

FINDING TRUTH

5 PRINCIPLES *for* UNMASKING ATHEISM,
SECULARISM, *and* OTHER GOD SUBSTITUTES

NANCY PEARCEY

NOTES

PART I—"I Lost My Faith at an Evangelical College"

1. David Kinnaman writes, "The significant spiritual and technological changes over the last 50 years make the dropout problem more urgent. Young people are dropping out earlier, staying away longer, and if they come back are less likely to see the church as a long-term part of their life." Cited in "Five Myths about Young Adult Church Dropouts," Barna Group, November 16, 2011, www.barna.org/teens-next-gen-articles/534-five-myths-about-young-adult-church-dropouts.
2. Cited in Allen C. Guelzo, "The Return of the Will," in *Edwards in Our Time: Jonathan Edwards and the Shaping of American Religion*, ed. Sang Hyun Lee and Allen C. Guelzo (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 133. The problem is that although God is knowable through general revelation, humans suppress that knowledge and are therefore in need of redemption—which is why we also need the Bible, or special revelation, with its message of redemption.
3. See Robin Collins, "The Teleological Argument: An Exploration of the Fine-Tuning of the Universe," in *The Blackwell Companion to Natural Theology*, ed. William Lane Craig and J. P. Moreland (Oxford: Blackwell, 2012).
4. Dennis Overbye, "Zillions of Universes? Or Did Ours Get Lucky?," *New York Times*, October 28, 2003. To counter the implications of fine-tuning, some cosmologists propose that there are multiple universes besides our own (the Many Worlds hypothesis). Most of those universes would be dark, lifeless places, but a few might possibly have the right conditions for life—and ours just happens to be one of them. This is sheer speculation, of course, since it is impossible to know if any other universes actually exist. "The multiverse theory requires as much suspension of disbelief as any religion," comments Gregg Easterbrook. "Join the church that believes in the existence of invisible objects 50 billion galaxies wide!" The only reason for proposing such a

- far-fetched idea is that it makes our own universe seem a little less like a freak improbability. Gregg Easterbrook, “The New Convergence,” *Wired*, December 2002.
5. George Greenstein, *The Symbiotic Universe: Life and Mind in the Cosmos* (New York: William Morrow, 1988), 85–90; and Paul Davies, “A Brief History of the Multiverse,” *New York Times*, April 12, 2003. Elsewhere Davies writes that “the seemingly miraculous concurrence of numerical values” for nature’s fundamental constants is “the most compelling evidence for an element of cosmic design.” *God and the New Physics* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1983), 189. For more on fine-tuning, see Guillermo Gonzalez and Jay Richards, *The Privileged Planet: How Our Place in the Cosmos Is Designed for Discovery* (Washington, DC: Regnery, 2004) and my book *Total Truth: Liberating Christianity from Its Cultural Captivity* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2004), 188–91.
 6. Paul Davies, “The Secret of Life Won’t Be Cooked Up in a Chemistry Lab,” *Guardian*, January 13, 2013. Earlier Davies wrote, “Trying to make life by mixing chemicals in a test tube is like soldering switches and wires in an attempt to produce Windows 98. It won’t work because it addresses the problem at the wrong conceptual level.” “How We Could Create Life: The Key to Existence Will Be Found Not in Primordial Sludge, but in the Nanotechnology of the Living Cell,” *Guardian*, December 11, 2002.
 7. See Stephen C. Meyer, *Signature in the Cell: DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design* (New York: HarperCollins, 2010).
 8. Cicero, *On the Nature of the Gods*, bk. II, chap. XXXVII; and “The Tusculan Disputations,” trans. C. D. Yonge (New York: Harper, 1877), 39.
 9. See my treatment in *The Soul of Science*, coauthored by Charles Thaxton (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1994), especially chapter 10; *Total Truth*, especially chapters 5 and 6; and *How Now Shall We Live?*, coauthored by Chuck Colson and Harold Fickett (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale, 1999), chapters 6 through 10. On the broader outworkings of Darwinian thought in philosophy and culture, see *Total Truth*, chapters 7 and 8, and *Saving Leonardo* (Nashville: B&H, 2010), chapters 3 and 6.
 10. With the Judeo-Christian religion “a new way of thinking is introduced into the Western world.” Its God “is very different from the divinities of earlier philosophies. He is a personal God, not an abstract principle.” C. H. Perlman, *An Historical Introduction to Philosophical Thinking*, trans. Kenneth Brown (New York: Random, 1965), 96–97. “To Greco-Oriental thought, whether mystical or philosophical, the ultimate reality is some primal impersonal force ... some ineffable, immutable, impassive divine substance that pervades the

