

WHY I BELIEVE IN GOD

Heb.11:6; Psa.14:1

Ed Dye

I. INTRODUCTION

1. That is, Why I believe that God is; why I believe the God exists; that I and all human beings exist because God is, and that we are responsible to God.
2. Does God exist? This is a question all people have faced at one time or another. Is there really a God who has created this wonderful, beautiful, functional Universe and man who lives in it? Is God guiding and directing the Universe – including the earth on which we are dwelling? Will all people finally stand before God in judgment?
3. The Atheist boldly states, “There is no God. God does not exist.” The true Theist just as boldly affirms that God does exist, that God is the Eternal, Self-Existent, Vitalizing Force of the Universe – the Being who has created and who intelligently directs all things, the Divine Being who is the First Cause. The Agnostic claims there is not enough evidence to make a decision on the matter of God’s existence one way or another. Therefore, he is not sure. And the Skeptic doubts God’s existence.
4. Who is correct? Does God exist or not? Is there sufficient evidence to **prove** that God does exist? Evidence to **prove** it beyond reasonable doubt?
5. Surely, if God does exist he would have and has provided sufficient evidence to prove his existence. I believe he has and that there is. This is why I believe in God! See Ac.14:17.
6. When I say “**prove**”, I do not mean it can be demonstrated scientifically as one might prove that a certain sack of potatoes weighs ten pounds, or that the human heart has four distinct chambers within it.
 - a. Such things as the weight of a sack of vegetables, or the divisions within a human muscle, are matters that may be verified empirically using the five senses.
 - b. While empirical evidence often is quite useful in establishing the validity of a case, it is not the sole means of arriving at proof of a case.
 - c. For example, in legal matters authorities recognize the validity of a *prima facie* case, which is acknowledged to exist when

- adequate evidence is available to establish the presumption of a fact that, unless such fact can be refuted, legally stands proven.
- d. It is my contention, and that of all true believers in God, that there is a vast body of evidence that makes an impregnable *prima facie* case for the existence of God – which in this case is one that simply cannot be refuted – a case that proves beyond any reasonable doubt that God is!
7. I realize that with the scorn and mockery often heaped upon those who believe in God, many tend to believe there is little or no evidence or proof of any kind for God’s existence.
- a. Some even have the idea that science has somehow disproved God.
 - b. In spite of this, the evidence for God is so overwhelming that the Psalmist wrote: “The fool has said in his heart there is no God” (or, “It is foolish to say in one’s heart there is no God”), Psa.14:1. Cf. Psa.19:1.
 - c. The inspired apostle Paul wrote: Rom.1:19,20.
 - d. Those who deny the existence of God do not do so for lack of evidence, but from a desire to alleviate their guilt and their accountability towards God.
 - (1) Paul explained this problem with reference to the Gentiles in Rom.1:22,28.
 - e. Of course, we can’t prove the existence of God by quoting the Bible to one who does not believe in God or in the Bible. But it is a fact that the Bible does give us some powerful arguments for the existence of God which we shall recognize as we examine the body of evidence for the existence of God.
8. Because of that body of evidence, I believe in God.
9. In this study of why I believe in God, we shall examine that body of evidence one or two arguments at a time in each separate lesson.

II. DISCUSSION

A. FIRST, I BELIEVE IN GOD BECAUSE OF THE EVIDENCE OF THE COSMOLOGICAL ARGUMENT FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

1. This argument is also known as the First Cause argument and addresses the matter of **Cause** and **Effect**. That is, that every effect has an antecedent cause.
 - a. For effects without adequate causes are unknown.

- b. In fact, they cannot be!
- 2. This very principle and argument is plainly and simply set forth in Heb.3:4 and traces the existence of the Cosmos, the Universe and all created things, to God as the Creator, the First Cause.
 - a. This passage clearly suggests to us that something cannot come from nothing. That anything that exists had to come from something. Unless, or course, something or someone was and is Eternal, had no beginning or ending!
 - b. Cosmology is that science or teaching dealing with the Universe, the Cosmos, which offers itself to view as sky, earth, and sea, as an orderly any systematic whole.
 - (1) Observing things around us, we come to think of an orderly Universe or Cosmos and reach the conclusion that there must be an adequate cause for what we see.
 - c. Let us apply the principle of the argument in Heb.3:4 to the Cosmos, the Universe, which exists and search for the adequate cause of it.
 - (1) When we find it, we will find God!
- 3. Throughout human history, one of the most effective arguments for the existence of God has been the cosmological argument, which addresses the fact that the Universe (Cosmos) is here, it exists, and therefore must be explained someway, somehow.
 - a. In his book, *Not a Chance*, R.C. Sproul (1994, p.169, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker), observed:
 - “Traditional philosophy argued for the existence of God on the foundation of the law of causality. The cosmological argument went from the presence of a cosmos back to a creator of the cosmos. It sought a rational answer to the question, ‘**Why** is there something rather than nothing?’ It sought a sufficient reason for a real world.” (emp. in orig.)
- 4. The universe exists and is real. Atheists and agnostics not only acknowledge its existence, but admit that it is a grand effect.
 - a. They even have to admit that it cannot account for its own being; that it didn’t cause itself.
 - b. But if an entity cannot account for its own self-being (i.e., it is not sufficient to have caused itself), then it is said to be “contingent” because it is dependent upon something or someone outside itself to explain its existence.
 - c. The Universe is obviously a contingent entity, since it is inadequate to cause, or explain, its own existence.

- d. Sproul (ibid., p.172) noted:
 “Logic requires that if something exists contingently, it must have a cause. That is merely to say, if it is an effect it must have an antecedent cause. Thus, since the Universe is a contingent effect, the obvious question becomes, ‘What **caused** the Universe?’”
- e. It is here that the law of cause and effect (also known as the law of causality) is strongly tied to the cosmological argument.
 (1) Simply put, the law of causality states that every material effect must have an adequate antecedent cause.
- f. Sproul addressed this when he wrote (ibid., pp.171,172):
 “The statement ‘Every effect has an antecedent cause’ is **analytically true**. To say that it is analytically or formally true is to say that it is true by definition or analysis.
 “There is nothing in the predicate that is not already contained by resistless logic in the subject. It is like the statement, ‘A bachelor is an unmarried man’ or ‘A triangle has three sides’ or ‘Two plus two are four...’.
 “Cause and effect, though distinct ideas, are inseparably bound together in rational discourse. It is meaningless to say that something is a **cause** if it yields no **effect**. It is likewise meaningless to say that something is an **effect** if it has no **cause**.
 “A cause, by definition, must have an effect, or it is not a cause. An effect, by definition, must have a cause, or it is not an effect.” (emp. in the orig.)
5. Effect without adequate causes are unknown. Further causes never occur subsequent to the effect.
- a. It is meaningless to speak of a cause following an effect, or an effect preceding a cause.
- b. In addition, the effect is never qualitatively superior to, or quantitatively greater than, the cause.
- c. This knowledge is responsible for our formulation of the law of causality in these words: Every material effect must have an **adequate** antecedent cause. For instance:
 (1) The river did not turn muddy because the frog jumped in.
 (2) The book did not fall from the table because the fly lighted on it.
 (3) These are not adequate causes.
- d. For whatever effects we observe, we must claim or demand adequate antecedent causes.

