

Ten Erroneous Skeptic-Dodges

“We destroy arguments, and every imagination raised against the knowledge of God.” (2 Corinthians 10:5)

Secularists routinely appeal to *scientific* assertions out of their beliefs that they render core tenets of Christian belief **untenable**. This paper **rebutts** that claim. As I will establish, their bogus-counter-claims (**boldface** after “**False:**” in each section) **cannot withstand scrutiny**:

- 1 False: “Materialism (ms) correctly describes reality and since it holds that only matter and energy exist, it logically follows that minds and communication are illusory.** **Reply:** That vision of existence **contradicts** what minds consistently *observe* and what we *experience* through our consciousness and feelings. So academic pretensions of *teaching* its’ views **absurdly contradicts their very own oxymoronic** world-view.
- 2 False: “Miracles cannot happen.”** If materialism was true, obviously *no personal* agent would exist to perform miracles. **Reply:** If an intelligent Being *does* exist outside of creation (as an author stands outside his/her writings), it is **rationally possible** and indeed **reasonable** for a transcendent intelligent creator to intervene in His creation.
- 3 False: “The laws of nature are inviolable and so impervious to interference by miracles.”** **Reply:** By what principle would that be so? And how could it be *substantiated* that it is so? Science is limited to learning how nature functions *within* its own parameters. So scientists have no competence to declare limitations on the capacity of an omni-potent Creator of the natural order and its physical laws,¹ to freely intervene in nature for the purpose of judging sin and advancing a saving rescue from it. Indeed the notion of divine-intervention is a real threat to *atheism* as opposed to nature’s laws.
- 4 “Miracles don’t happen.”** **Reply:** In the 20th Century, scholars began noticing aspects of the cosmos that led them to conclude the cosmos was expanding from a big bang (BB). They ultimately indicated creation came into existence from **no physical source**² consistent with Genesis 1:1. This hereby **establishes** (below) the BB as the **largest miracle ever!** So it is also highly plausible that Jesus was raised from the dead!
- 5 False: “Science can, without God, account for [phenomenal]³ existence,”** claimed atheist Dr. Peter Atkins in public debates. **Reply:** Scientific observations indicate that prior to the “zero-volume” start of the BB, there was **neither** matter, energy, space, **nor** time. Therefore there was **no conceivable way** for *such* factors to contribute in *causing* it. See my paper, “The Scientific Impossibility of Our Universe Creating Itself.”⁴
- 6 False: “Religious discourse is entirely incompatible with scientific inquiry into the natural order.”** **Reply:** It is true that “science” and religion use different methods to gain *factual* data; the former through *direct* study of *physical* things while the latter gains contents by receptivity to verbal messages (**vm**). Yet to the extent that the former shuts *vm* out, they are prejudicially remaining ignorant of rationality, wisdom, and goodness.

¹ Simon Greenleaf. *The Testimony of the Evangelists*, 1846. (Kregel, 1995), p.36f. Greenleaf berates both Spinoza and Hume extensively.

² See my essay, “Was the Big Bang the Big Beginning?” at my website: www.christianityontheoffense.com/articles

³ “Phenomena” concerns aspects of creation that can be perceived by any of our five senses, e.g., a rock, a tree, a person, a universe.

⁴ Accessible at my website: Op.cit. (2). Let me know if you successfully rebut my paper’s thesis on the basis of facts!

- 7 **False: “Christianity is *only* about faith while science is entirely about facts.” Reply:** “Faith” in the Christian context has two meanings: 1) the act of *entrusting* oneself to the promises of God, and 2) the concession that Christian claims can’t be proved. In actual fact, **scientific** research into nature’s interactions **likewise cannot be proved**. Only logical truths and mathematical equations achieve total certainty. Instead, the *scientific* means for gaining knowledge is to first gather the data relevant to the phenomenon being studied and then compare the range of competing hypotheses to judge which of them **most closely fits the facts**. This method is called “*inferring the best explanation (IBE) among competing hypotheses.*” Atheistic-causation of nature fails to concretely-suggest the cause, while theistic hypothesis (pt.#4) that implies a Creator can be scientifically substantiated. Likewise, when the question of Jesus existence and power is scrutinized against *historical* data, the Christ of the New Testament is vindicated.⁵
- 8 **False: “Religion has contributed nothing in advancing *scientific* knowledge.” Reply:** Apart from the biblical tenet that God created the heavens and the earth in the manner of Genesis 1:1, no people were ever motivated to investigate the **specifics** of the stuff of *nature*. While the Mesopotamians first mapped the night sky, the Arabs advanced the study of mathematics, the Greeks pioneered disciplined philosophical reflection and the Chinese harnessed nature for pragmatic reasons, none of them introduced the *direct* study of the very *nature* of nature.” Instead it was *Christian* natural philosophers (“scientists”) in the medieval era who turned their “scopes” onto the fundamentals of nature out of a conviction that its’ substance was **neither** chaos nor evil for the reason that God is the intelligent creator of reality.⁶ So it is evident that if past Christians failed to tie their faith to nature, *scientific* understanding of nature would be unknown today.
- 9 **False: “If it isn’t science, it’s worthless.” Reply: No,** it’s worthless **if it’s *only* science!** Clearly, science is an enormously valuable tool. But science *alone* is useless since it remains un-harnessed so that no benefits at all can conceivably be produced. Purpose, morality, and values, are just a few non-science concepts that individuals and societies require in order to survive, let alone thrive. Indeed it is *absurd* that Hume’s dictum to *put to the flames*” texts that can’t be scientifically-measured, further retains such a *naive* following today. The choice in pt.#6 should be framed as both/and instead of either/or.
- 10 **False: “Atheism *deserves* the default position.” Reply:** *Scientific* inquiry accounts for specific **aspects** of actual phenomena as opposed to pronouncing *meta-physical* assumptions (e.g., “*the cosmos is self-existent*”). But due to the absence of a sufficient cause with respect to the cosmos, atheism utterly fails to account for our existence. Indeed, it utterly lacks the testable and observable and publicly-accessible facts that would be necessary to substantiate its so-called “default” claim.

Gary Jensen, NALC Lutheran Pastor, retired © February 23, 2025

Gjensen549@gmail.com ** Christianityontheoffense.com ** lookanothertime.blogspot.com

M.Div. from Luther/Northwestern Theological Seminary ** M.A. with Honors in *Science and Religion* from Biola University

⁵ Lee Strobel. *Case for Christ*. (Zondervan, 2016). ** Simon Greenleaf, co-founder of Harvard Law School in *Testimony of the Evangelists*, Kregel, 1995), *scrutinized* the Gospel accounts of Jesus’ passion and concluded they are by evidential standards, fully credible.

⁶ Langdon Gilkey. *Maker of Heaven and Earth*. “Creation and the Intelligibility of our World.” (Doubleday. 1959), ch. 5.