- universe or rather is the universe.” By contrast, in biblical thought, “God is neither a metaphysical principle nor an impersonal force.... Hebraic religion affirms God as a transcendent Person.” Will Herberg, *Judaism and Modern Man: An Interpretation of Jewish Religion* (New York: Boucher, 2007), 48.
11. Étienne Gilson, *God and Philosophy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1941), 19–20, 37, 42.
 12. Paul Bloom, “Religion Is Natural,” *Developmental Science* 10, no. 1 (2007): 147–51.
 13. Cited in Martin Beckford, “Children Are Born Believers in God, Academic Claims,” *Telegraph*, November 24, 2008.
 14. C. S. Lewis, *Miracles* (New York: HarperCollins, 1974), 150.
 15. Around the 1930s, a new field called the sociology of knowledge began to investigate how even scholars and scientists fail to fit the ideal of objectivity, but are influenced (often unconsciously) by their prior expectations and assumptions. The sociology of knowledge was founded by philosopher Max Scheler and sociologist Karl Mannheim.
 16. See Thomas K. Johnson, *The First Step in Missions Training: How Our Neighbors Are Wrestling with God’s General Revelation* (Bonn: Verlag für Kultur und Wissenschaft, 2014), 23–24.
 17. See Margaret Heffernan, *Willful Blindness: Why We Ignore the Obvious at Our Peril* (New York: Walker, 2011).
 18. Johnson, *First Step*, 23.
 19. David Powlison, “Idols of the Heart and ‘Vanity Fair,’” *Journal of Biblical Counseling*, October 16, 2009.
 20. Similarly, in Paul’s letter to the Colossians, he warns against “sexual immorality, impurity, passion, evil desire, and covetousness, which is idolatry” (Col. 3:5). Again, idolatry is the sin driving the other sins.
 21. *The Larger Catechism of Martin Luther*, trans. Robert H. Fischer (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1959), 9.
 22. Cited in Pericles Lewis, *Religious Experience and the Modernist Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 36. For a fuller discussion of the trend to treat art as a religion, which started with Romanticism, see *Saving Leonardo*, chapters 7 and 8.
 23. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 1536 ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995), 4.17.36.
 24. “In the ancient world there was no banking system as we know it today, and no paper money. All money was made from metal, heated until liquid, poured into moulds and allowed to cool. When the coins were cooled, it was necessary to smooth off the uneven edges. The coins were comparatively

soft, and of course many people shaved them closely. In one century, more than eighty laws were passed in Athens to stop the practice of whittling down the coins then in circulation.” This money, which was less than full weight, was described as “debased.” Donald Grey Barnhouse, *Romans: God’s Glory* (Philadelphia: Evangelical Foundation, 1964), 18, cited at Blue Letter Bible, s.v. “*dokimos*,” www.blbclassic.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strong=G1384&t=NASB.

25. In using the term *exchanged*, Paul is echoing a verse from the Old Testament: “They made a calf in Horeb and worshiped a metal image. They exchanged the glory of God for the image of an ox that eats grass” (Ps. 106:19–20). An echo goes back even further to Genesis 1:26, where the cultural mandate gives humans stewardship over the rest of creation. “God created human beings for ‘dominion’ over these creatures, but fallen human idolaters now bow before the likenesses of animals.” Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), 211, n. 26.
26. Richard B. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics* (New York: HarperOne, 1996), 387. Sarah Ruden, a scholar of Greco-Roman culture, says the main form of homosexual behavior that Paul was most likely to observe in his day was pederasty, most frequently the sexual abuse of young male slaves by their masters, although freeborn boys were vulnerable to being raped as well. Among the Greeks and Romans, the active partner was praised as virile and masculine, even when they were cruel and vicious, while the passive partner (the victim) was regarded as weak and disgusting. But Paul treats the active partner as equally guilty and degraded, and in fact condemns homosexuality as a form of injustice (the word for “unrighteousness” in Romans 1:18 is often translated “injustice”). Because pederasty was accepted in Roman culture, and the perpetrators even admired, “Paul’s Roman audience ... would have been surprised to hear that justice applied to homosexuality, of all things.” “No Closet, No Monsters? Paul and Homosexuality,” chap. 3 in *Paul among the People: The Apostle Reinterpreted and Reimagined in His Own Time* (New York: Image Books, 2010).
27. Cited in *Soul of Science*, 184–85.
28. Roy Clouser, *The Myth of Religious Neutrality: An Essay on the Hidden Role of Religious Belief in Theories*, rev. ed. (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005), 104.
29. Not all forms of reductionism are problematic. In some cases, a good understanding of a system’s components enables one to predict all the important properties of a system as a whole. That is to say, some things really