6. This brings us back to the original question: What caused the Universe?
 - a. There are but three possible answers to this question:
 - (1) The Universe is eternal; it has always existed, and will always exist.
 - (2) The Universe is not eternal; rather, it created itself out of nothing.
 - (3) The Universe is not eternal, and did not create itself out of nothing; rather, it was created by something (or Someone) anterior (earlier, prior), and superior, to itself.
 - (4) Obviously, these three options merit serious considerations
7. The first question and its answer: Is the Universe eternal?
 - a. Some men who do not believe in God claim that it is, which for them avoids the problem of a beginning or an ending, and also the need for any “first cause” such as God.
 - b. But “modern science denies an eternal existence to the Universe, either in the past or in the future,” so conceded Dr. Robert Jastrow (Atheist or Agnostic) in his book: *Until The Sun Dies*, pp.19,30, 1977.
 - c. The scientific evidence states clearly that the Universe had a beginning. As Dr. Henry Morris has commented, “The Second Law of Thermodynamics requires the universe to have had a beginning.” (Scientific Creationism, 1974, p.26 (San Diego, CA: Creation-Life Publishers).
 - d. Thus the Universe is not eternal; it had a beginning!
8. The second question and its answer: Did the Universe create itself out of nothing?
 - a. In the past, it would have been practically impossible to find any reputable scientist who would be willing to advocate a self-created Universe.
 - b. George Davis, a prominent physicist of the past generation, explained why when he wrote: “No material thing can create itself.”
 - c. Further, Dr. Davis affirmed that this statement “cannot be logically attacked on the basis of any knowledge available to us” (1958, p.71, “Scientific Revelations Point to a God,” *The Evidence of God in an Expanding Universe*)
 - d. The Universe is the created, not the creator.
 - e. However, of late some have claimed that the Universe did create itself.

- (1) Edward P. Tryon, professor of physics at the City University of N.Y., wrote for example: “In 1973, I proposed that our Universe had been created spontaneously from nothing, as a result of established principles of physics.” (“What Made The World?”, 1984, p.14), *New Scientist*, Vol.101, Mar.8.
 - (2) Later, two physicists (also evolutionists), Alan Guth and Paul Steinhardt, in an article titled “The Inflationary Universe,” published in the *Scientific American*, Vol. 250, May, 1984, wrote: “...The inflationary model of the Universe provides a possible mechanism by which the observed universe could have evolved from an infinitesimal region. It is then tempting to go one step further and speculate that the entire Universe evolved from literally nothing.”
 - (3) Ultimately their inflationary model was shown to be incorrect, as well as a newer version later suggested, with both being discarded by the scientific community as a whole.
- f. The following by Ralph Estling of Great Britain in the summer edition of the *Skeptical Inquirer*, 1994, is an example:
- “The problem emerges in science when scientists leave the realm of science and enter that of philosophy and metaphysics, too often grandiose names for mere personal opinion, untrammelled by empirical evidence of logical analysis, and wearing the mask of deep wisdom.
- “And so they conjure up an entire Cosmos, or myriads of cosmoses, suddenly, inexplicably, causelessly leaping into being out of – out of Nothing Whatsoever, for no reason at all, and thereafter expanding faster than light into more Nothing Whatsoever...they then intone equations and other ritual mathematical formulae and look upon it and pronounce it good.
- “I do not think that what these cosmologists, these quantum theorists, these universe-makers, are doing is science. I can't help feeling that universes are notoriously disinclined to spring into being, ready-made, out of nothing.”
- g. He further wrote six months later in the Jan/Feb 1995 issue of the *Skeptical Inquirer* : “All things begin with speculation, science not excluded. But if no empirical evidence is eventually forthcoming, or can be forthcoming, all speculation is barren...

There is no evidence, so far, that the entire universe, observable and unobservable, emerged from a state of absolute Nothingness”

- h. To suggest that the Universe created itself is to assert a self-contradictory position. Sproul addressed this when he wrote that what an atheist or agnostic

“...deems possible for the world to do – come into being without a cause – is something no judicious philosopher would grant that even God could do. It is as formally and rationally impossible for God to come into being without a cause as it is for the world to do so...

“For something to bring itself into being it must have the power of being within itself. It must at least have enough causal power to cause its own being. If it derives its being from some other source, then it clearly would not be either self-existent or self-created. It would be, plainly and simply, an effect.”

- i. The Universe did not create itself. Such an idea is absurd, both philosophically and scientifically, to say nothing of scripturally!

9. The third question and its answer: Was the Universe Created?

- a. Either the Universe had a beginning, or it did not. But all available evidence indicates that the Universe did have a beginning.
- b. If the Universe had a beginning, it either had a cause or it did not.
- c. One thing we know assuredly, however: it is correct – logically and scientifically – to acknowledge that the Universe had a cause, because the Universe is an effect, and requires an adequate antecedent cause. Nothing causeless happens.
- d. Since it is apparent that the Universe is not eternal, and since likewise it is apparent that the Universe could not have created itself, the only remaining alternative is that the universe **was created** by something, or Someone, that:
 - (1) Existed before it, i.e., some eternal, uncaused First Cause;
 - (2) Is superior to it – since the created cannot be superior to the creator; and
 - (3) Is of a different nature, since the finite, contingent Universe of matter is unable to explain itself.
- e. In connection with this, another important fact should be considered.
 - (1) If there had ever been a time when **nothing** existed, then there would be nothing now.

- (2) It is a self-evident truth that nothing produces nothing.
- (3) In view of this, **since something exists now, it must follow logically that something has existed forever.**

(4) As Sproul has remarked:

“Indeed, reason demands that if something exists, either the world or God (or anything else), then **something** must be self-existent....

“There must be a self-existent being of some sort somewhere, or nothing would or could exist.” (*Not A Chance*, 1994, pp.179,185, emp. in the orig.)

f. Everything that exists can be classified as either **mind** or **matter** (which includes energy). There is no third alternative; just these two things. The theist’s argument, then, is this:

- (1) Everything that exists is either matter or mind.
- (2) Something exists now, so something eternal must exist.
- (3) Therefore, either matter or mind is eternal.

(A) Either matter or mind is eternal.

(B) Matter is not eternal, as per the evidence previously cited.

(C) Thus, it is mind that is eternal.

g. Of the two things that exists, mind is superior to matter.

- (1) Mind knows but matter is the object known.
- (2) Mind moves and modifies matter.
- (3) Matter is the servant of mind.
- (4) The chemist is greater than the chemicals which he handles and the mind is greater than the body which it guides and perhaps destroys.

h. Mind, that which existed from all eternity has spontaneity (“spontaneous” – “acting or done or occurring without external cause”) and force.

- (1) Without spontaneity it would have remained dormant, without force it would have caused no event.
- (2) Mind possesses these qualities. It can move bodies and cause events.
- (3) Matter is destitute of these qualities.
- (4) Matter remains in the condition in which it is, whether of rest or motion, until something from without changes it.
- (5) Matter could have produced no change in its eternal state of rest or motion.

