "existence" of evil":
EVIL is a privation (meaning the lack of good). EVIL does *not* exist in and of itself instead it is depended upon that which is GOOD. However, GOOD can exist apart from evil (i.e.: GOD existed prior to EVIL; thus, GOOD existed without any EVIL) but EVIL cannot exist without GOOD.
An illustration/analogy:
Imagine a brand new perfectly good T-shirt hanging *on a hanger in a closet*. Then imagine that some moths come and eat some holes in this T-shirt. The T-shirt now has holes in it and is no longer perfectly good. Thus, the T-shirt lacks goodness. The more holes the moths eat in the T-shirt the more the T-shirt is lacking in goodness. However, if the months eat *every single tiny thread* of the T-shirt there would no longer be a T-shirt left, only a hanger in a closet.

To God be the Glory! This handout is free and is intended for encouragement and educational purposes.
For more information and free handouts like this please to: 1T3Life.org

9

B. When speaking of moral evil:[41]

1. Evil is *a deviation from the way things out to be*.

2. However, you cannot have a deviation from the way things out to be unless there *is a way things ought to be*.

3. You cannot have a have a deviation from the way things out to be <u>and</u> the way things ought to be unless there is *The Standard* that says "this is the way things ought to be."

4. However, The Standard has *The Standard Giver/One from which The Standard comes*.

………

5. But if one gets rid of The Standard Giver/One from which The Standard comes from then *the result is that one gets rid of The Standard*.

6. And if one gets rid of The Standard *then the result is that one gets rid of the way to distinguish between the deviation from the way things out to be <u>and</u> the way things ought to be*.

7. And if one gets rid of the way to distinguish between the deviation from the way things out to be <u>and</u> the way things ought to be *then the result is that there is no deviation from the way things out to be. Therefore, there is no evil.*

………

8. However, *we are able to recognize/distinguish real moral evil* (i.e.: someone taking a living, breathing day-old baby and chopping her up with a sword into different parts for the "fun of it").

9. Therefore, we are able to recognize/distinguish moral evil (a deviation from the way things out to be) <u>*from*</u> *the way things ought to be*.

10. Therefore, there is *The Standard* that says "*this is the way things ought to be*."

11. And therefore The Standard has *The Standard Giver/One from which The Standard comes*.

12. Conclusion, there is The Standard Giver and the way things ought to be comes from who The Standard Giver *is*. For The Standard is not above The Standard Giver and The Standard is not arbitrarily below The Standard Giver, instead *The Standard comes from the essence of The Standard Giver*.

C. The solution to evil:

The solution to evil is the life, death, burial, resurrection of Jesus Christ and His return. Jesus Christ is the only one who lived the perfect life and thus His death was the worst death of all. Also, His death on the cross was the perfect atonement/propitiation for sin. Furthermore, He will judge all the peoples of the earth and thus set everything straight and make a new earth that is perfect and thus fully vanquish evil from the earth. Thus, this world is not the best of all possible worlds but instead is the best way (because love requires freedom) to the best of all possible worlds.

God's Solution - God paid the penalty for our sin/hostility towards God/evil:

Jesus Christ "died for our sins according to the Scriptures, he was buried, and he was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures."-1 Corinthians 15:3

"God demonstrates His own love for us in this: While we were still sinners, Christ died for us."-Romans 5:8

"God made him who had no sin to be sin for us, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God."-2 Corinthians 5:21

"God did this to demonstrate His justice . . . so as to be just and the one who justifies those who have faith in Jesus."-Romans 3:25b-26

"The reason I was born and came into the world is to testify to The Truth. Everyone who is of The Truth listens to my voice."-Jesus, John 18:37

---

[41] For a further discussion on moral evil listen to Question #3 on the issue of evil from the recorded university lecture given by Ravi Zacharias and William Lane Craig, *Top Five Questions U of I Students Ask* (RZIM/2003/Audio).

To God be the Glory! This handout is free and is intended for encouragement and educational purposes.
For more information and free handouts like this please to: 1T3Life.org

10