are merely the sum of their parts. Take, for example, the kinetic theory of gases. As John Polkinghorne writes, we can use “the kinetic theory of gases to reduce the concept of temperature (originating in the thermodynamics of bulk matter) to exact equivalence to the average kinetic energy of the molecules of the gas.” *Interdisciplinary Encyclopedia of Religion and Science*, s.v. “Reductionism,” ed. G. Tanzella-Nitti and A. Strumia, 2002, <http://inters.org/reductionism>.

30. Herman Dooyeweerd describes how absolutization leads to reductionism: Those who look for ultimate reality within creation “will be inclined to present one aspect of reality ... as reality in its completeness. They will then reduce all the others to the point where all of them become different manifestations of the absolutized aspect.... Think of modern materialism, which reduces all of temporal reality to particles of matter in motion. Consider the modern naturalistic philosophy of life, which sees everything one-sidedly in terms of the development of organic life.... [Humans tend] to absolutize the relative and deify the creature.” *Roots of Western Culture: Pagan, Secular, and Christian Options* (Grand Rapids, MI: Paideia Press, 2012), 42.
31. John Horgan, “More Than Good Intentions: Holding Fast to Faith in Free Will,” *New York Times*, December 31, 2002. Francis Schaeffer offered this analogy: When a person’s worldview is too “small,” it’s like trying to stuff a person into a garbage can—an arm or a leg will always stick out. *True Spirituality in The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer* (Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1982), vol. 3, 172–73.
32. John Searle, interview by Jeffrey Mishlove, *Thinking Allowed: Conversations on the Leading Edge of Knowledge and Discovery*, 1998, www.williamjames.com/transcripts/searle.htm (italics added).
33. The book was Gene Edward Veith, *Postmodern Times: A Christian Guide to Contemporary Thought and Culture* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1994).

PART 2—PRINCIPLE #1: Twilight of the Gods

1. Albert M. Wolters, *Creation Regained: Biblical Basics for a Reformational Worldview* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1985), 4.
2. Christian Smith and Melinda Lundquist Denton, *Soul Searching: The Religious and Spiritual Lives of American Teenagers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 89.
3. David Kinnaman, *You Lost Me: Why Young Christians Are Leaving Church ... and Rethinking Faith* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2011), 190. A study by Fuller Seminary found that the single most important factor in whether teens hold on to their Christian convictions in college is whether they found

- answers to their questions while still in high school: “The more college students felt that they had the opportunity to express their doubt while they were in high school, the higher [their] levels of faith maturity and spiritual maturity.” Lillian Kwon, “Survey: High School Seniors ‘Graduating from God,’” *Christian Post*, August 10, 2006.
4. Bradley Wright, “If People Leave the Faith, When Do They Do It?,” Patheos, January 28, 2012, www.patheos.com/blogs/blackwhiteandgray/2012/01/if-people-leave-the-faith-when-do-they-do-it/. Wright cites a study showing that those most likely to leave are ages seventeen to twenty. The next most likely to leave are a year or two younger (ages fifteen to sixteen). After age twenty, the numbers decline somewhat, then finally drop off after age twenty-six.
 5. Christian Smith, director of the Center for the Study of Youth and Religion at the University of Notre Dame, reports that teenagers today often define faith primarily in terms of “meeting emotional needs.” Their one-dimensional understanding is the product of “an overwhelmingly relativistic and privatized cultural climate,” as well as “youth leaders who have not challenged that climate.” Cited in Chris Norton, “Apologetics Makes a Comeback among Youth,” *Christianity Today*, August 31, 2011.
 6. Norton, “Apologetics.” See also Troy Anderson, “A New Day for Apologetics: People Young and Old Are Flocking to Hear—and Be Changed by—Winsome Arguments for the Christian Faith,” *Christianity Today*, July 2, 2008.
 7. An idol may also be something mistakenly thought to be in creation—something unreal or imaginary, such as space aliens. The point is that *if it were real*, it would be something less than God, something within the cosmic order.
 8. Terry Eagleton, *Culture and the Death of God* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014), 119. See also Andrew Brown, “Religion without a Church? Humanism Almost Qualifies,” *Guardian*, August 12, 2014. Herman Dooyeweerd notes that idols result from a “deification of the creature” and “the absolutizing of the relative” *New Critique of Theoretical Thought* (Ontario, Canada: Paideia, 1984), I:58, 61, 176 and II:322, 572. For example, the mechanistic materialism of the Enlightenment resulted from “an absolutization of the mechanical phenomena.” *Roots*, 172–73. Reinhold Niebuhr defined idolatry as the tendency to lift “some finite and contingent element of existence into the eminence of the divine,” treating it “as the ultimate principle of coherence and meaning.” *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, vol. 1 (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 164–65. H. Richard Niebuhr also warned of “the absolutizing of what is relative.” *Christ and Culture* (New