- (6) If we are free to entertain a theory as to the eternal existence of something or Someone, why entertain the one least likely to be truth?
- i. The one original existence must have had other attributes which mind possesses but which matter does not possess.
 - (1) There must have been in this original being all that is developed and manifested in the Universe.
 - (2) It possessed the power to think, plan and feel. It had the capacity to love and to hate, to make moral distinctions, to choose between right and wrong.
 - (3) It cannot be proved that matter possesses these attributes in any degree. In fact, just the opposite can be proven. These powers do. But these powers do inhere in mind.
 - (4) Mind, therefore, was eternal and not matter.
- j. The principle objection by some to this line of reasoning has been the childish, foolish, absurd suggestion that we do not know the difference between mind and matter!
 - (1) Certainly we do not know all about either but we do know something about both.
 - (2) They have some attributes in common as do all things which exist. The fact of existence is one point in common.
 - (3) Matter is known by its qualities, mind by its activities.
 - (4) One is senseless, the other full of thought and feeling.
 - (5) One is passive, the other active.
 - (6) One is amenable to physical law, the other to intellectual and moral law.
 - (7) It is as reasonable to question the existence of matter as to question the existence of mind!

Concluding thoughts to the cosmological argument and our first lesson on why I believe in God.

- 1. The central message of the cosmological argument, and the law of cause and effect upon which it is based, is this:
 - a. Every material effect must have an adequate antecedent cause.
 - b. The Universe is here; intelligent life is here; morality is here; love is here. What is their adequate antecedent cause?
 - c. Since the effect can never precede, or be greater than the cause, it stands to reason that the Cause of life must be a living Intelligence which Itself is both moral and loving.

- d. When the Bible records the words, “In the beginning, God...,” it makes known to us just such a First Cause.
2. Note this simple illustration: It is said that Benjamin Franklin, while in Paris, made a model planetary system showing the earth and the planets nearest it. Many astronomers copied it to use in their studies. One day an atheist friend saw it and asked, “Who made it?” “No one made it,” answered Franklin. “It made itself, it just happened.” “What,” cried the man, “you’re joking, of course!” Franklin replied, “And so is the man who says the Universe just happened.”
3. Another: Two friends slept in their tent on the desert. One put his head out the following morning and said, “Some camels passed here last night.” “How do you know, did you see them?” his friend asked. “Oh no, but I see their tracks,” he replied. So we argue, though we do not see God, we see His handiwork and we know He has been here; that he is; that he exists!
4. Oh, yes, even the Scriptures make reference to the cosmological argument for the existence of God: Rom.1:19,20; Psa.19:1; Heb.3:4.
 - a. Note this from Heb.3:4: From an **effect** (house) the writer reasons to a **cause** (builder) and uses this to generalize to the existence of God as **builder** of all things.
5. The existence of the Universe is not self-explanatory. The cosmological argument present an explanation for its existence by reasoning to God as the only reasonable, logical and scriptural Self-existent Being capable of producing it. He is the **Uncaused cause** of all things!
6. This is one of the reasons I believe in God, and that to Him I am responsible for my actions and my well being here and though out eternity!

B. SECOND, I BELIEVE IN GOD BECAUSE OF THE EVIDENCE OF THE TELEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD, OR THE ARGUMENT FROM THE EVIDENCE OF DESIGN IN THE UNIVERSE.

1. This is perhaps the most well known, most popular, and most often used argument to establish Divine Creation for the Universe.
2. And in my opinion it is one of the most powerful and easiest to accept arguments in favor of the existence of God, as well as the most difficult to refute.
3. If there is evidence of design in the Universe, and there is; then, there must have been a Designer. For design demands a designer, as order demands an orderer, and as intelligence demands a higher intelligence from whence it came.
 - a. On what evidence can one base reasonable doubt that this Universe, including man who inhabits this earth, exhibits marks of intelligent Causation?
4. Every finite effect, of which the Universe is one, has an adequate antecedent cause to produce it. An infinite intelligent designer is the only adequate cause to produce the order and design we observe in the Universe.
5. “Teleology” has reference to purpose or design in the material world. Thus this approach suggests that where there is purposeful design, there must be a designer.
 - a. The deduction being made, of course, is that order, planning, and design in a system are deductive of intelligence, purpose and specific intent on the part of the originating cause.
 - b. In logical form our argument is presented as follows:
 - (1) If the Universe evinces purposeful design, there must have been a designer.
 - (2) The Universe evinces purposeful design.
 - (3) Therefore, the Universe must have had a designer.
 - c. How can there be design without a designer. And practically applied how can there be a watch without a watch maker, a house without a house builder, a painting without a painter, a poem

without a poet, a law without a lawgiver, a bridge without a bridge builder; a car; a train; an aircraft; a computer; etc., etc.

- d. Just so, how can there be a Universe without a Universe builder of sufficient intelligence and power to design and create it? How can that designer and creator be anyone but Jehovah God? The God of the Bible?
6. Various examples from the animal wisdom, or instinct in animals demand a Creator.
- a. The salmon returning to the place where it was born after many years at sea to spawn.
 - b. Eels from Europe and America migrate to the abysmal deeps south of Bermuda where they breed and die; the young eels return to either Europe or America, depending on the place from whence their parents came.
 - c. The migration pattern of various birds has been a mystery to ornithologists for years.
 - (1) Now we know that Starlings fly by day using the sun as a compass and can actually adjust their course to the changes of the sun as the day goes on.
 - (2) Old World Warblers migrate by night and navigate by the stars. Their migration comes to a temporary halt if for, rain, or clouds obscure the stars.
 - (3) An Ornithologist has shown that the Indigo Bunting has “a ‘biological clock’ set by the birds’ internal response to seasonal changes in the length of days.” The only star they definitely need in migration is Polaris, the North Star (“Beacon for Buntings,” Time, Nov.14, 1969).
 - (4) Is all of this chance or design?
7. The evidence of design in the human body is another example that demands an intelligent Creator.
- a. Any one part of the human body can be used to illustrate design, and the necessity of a designer.
 - b. In the Reader’s Digest, April, 1967; Mar., Sept., 1969; Sept., 1970; Aug., 1971; Feb., May, June, 1972, there were a series of articles on Joe’s heart, hand, foot, spine, skin, etc., which provided many illustrations of the marvelous design in our bodies
 - c. The late George Gaylord Simpson of Harvard once suggested that I man one finds “the most highly endowed organization of

matter that has yet appeared on the earth...” --- George Gaylord Simpson (1949), *The Meaning of Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).

d. Another evolutionist observed:

“When you come right down to it, the most incredible creation in the universe is you –with your fantastic sense and strengths, your ingenious defense systems, and mental capabilities so great you can never use them to the fullest. Your body is a structural masterpiece more amazing than science fiction.” -- Alma E. Guinness, ed. (1987, *ABC’s of the Human body* (Pleasantville, NY: Reader’s Digest Association).

8. The design of the Universe considered. Quotes from: *The Design of the Universe*, pp. 18-22, *The Case For The Existence Of God*, by Bert Thompson, Ph.D. and Wayne Jackson, M.A. (Apologetics Press, Inc., Montgomery, Ala). Pp.13 a,b,c,d,e of these notes.

9. Again, the Bible by its Holy Spirit inspired writers lends credence to and legitimizes the teleological argument, or the argument from design to the Designer.

a. King David exclaimed: Psa.19:1.

(1) This Psalm divides rather naturally into three sections.

(a) The **abstract** revelation of God in nature, i.e., his great power and wisdom in the intricacy of the Universe in nature, Vv.1-6, and stresses that God is revealed in **nature**.

(1) V.1 reveals an unmistakable witness.

(2) V.2, an untiring witness.

(3) Vv.3-6, an understandable witness.

(b) The **concrete** revelation of Jehovah through “word” communication, laying emphasis upon the spiritual message from Jehovah, Vv.7-10, which is a natural expectation since God is, and stresses that God is revealed in his **law**.

(c) Thirdly, the **benefits** of his written revelation produced in the honest and good heart, Vv.11-14.

b. Once again, upon considering the marvels of the human body, David’s lips gave use to the praise of Psa.139:14.

(1) We do not know all that David knew about the human body from a scientific viewpoint. But by inspiration he

declared what scientific knowledge can now prove about the human body.

- (2) The following quotes from Exploring The Psalms, Vol. Two, pp.597,598, by John Phillips, Loizeaux Brothers, Neptune, N.J, 1988:

“We know that every living creature is made up of microscopic cells so small that the letter O on this page would contain between thirty or forty thousand of them. Each microscopic cell is a world in itself, containing an estimated two hundred trillion tiny molecules of atoms. Each cell, in other words, is a micro-universe of almost unbelievable complexity. All these cells put together make up a living creature.

“Each cell has its own specialized function and each works to an intricate table which tells it when to grow, when to divide, when to make hormones, when to die.

“Every minute of every day, some three billion cells in the body die and the same number are created to take their place.

“During any given moment in the life of any one of these cells, thousands of events are taking place, each one being precisely coordinated at the molecular level by countless triggers.

“The human body has more than a million million of them – a million in each square inch of skin, thirty billion in the brain, billions of red blood cells in the veins.

“Obviously, such a complicated and unerring development of cells cannot possibly be the result of chance. ‘He created me!’ David exclaimed.”

- c. In the N.T. Paul and Barnabas reasoned with the pagans of Lystra concerning the beneficent phenomena of nature, when they affirmed: Ac.14:17.

(1) Since God is, naturally he would not leave himself without witness!

- d. Again, the inspired apostle Paul wrote: Rom.1:19,20.

(1) It is obvious from this passage that God’s existence, witnessed by means of his purposeful creation, is so evident that a refusal to acknowledge such is inexcusable!

(2) See Psa.14:1; Rom.1:22,28.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS ON THE EVIDENCE OF THE TELEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD, OR THE ARGUMENT FROM THE EVIDENCE OF DESIGN IN THE UNIVERSE.

1. In summation, let me suggest the following:
 - a. There is abundant and obvious evidence of purposeful design in the Universe.
 - b. Such purposeful design is clear proof of **Intelligence**.
 - c. Intelligence denotes **Personality**.
 - d. The conclusion, therefore, that an **Intelligent Personality** was responsible for bringing our present ordered Universe into existence is eminently reasonable. In fact, it is unreasonable, and as the Psa.14:1 declares, foolish, to think otherwise!
2. This is another reason why I believe in God, and that all men are responsible to him for their being and well-being!
3. One final thought, which is strange indeed. Even though Atheists and Evolutionists have conceded that the statement: “Everything designed has a designer’, is an analytically true statement” and thus requires no formal proof, they still do not believe that there is evidence warranting the conclusion that a Supreme Designer exists, and they therefore continue to reject any belief in God, the God of the Bible.
 - a. Amazing!
 - b. What did someone say about there being “none so blind as those who refuse to see”?!

C. I BELIEVE IN GOD BECAUSE OF THE MORAL ARGUMENT, SOMETIMES CALLED THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL ARGUMENT, WHICH INVOLVES A RECOGNITION OF MAN'S MORAL CONSCIOUSNESS, SOMETHING WHICH MAN ALONE POSSESSES

1. There exists within all men an ultimate recognition of a moral code to which rational persons are responsible. This moral consciousness is inherent within man.
 - a. From the smuggest atheist to the most illiterate savage, this fact is apparent.
 - b. Even if an unbeliever should perhaps deny his personal belief in the existence of any such code, yet if his own wife were brutally raped or murdered, or his own child shamefully molested, he would vociferously proclaim that a "wrong" had been perpetrated.
 - c. What we are saying is that every man can be driven to a point where he will defend some standard of right and wrong.
 - d. Animals do not have any such moral code.
 - (1) A dog possesses no remorse, feels no pangs of conscience, when stealing a bone from one of his peers.
 - (2) A cock knows no remorse when mortally wounding another in a cock fight.
 - e. Man and man only experiences such things. While we grant that man may dull or sear his conscience by constant abuse, that does not negate its presence.
2. "In his study on Crime and Personality, Psychologist H.J. Eysenck notes that criminal activity, far from being universal, is restricted to a small proportion of the population, probably less than 10 percent. He points out that most people lead decent, moral, law-abiding lives. He concludes from his findings that 'the reason we do not steal under conditions when it is almost certain that we would never be caught must be that there is something in us which restrains us from doing so. This is far more powerful in controlling behavior than the rather abstract fear of the policeman and the magistrate.'" (Family Weekly, June 11, 1972)
3. We are aware of the fact that man's concept of exactly what is "moral" may vary from place to place or from age to age. That is not our point.
 - a. For man's conscience must be educated by his conscience-Giver, namely God. Human sense of morality can be grossly perverted.

- b. Our argument is, regardless of how base a man may become, regardless of how twisted his thinking may be, if he is still rational, he will have some consciousness of what, to him at least, is moral.
- c. And this awareness and its origin no atheist can explain since he does not believe that there is an eternal Mind, i.e., an intrinsically moral Being, with which goodness is coexistent, even though he desperately tries to do so by several theories through which he seeks to justify human behavior in morality and ethics; such as: **Hedonism, Utilitarianism, Nihilism, Relativism, Situationism, or “situation ethics”, and Determinism.**

4. C. S. Lewis, who was once a skeptic himself, wrote in his valuable little book, *Mere Christianity*, p.19:

“I know that some people say the idea of a Law of Nature or decent behavior known to all men is unsound, because different civilizations and different ages have had quite different moralities.

“But this is not true. There have been differences between their moralities, but these have never amounted to anything like a total difference.

“If anyone will take the trouble to compare the moral teaching of, say, the ancient Egyptians, Babylonians, Hindus, Chinese, Greeks and Romans, what will really strike him will be how very like they are to each other and to our own.

“Some of the evidence for this I have put together in the appendix of another book called *The Abolition of Man*: but for our present purpose I need only ask the reader to think what a totally different morality would mean. Think of a country where people were admired for running 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.

“Men have differed as regards what people you ought to be unselfish to – whether it was only your own family, or your fellow countrymen, or everyone. But they have always agreed that you ought not to put yourself first. Selfishness has never been admired.

“Men have differed as to whether you should have one wife or four. But they have always agreed that you must not simply have any woman you liked.” (quoted from *Fortify Your Faith*, p. 21, Wayne Jackson, Apologetics Press, Inc.)

5. A.E. Taylor, in *Does God Exist?*, p.84, wrote that men may draw “the line between right and wrong in a different place, but at least they all agree that there is such a line to be drawn.” (quoted from Truth In Life, p.16, Senior High, Year 3 – Book 3, Evidences for Faith, by Ferrell Jenkins, Cogdill Foundation Publications, Marion, Ind.)