York: HarperCollins, 1951), 145. George Steiner notes that many modern philosophies function as “surrogate theologies.” They are propounded by “secular messiahs” and express a “nostalgia for the absolute.” *Nostalgia for the Absolute* (Toronto: House of Anansi, 1974), 49. Chapter 1 is titled “The Secular Messiahs.”

9. Timothy Keller, “Talking about Idolatry in a Postmodern Age,” Gospel Coalition, April 2007, <http://old.westerfunk.net/archives/theology/Talking%20About%20Idolatry%20in%20a%20Postmodern%20Age/>.
10. That’s why philosopher David Naugle describes worldviews as “visions of the heart.” *Worldview: The History of a Concept* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 268ff.
11. “Atheistic religions ... include eastern religions like Theravedic Buddhism, Jainism, Taoism, and Confucianism.” Eric Steinhart, “On Atheistic Religion,” Patheos, January 8, 2012, www.patheos.com/blogs/camelswithhammers/2012/01/on-atheistic-religion-2/. However, “godless faiths are sustained only by small intellectual elites, and the popular forms of Buddhism, Confucianism, and Taoism abound in Gods.” Rodney Stark, “Why Gods Should Matter in Social Science,” *Chronicle of Higher Education* 49, no. 39 (June 6, 2003). In the Supreme Court decision *Torcaso v. Watkins* (1961), Justice Hugo Black stated that “among religions in this country which do not teach what would generally be considered a belief in the existence of God are Buddhism, Taoism, Ethical Culture, Secular Humanism and others”; and André Comte-Sponville, *The Little Book of Atheist Spirituality* (New York: Penguin, 2006), 2.
12. Hermann Hesse, *Siddhartha*, trans. Hilda Rosner (New York: Bantam, 1951), 144. At the same time, many of these religions do have moral teachings, however difficult that may be to square with their metaphysics. In Hinduism the concept of karma involves a concept of justice—good actions cause good karma and bad actions cause bad karma; what you reap is what you sow. It is a near-mechanical rule, almost like a law in physics (e.g., for every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction).
13. Journalist Arthur Koestler observes that the Eastern view leads to the “denial of a universal moral law” and finally to “passive complicity” with evil. He illustrates the Eastern view with lines from one of the oldest of Zen poems: “Be not concerned with right and wrong / The conflict between right and wrong / Is the sickness of the mind.” *The Lotus and the Robot* (New York: Macmillan, 1960), 272, 270.
14. Cited in Stark, “Why Gods Should Matter.” Stark offers a great deal of additional evidence: “The founder of British anthropology, Edward Burnett Tylor, and the founder of British sociology, Herbert Spencer, both took

pains to point out that only some kinds of religions have moral implications. ‘Savage animism [religion] is almost devoid of that ethical element which to the educated modern mind is the very mainspring of practical religion,’ Tylor reported. ‘The lower animism is not immoral, it is unmoral.’ Spencer also noted that many religions ignore morality, and he went even further by suggesting that some religions actively encourage crime and immorality: ‘At the present time in India, we have freebooters like the Domras, among whom a successful theft is always celebrated by a sacrifice to their chief god Gandak.’ ... In his distinguished study of the Manus of New Guinea, Reo Franklin Fortune contrasted the moral aspects of their religion with that of the typical tribe, agreeing that ‘Tylor is entirely correct in stating that in most primitive regions of the world, religion and morality maintain themselves independently.’ Ruth Benedict also argued that to generalize the link between religion and morality ‘is to misconceive’ the ‘history of religions.’ She suggested that the linkage probably is typical only of ‘the higher ethical religions.’ Ralph Barton reported that the Ifugaos impute their own unscrupulous exchange practices to their Gods and seize every opportunity to cheat them. Peter Lawrence found that the Garia of New Guinea have no conception whatever of ‘sin,’ and ‘no idea of rewards in the next world for good works.’”