6. Since it is evident that morals and ethics do, in fact, exist, the question becomes: What is their origin? And the answer is: There are but two options.
 - a. Morality and ethics are either: ***theocentric*** – that is, centered in an external source of eternal goodness, namely, **God**.
 - b. Or ***anthropocentric*** – this is, grounded in the mind of man as a creature that evolved naturally as a result of inanimate forces operating over eons of cosmic and geologic time. (see Geisler and Corduan , 1988, pp.109-122, *Philosophy of Religion*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker), quoted from *The Case for the Existence of God*, p.60.
 - c. The truth of the matter is that only the theocentric approach to morality can explain the purpose of life, and therefore provide adequate motivation for a genuinely ethical approach to life.

7. Though proof of God’s existence is abundantly evident in the beautifully-designed Universe, which reveals “his eternal power and Godhead,” His character and his Will for man are made known only in His verbal communications (available to us in the biblical documents, His written word.
 - a. Thus, the Bible declares that God is eternal (Psa.90:2; 1Tim.1:17; Heb.1:8-12), and that he is morally perfect.
 - b. Not only is God holy (Isa.6:3; Rev.4:8), just and righteous (Psa.89:14), and good (Psa.100:6; 106:1), but in the ultimate sense, only God is good (Mk.10:18).
 - c. Since the God of the Bible is perfect (Mt.5:48), it is to be expected that all that proceeds from Him is good initially.
 - (1) Accordingly, that which he created was good (Gen.1:31).
 - (2) And all that He does, commands, and approves is likewise good (Psa.119:39,68).
 - (3) What he has commanded results from Who He is, and thus is likewise good.
 - (a) In the O.T. in Micah 6:8: “He showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Jehovah require of thee,

but to do justly, and love kindness, and walk humbly with thy God.”

- (b) In the N.T. in 1Pet.1:15,16: “But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; 16. Because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy.” See Lev.11:44.
- (4) Moral sensitivity (i.e., the awareness that right and wrong do exist) has been implanted in the heart of man by virtue of his creation in the image of God Who is eternally good.
- d. Biblical morality has several thrusts:
 - (1) It is designed to develop within man right attitudes, or to state it another way, to instill a divine level of thinking.
 - (2) Also, it is intended to help humanity translate spiritual attitudes into actions that will be helpful to all others.
 - (3) Finally, the desired result is to guide man back into accord with the divine ideal, ensuring both his present and his eternal happiness – to the glory of God.
- e. The Apostle Paul attests that men’s inner moral compass comes from God who gave it to them, and that God will judge all men according to their deeds under God’s revealed will that applies to them, Rom.1:18-2:16.

Concluding thoughts on The Anthropological Argument which involves a recognition of man’s moral consciousness.

1. Evidence of the existence of God not only surrounds us but is deeply embedded within us.
 - a. Some may and some do ignore and deny the evidence, but they cannot escape it.
 - b. And one day God will call us all into account for what we have done with this evidence!
2. Consider this. Surely you can’t ignore it. Moral standards are not applied to things.
 - a. It is impossible that a moral order should have arisen from non-moral matter.
 - b. Dr. James D. Bales in his book (*Reasons For Our Faith*, Lesson III, p.2) illustrated it this way:

“If you had a flat tire on the way here, you might be very peeved and upset about it, but you would not blame the physical tire, since

conditions being what they were it could not help doing what it did. You might blame the man who put out shoddy material, and that sold you that sorry tire.”

3. A moral nature in man and the Universe demands *a moral person* back of all things, not chance. And that Person can only be God, the Eternal First Cause.
 - a. This must be, because as we have seen in our study of the evidence that chance cannot be an adequate cause of all things.
 - b. We must begin with a personal being. That being is God.
 - c. The cosmological, teleological and anthropological arguments leads us to conclude that it is more reasonable to believe in God than to believe in chance.

4. As we draw this part of our discussion on the existence of God to a close, and for emphasis, we shall mention some important summary observations, as we quote the following from *The Case for the Existence of God*, pp.72-74:

“1. Human moral responsibility is based upon the fact that God is our Creator (Psa.100:3), and that we have been made in His spiritual image (Gen.1:26). Just as a potter has a right over the clay he is fashioning, so our Maker has the right to obligate us morally and spiritually to right living (see Rom.9:21). Jer.10:23.

“2. Since morality is grounded in the unchanging nature of God (Mal.3:6; 1Pet.1:15), it is absolute – not cultural, not relative, not situational.

“3. God’s will for human behavior is not a matter of subjective speculation that every man figures out for himself; rather, Jehovah has spoken (Heb.1:1), and His Mind is made known in objective, biblical revelation (1Cor.2:11ff; 2Tim.3:16,17).

“4. Though the Lord possesses an unchanging nature, His revelatory process was progressive and adapted to man as he spiritually developed in those times of antiquity. Accordingly, in ages of the past Jehovah tolerated, and even regulated, certain acts that are not permissible in the Christian era. This, of course, does not mean that God vacillates in His morality; it simply means that He dealt with man as he was in that infantile state (Mt.19:8; Ac.14:16; 17:30,31). Today, the N.T. stands as the Lord’s final and ultimate standard of authority.

- “5. Though the N.T. is the ‘law of Christ’ (Rom.8:2; Gal.6:2), it is not a ‘legal’ system in that each aspect of human conduct is prescribed with a ‘thou shalt’ or ‘thou shalt not.’ Yes, there are both positive and negative commands in the N.T., but they do not spell out every specific activity. The inspired document contains many rich principles that challenge us to develop a greater sense of spiritual maturity and to soar to heights that are God-honoring.
- “6. One must recognize also that N.T. ethics does not deal merely with actions, but addresses motives as well. For instance, what if one accidentally runs down with his automobile (and thereby kills) a careless pedestrian? He is not held accountable before God, for his act was unintentional. On the other hand, one can be guilty (in disposition) of both adultery and murder (cf. Mt.5:28 and 1Jno.3:15).
- “7. It is imperative that men recognize that ethical activity (i.e., right relations with one’s fellows) is not the totality of a person’s obligation before God. The centurion Cornelius certainly learned this truth (Ac.10). There are spiritual responsibilities that the Lord has prescribed as a test of true faith, and yet men frequently ignore such divine obligations.
- “8. Finally, even though the Almighty has called His human creation to a high moral level, must recognize that He is aware that we are but frail, dusty flesh (Psa.78:39; 103:14). And so His marvelous grace has been revealed in the unspeakably wonderful gift of His Son. Those who in loving faith submit to Him (Heb.5:8,9) can know the pardon of their moral blunders (Ac.22:16), and are challenged to live righteous and godly lives in this present world (Tit.2:11-14).

Introductory remarks leading to our fourth lesson on why I believe in God.

In the first lesson of the series, I affirmed that **I Believe In God Because Of The Evidence Of The Cosmological Argument For The Existence Of God.**

1. This argument is also known as the First Cause argument and addresses the matter of **Cause** and **Effect**. That is, that every effect has an antecedent cause.
 - a. For effects without adequate causes are unknown.
 - b. In fact they cannot be. This is a fact admitted by Atheists.
 - c. This very principle and argument is plainly and simply set forth in Heb.3:4 and traces the existence of the Cosmos, the Universe, and all created things, to God as the Creator, the First Cause.

In the second lesson of the series on why I believe in God, I affirmed that **I Believe In God Because Of The Evidence Of The Teleological Argument For The Existence Of God, Or The Argument From The Evidence Of Design In The Universe.**

1. If there is evidence of design in the Universe, and there is; then, there must have been a Designer. For design demands a designer, as order demands an orderer, and as intelligence demands a higher intelligence from whence it came.
2. “Teleology” has reference to purpose or design in the material world. Thus this approach suggests that where there is purposeful design, there must be a designer.
3. In logical form our argument is presented as follows:
 - a. If the Universe evinces purposeful design, there must have been a designer.
 - b. The Universe evinces purposeful design.
 - c. Therefore, the Universe must have had a designer.
4. In summation, we suggested the following:
 - a. There is abundant and obvious evidence of purposeful design in the Universe.
 - b. Such purposeful design is clear proof of **Intelligence**.
 - c. Intelligence denotes **Personality**.
 - d. The conclusion, therefore, that an **Intelligent Personality** was responsible for bringing our present ordered Universe into existence is eminently reasonable. In fact, it is unreasonable, and as Psa.14:1 declares, foolish, to think otherwise!

5. Then we considered one final thought in that lesson, which is strange indeed, but true. Which is this: Even though Atheists and Evolutionists have conceded that the statement: “‘Everything designed has a designer’, is an analytically true statement” and thus requires no formal proof, they still do not believe that there is evidence warranting the conclusion that a Supreme Designer exists, and they therefore continue to reject any belief in God, the God of the Bible!
 - a. Amazing to say the least!
 - b. What did someone say about there being “none so blind as those who refuse to see”?!

In the third lesson of the series on why I believe in God, I affirmed **I Believe In God Because Of The Moral Argument, Sometimes Called The Anthropological Argument, Which Involves A Recognition Of Man’s Moral Consciousness, Something Which Man, And Man, Alone Possesses.**

1. There exists within all men an ultimate recognition of a moral code to which rational persons are responsible. This moral consciousness is inherent within man.
 - a. From the smuggest atheist to the most illiterate savage, this fact is apparent.
 - b. Animals do not have any such moral code.
 - (1) A dog possesses no remorse, feels no pangs of conscience, when stealing a bone from one of his peers.
 - (2) A cock knows no remorse when mortally wounding another in a cock fight.
 - c. Man and man alone experiences such things. While we grant that man may dull or sear his conscience by constant abuse, that does not negate its presence.
2. Evidence of the existence of God not only surrounds us but is deeply embedded within us.
 - a. Some may and some do ignore and deny the evidence, but they cannot escape it.
 - b. And one day God will call us all into account for what we have done with this evidence!
3. If there is no God, thus no true, absolute moral standard, no absolute right or wrong, then there would be no more wrong in killing a human being than in killing a rabbit or a skunk!

Now we are ready for the fourth lesson in the series on why I believe in God.

D. I BELIEVE IN GOD BECAUSE ALL THE OBJECTIONS OF THE ATHEISTS TO BELIEVING IN GOD LIE WITH EQUAL FORCE AGAINST ATHEISM, THUS I BELIEVE BECAUSE ATHEISM HAS INSUPERABLE DIFFICULTIES OF ITS OWN. IT CREATES MORE PROBLEMS AND RAISES MORE QUESTIONS THAT IT CAN POSSIBLY SOLVE OR ANSWER.

1. Atheists have objected to a belief in God because, they say, we seek to rise from the finite to the infinite; that from finite reasoning we seek to draw an infinite conclusion. Such reasoning they claim is unreasonable and utterly foolish!
 - a. We do, of course, seek to pass from the finite to the infinite in our reasoning. There is nothing unreasonable in that!
 - b. Just as the limited suggests the unlimited; as finite time suggests infinite time, and finite space suggests infinite space, so finite intelligence suggests Infinite Intelligence.
 - c. But the Atheist, foolishly claims to know that there is no God (Psa.14:1), and believes that matter is eternal, self-existent and infinite.
 - (1) For the Atheist to **know** there is no God, he would have to know every thing!
 - (2) And when the Atheist reasons that matter is eternal, self-existent and infinite, and that in the absence of any evidence to support such reasoning – look whose reasoning is unreasonable and utterly foolish!
 - d. Of course reason demands that something is infinite in eternal existence. While the Atheist believes it is matter of some kind, a belief without any evidence to support it; the Christian believes it is God, and believes it based on an abundance of evidence.
2. Atheists have said that the conception of an intelligent First Cause proves nothing because the First Cause would then need to be accounted for.
 - a. We do not need to account for the first cause because it is the **first** cause and there could be no cause back of it.
 - b. Since we cannot go back of the first cause it is more reasonable to stop at mind than to stop at matter.

- c. If this be a difficulty, however, Atheism is likewise beset with it, for if matter is the eternal existence, what was before it?
 - d. Moreover, matter gives no evidence of self-existence. Matter is an effect that demands an adequate cause.
3. Skeptics have objected that we do not know God perfectly.
- a. Indeed, we know nothing perfectly.
 - b. If we knew God perfectly, we would then be deity ourselves.
 - c. However, matter in none of its forms is known perfectly.
 - d. If we must know a thing perfectly before we can know it exists, then we cannot know that matter exists, can we? Then where does that leave the Atheists and the Skeptics in their objection?
 - e. Probably no one will ever understand a being of greater measure than himself.
 - (1) Some people cannot understand how others can be so noble, so unselfish and so sacrificing on behalf of others.
 - (2) They do not have any standards by which to measure them.
4. The Atheists criticizes the Christian for assuming that God exists.
- a. Then he turns around and assumes the eternal existence of matter, that the forces of this world are self-active, that the laws of the universe are eternal, and that nature continually repeats the same cycle of changes (else it would have run its course and have become inactive long ago).
 - b. Atheism assumes that nature exhibits no thought, no design, no plan, that demands a Supreme Intelligence, Designer, or Planner.
 - c. Bold indeed are these assumptions and not one of them can be proved.
5. Atheism assigns an inadequate cause of the universe.
- a. Matter does not possess the qualities of thinking, feeling, and volition which we see are necessary in the cause of the universe.
 - b. Matter is, therefore, an inadequate cause of the universe.
6. Atheism assumes that life came from dead material without outside stimuli.
- a. This would be a greater miracle than miraculous creation of matter and of the resurrection of the dead!

7. Atheism maintains the absurd position that all things exist as the result of chance.
 - a. Theists believe in design.
 - b. The opposite of design is chance, sheer chance.
 - c. A watch cannot by chance bring itself into existence, neither can a Universe.
 - d. If the pieces of a watch were placed together in a sack and shaken for a million years they would not arrange themselves into a watch.
 - e. The organs of the human body could not have arranged themselves by chance; the design of nature did not just happen.
 - f. In fact, nothing runs by chance.

Some concluding thoughts on lesson four that all the objections of the Atheists to believing in God lie with equal force against Atheism.

1. Every objection which an Atheist can make against the existence of God can be made against his belief in the eternal existence of matter.
2. Based on evidence considered in the previous lessons studied, we are justified in believing in an Eternal Mind and in discarding chance (whatever that may be).
3. So this is another reason why I believe in God and that all men are responsible to Him and some day will give final account for the deeds of the body!

Notes for Lesson #4 taken from *Why We Believe The Bible*, pp.24,25
By George W. Dehoff, Dehoff Publications

E. I BELIEVE IN GOD BECAUSE OF THE HISTORICAL PERSON AND INFLUENCE OF JESUS OF NAZARETH, WHO CLAIMED TO BE THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD.

1. The most defensible and utterly devastating argument for the existence of God is the *historical person and influence of Jesus of Nazareth who claimed to be the Christ, the Only Begotten Son of God.*
 - a. There is absolutely no way to explain Jesus Christ apart from the fact that he came from God.
 - b. Consider the following incontrovertible facts, to name just a few, which are as historically certain as history can be, concerning the truth that Jesus Christ was a verifiably historical character.
 - (1) Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ, existed in the flesh. He was no myth. Historical facts too numerous to mention attest.
 - (2) His name was Jesus and he was born in the latter half of the eighth century of the Roman era.
 - (3) His ancestry was Hebrew; his country was Palestine.
 - (4) He died in Jerusalem in the administrations of governor Pontius Pilate and the Roman emperor Tiberius Caesar.
2. Now this historical Jesus, somehow or other, launched a religious movement that has shaken this old world to its very core.
 - a. No philosophy, religious or otherwise, can even begin to compete with the near universal influence of this religion.
 - b. Consider this, for instance, its two closest competitors – Islamism and Buddhism.
 - (1) The growth of Islamism in some countries can be accounted for on the basis of the fact that:
 - (a) It is propagated by intimidation and force.
 - (b) It advocates the sensual gratification of the flesh and incorporates such into its promise of paradise.
 - (c) It pictures heaven as a gigantic harem where the “black-eyed daughters of paradise are held out as a reward to the commonest inhabitants.”
 - (2) Buddhism promises an escape from the grim realities of life through asceticism and self-hypnotic meditation.
 - (a) This accounts for its spread in lands of miserable living conditions.
 - (b) A translation of Buddha’s first sermon is this: “Birth is suffering. Decay is suffering. Illness is suffering. Death is suffering. Presence of objects we hate is

suffering. Separation from objects we love is suffering. Not to obtain what we desire is suffering. Clinging to existence is suffering. Complete cessation of thirst or of craving for existence is cessation of suffering.” – Why We Believe The Bible, p.98, Geo. W. Dehoff.

(1) No one can write a more pessimistic speech!

(c) “Buddha taught that all existence is hopeless misery. That this misery can be extinguished by going out of existence. This going out of existence is “Nirvana” and may be attained by right belief, right speech, right means of livelihood, right memory, right aspiration, right conduct, right endeavor and right meditation.” – Dehoff, p.98

3. But how does one account for the success of Christianity?
 - a. Jesus forbade its spread by intimidation and force (Jno.18:36), and rather than indulge fleshly lusts, it positively prohibits such (1Cor.6:9,10; Gal.5:19-21).
 - b. Neither is the Christian permitted to escape from life’s problems through ascetic seclusion, Col.2:20-23. On the contrary, he is to overcome the world by his faith (1Jno.5:4,5), and let his influence radiate among men that they might come to glorify God (Mt.5:16).
4. The success of the religion of Jesus Christ can only be accounted for on the basis of the *divine origin* of the movement, and that supernatural origin is demonstrated by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.
 - a. We will not go into any detailed evidence for the bodily resurrection of Jesus at this time. But many excellent volumes covering such are available.
 - b. We will, however, inject a significant quotation relative to this argument. This quote is from one of the most prominent writers of the past century who denied the Lord’s resurrection. It is from Dr. Shirley Jackson Case of the University of Chicago, who was a rabid modernist who strongly denied that Jesus was raised from the dead in an article entitled “The Resurrection Faith of the First Disciples,” that appeared in the *American Journal of Theology* (Vol. 13, 1909, in which he confessed: “The first Christians confidently believed that Jesus really died, was really buried, and actually rose from the dead and appeared to his disciples, The

testimony of Paul alone is sufficient to convince us beyond any reasonable doubt that this was a commonly accepted opinion in his day – an opinion at that time supported by the *highest authority imaginable, the eyewitnesses themselves.*” (See *Chats From a Minister’s Library* by Wilbur M. Smith, Chapter 3), as quoted from *Fortify Your Faith* by Wayne Jackson, pp.22,23.

- c. Note this: When a man nineteen hundred years this side of the event opposes the historicity of the resurrection of Jesus, while at the same time *admitting* that the original conviction of such was grounded on eyewitness testimony, *the highest authority imaginable*, he advertises an intellectual acumen, keen insight or discernment, that leaves something to be desired.
5. This indisputable fact must be considered: If the supernatural elements of Christianity are historically provable, then Jesus of Nazareth was actually who he claimed to be, the Christ, the Son of God (Mk.14:61,62), and therefore, God exists – because he came from God; God sent him into the world to seek and to save the lost!
6. In view of this, now consider with me the Messianic Prophecies of the O.T. which are without a doubt indisputable proof that Jesus of Nazareth was who he claimed to be, and therefore, his existence is infallible proof that God is.
 - a. In these Messianic prophecies a complete history of the birth, life, death by crucifixion, burial, resurrection from the dead, ascension and coronation of Jesus Christ was written more than 500 years before he was born – more than 500 years before this Jesus of Nazareth ever appeared on the earth as a man.
 - b. This detailed account of his life could not have been written and put in print that many years before the appearance of the subject of the prophecies unless the Creator of the Universe had guided those who wrote, nor unless he did it in fulfilling his eternal purpose.
 - c. These Messianic Prophecies, which we will now consider, Jesus of Nazareth fulfilled to the letter, thus proving he was who he claimed to be and that God is.
7. **The Coming Of Messiah Was Foretold.**
 - a. The first promise of the coming of Christ as made after the first sin when God said to Satan, “I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel,” Gen.3:15.

- (1) The “Seed of the woman” is Christ and the serpent is the devil.
- (2) Satan was to inflict a wound but not a fatal one – Christ would be crucified but would rise from the dead.
- (3) He was to bruise Satan’s head, a fatal wound.
- b. The promise and prophecy to Abraham: “In thee (in thy seed) shall all families of the earth be blessed” (Gen.12; 22) refers to the coming of Christ (Gal.3:16).
- c. God through Jeremiah prophesied: “Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise up unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute justice and judgment on the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is the name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness” (Jer.23:5,6). – 1Cor.1:30.
- d. Isa.9:6 prophesied, “For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulders; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.” – Titles that can be applied only to Jesus Christ!
- e. Hundreds of O.T. prophecies relate to the coming of Christ. These are sufficient to show that in every age the promise of his coming was kept alive in the heart of man.

8. **The Time Of Christ’s Coming Was Foretold.**

- a. Christ was to come in the “last days,” Isa.2:1,2; Joel 2:28.
 - (1). Peter quotes this as being fulfilled in Ac.2 when Jesus Christ had been raised to sit on David’s throne in heaven at the right hand of God, Vv.21-36.
- b. He was to come during the fourth universal empire – the Roman Empire, Dan.2:44. According to N.T. fulfillment:
 - (1) “And it came to pass in those days there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be taxed,” Lk.2:1.
 - (2) “Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee. Annas and Caiaphas being high priests...” Lk.3:1,2.
 - (3) Thus the coming of Christ and of John, his harbinger, was during the days of the Roman Empire.
- c. Christ was to come while the temple was yet standing.

- (1) "...and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple," Mal.3:1
 - (2) "I will fill this house with glory saith the Lord," Hag.2:7.
 - (3) Jesus, during his personal ministry, often went into the temple. Cf. Mt.21:23ff.
 - (4) Soon after he left the earth the temple was destroyed, Mt.24.
- d. "The scepter shall not depart from Judah nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be," Gen.49:10.
- (1) Shiloh refers to Jesus Christ of the tribe of Judah.
 - (2) This text signifies a ruler was to come who is identified as Jesus Christ.
 - (3) But this "scepter" shall not be produced from among Judah's posterity "until Shiloh come".
 - (4) Or, it "shall not come out of or be produced by"; or "Judah will not wield or produce the scepter of law giving and authority until Shiloh come."
 - (5) Jesus Christ, of course, is of the tribe of Judah. Cf. Heb.7:12-14.
- e. Just as the astronomer predicts the eclipse of the sun and it comes to pass, so the O.T. prophets told the very time Christ would come and, lo, he appeared!
9. **The Place of Christ's Birth Was Foretold.**
- a. It was prophesied that Christ would be born in "Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting," Mic.5:2.
 - (1) This statement is clear. Christ was born in Bethlehem of Judea, Mt.2:1-6; Jno.7:42.
10. **Christ's Lineage Was Foretold.**
- a. He was to be a descendant of Abraham, Gen.12:1-3. Cf. Gal.3:16
 - b. And of Isaac, Gen.21:12. Cf. Heb.11:18.
 - c. And of David, Jer.23:5; Cf. Ac.13:23; Rom.1:1-3.
 - d. Christ was to be of the tribe of Judah, Gen.49:10. Cf. Heb.7:14.
11. **Christ Was To Be Virgin-born.**
- a. Isa.7:14. Cf. Mt.1:18-25; Lk.1:24-35.
12. **Christ's Character Was Foretold.**

- a. The O.T. prophets prophesied that Christ would be meek and lowly, a man of sorrows, unpopular, persecuted during his earthly ministry; also that he would be a King and desired of all people, Isa.53; etc.
 - b. Only in Jesus Christ do we have such contradictory features manifested.
 - c. He was to love righteousness, gentleness and tenderness. He was to obey the Father in all things.
 - d. It was predicted that he would save others but not himself.
 - e. All these things were true in every respect with Jesus of Nazareth
13. **Various And Detailed Events In Christ's Life Were Foretold.**
- a. It was divinely prophesied that a harbinger would go before Christ to prepare the way for him.
 - (1) He was to go in the power and spirit of Elijah.
 - (2) This, of course, refers to John the Baptist who prepared the way for Christ.
 - (3) Isa.40:2,3; Mal.3:1; Mt.3:1-3; 17:10-13; Lk.1:17.
 - b. The Messiah was to confirm his message with miracles of healing the blind, deaf and lame, Isa.35:5,6.
 - (1) This he did abundantly during the whole of his personal ministry.
 - c. He was to be rejected by his brethren and hated by the Jews, Psa. 69:8; Jno.1:11; 15:24.
 - d. Christ was to be forsaken by his disciples (Zech.13:7; Mt.26:31; Jno.16:32) and sold for thirty pieces of silver (Zech.11:12; Mt.26:15).
 - e. Hundreds of other events in the life of Christ have been foretold but these are sufficient to show that the O.T. prophets wrote a complete history of his life hundreds of years before he was born and were recorded in a book published before he was born.
14. **His Death By Crucifixion And His Burial In A Borrowed Tomb Were Foretold.**
- a. Christ was to die under a judicial sentence and not at the hands of a mob: "He was taken from prison and from judgment and who shall declare his generation for he was *cut off* out of the land of the living," Isa.53:8
 - (1) Though Christ did not receive a just trial, yet he died under a judicial sentence.
 - b. He would make "his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death," Isa.53:9. Cf. Mt.27:57-60.

- c. He was to die by crucifixion.
 - (1) “He shall be *cut off* out of the land of the living” indicates a violent death.
 - (2) “For dogs have encompassed me: the assembly of the wicked have enclosed me: they pierced my hands and feet,” Psa.22:16.
 - (a) Only in death by crucifixion were the hands and feet pierced.
 - d. He was to be scourged before his crucifixion, Isa.50:6. Cf. Mt.27:26.
 - e. Soldiers were to gamble for his clothing, Psa.22:18. Cf. Mt.27:35; Jno.19:23,24.
 - f. Christ was to perish among his enemies and in the midst of cruel mockings, Psa.22:6-11. Cf. Mk.15:16-20.
 - g. His side was to be pierced, Zech.12:10. Cf. Jno.19:34.
15. **His Resurrection From The Dead, His Ascension To Heaven To Sit On David’s Throne On The Right Hand Of God, Thus His Coronation Were Prophesied.**
- a. Christ was to rise from the dead. The O.T. scriptures foretold this and his disciples of Christ heard him predict it while he was with them long before his death, Isa.53:10,11; Mt.16:21; 20:17-19; Ac.2:23-32.
 - b. The ascension of Christ was foretold. He was to conquer death and ascend on high, Psa.68:18.
 - (1) This he did: Lk.24:44-53; Ac.1; Ac.2; etc.
 - (2) Picture the solemn occasion as Jesus stands on the hilltop of Judea and bids goodbye to his chosen disciples.
 - (3) He leaves upon them the burden of preaching the gospel and spreading his kingdom and goes with the clouds toward that home from whence he came.
 - (4) As he goes home to heaven there is great rejoicing. A Son who has been gone from home for thirty-three years is returning.
 - (5) He has been to earth, suffered, died and finished the work his Father gave him to do.
 - (6) Now he returns and is ushered into the presence of God the Father. He is crowned Lord of Lords and King of Kings.
 - (7) He is now seated on David’s throne and there is given him “dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all peoples, nations and languages should serve him: his dominion is

an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.” Ac.1:9; Eph.4:8; Dan.7:13,14; Psa.24:7-10.

Concluding thoughts on why I believe in God because of the historical person and influence of Jesus Christ who claimed to be the Son of God, and the O.T. Messianic Prophecies which prove him to be who he claimed to be.

1. Jesus of Nazareth was a historical character; he existed; he was no myth; historical evidence establishes it beyond a reasonable doubt.
2. Also, all these messianic prophecies we have noted were written more than five hundred years before he came to this earth, was crucified, buried and rose from the dead.
3. These prophecies constitute a storehouse of information to strengthen our faith and to convict the gainsayer.
4. These prophecies cannot be the result of fortunate guessing or blind chance.
5. The hundreds of prophecies in the O.T. concerning the coming Christ and their minute fulfillment in the life of Jesus as recorded in the N.T. (he fulfilled all of them) simply prove to the candid and thoughtful person that:
 - a. Jesus was who he said he was – the Son of God – God in the flesh. And that being true, that God, of necessity, is – that God exists.
 - b. The Bible is the inspired Word of God.
 - (1) For no mere man, as the writers of the O.T. were, could possibly know such things about a person who was to come into the world hundreds of years in the future; nor could they possibly guess in such detail about such a person.
 - (2) The only explanation for such a thing is that they were inspired of God to write these things, which proves that God is, and that their writings originated in the mind of God. Cf. 2Pet.1:19-21.