15. Xenophanes, cited in Adam Drozdek, *Greek Philosophers as Theologians: The Divine Arche* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007), 15; and Augustine, *City of God*, bk. 3, chap. 3.
16. The city-state of ancient Carthage was a Phoenician colony located in what is now Tunisia. Phoenician colonies in Sicily, Sardinia, and Malta also practiced child sacrifice, as did ancient Israel, where it was ringingly denounced by several Old Testament prophets (Lev. 20:2–5; Deut. 12:31; 18:10; Jer. 7:31; 19:4–5; 32:35; Ezek. 16:20–21; 20:26, 31; 23:37).
Revisionists (mostly from Tunisia) have denied that Carthage practiced child sacrifice, but a new study seems to have laid that theory to rest. Sarah Griffiths, “Ancient Greek Stories of Ritual Child Sacrifice in Carthage Are True, Study Claims,” *Daily Mail*, January 23, 2014; and Maev Kennedy, “Carthaginians Sacrificed Own Children, Archaeologists Say,” *Guardian*, January 21, 2014.
17. Clouser, *Myth*, chap. 2. Even a creator god may not be the ultimate reality. Gnosticism taught that within the cosmic order are several levels of spiritual beings from the highest deity down to the lowest deity or sub-god (usually translated as demiurge). It was this subordinate deity who created the material world where humans live. Because this world is the realm of death, decay, and destruction, the demiurge who created it was even said to be evil. To be

precise, the demiurge was not even a true creator but merely an architect, because matter was thought to be eternal. He merely gave form to unformed matter.

18. There is evidence that many ancient cultures held monotheism prior to becoming polytheistic, which supports Paul's statement in Romans 1 that people reject worship of the Creator and substitute worship of creation. For a recent study, see Winfried Corduan, *In the Beginning: A Fresh Look at the Case for Original Monotheism* (Nashville: B&H, 2013). Some scholars believe that the ancient Chinese worshipped a monotheistic divinity before the rise of Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism. See Chan Kei Thong and Charlene L. Fu, *Finding God in Ancient China: How the Ancient Chinese Worshiped the God of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2009). John S. Mbiti studied some three hundred peoples of Africa, concluding, "In all these societies, without a single exception, people have a notion of God" as the Supreme Being and Creator. *African Religions and Philosophy*, 2nd ed. (New York: Praeger, 1969), 29. Geoffrey Parrinder also argues that the indigenous African culture was monotheistic. *African Mythology* (New York: Peter Bedrick Books, 1991). However, even when teaching that one supreme God exists, most traditional religions also teach that there are lower-level spirits or divinities. Often these religions teach that the Supreme God was alienated from his people and withdrew from them, which is why they now have to placate the lower-level spirits.

The finding that many cultures held an original monotheism has discredited the nineteenth-century Hegelian-inspired view that religions evolve from simple to complex (from animism through polytheism, to henotheism, to monotheism). See Gleason L. Archer, *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1975). On the implications for missions, see Don Richardson, *Eternity in Their Hearts: Startling Evidence of Belief in the One True God in Hundreds of Cultures throughout the World*, 2nd ed. (Venture, CA: Regal, 1984).

19. Jonathan Petre, "And after Double Maths It Will Be ... Paganism: Schools Told to Put Witchcraft and Druids on RE Syllabus," *Daily Mail*, April 14, 2012.
20. "A Definition of Wicca," Church and School of Wicca, www.wicca.org/Church/define.html. Another website states, "Wiccans believe that the spirit of the One, Goddess and God, exist in all things ... [and] that we must treat all things of the Earth as aspects of the divine." Herne, "What Is Wicca?," Celtic Connection, <http://wicca.com/celtic/wicca/wicca.htm>. There are also people today who consider themselves pagans but are completely secular, treating the

gods as psychological symbols or Jungian archetypes. They might view the goddess, for example, as a symbol of female empowerment.

21. G. S. Kirk, J. E. Raven, M. Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers: A Critical History*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 150ff.; and Eric Temple Bell, *The Magic of Numbers* (New York: Dover, 1946), 85.
22. See *Total Truth*, appendix 3, “The Long War between Materialism and Christianity.”
23. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, bk. XI, pt. 7; and Plato, *Republic*, bks. VI and VII. In the *Timaeus*, Plato attributes the origin of the material world to a personal deity, but it is a low-level god or sub-deity or demiurge (as in Gnosticism). This low-level deity did not create from nothing; he merely injected reason (rational forms) into reasonless matter. As Reijer Hooykaas writes, this is a creator whose hands are tied in two respects: “He had to follow not his own design but the model of the eternal Ideas [Forms]; and second, he had to put the stamp of the Ideas on a chaotic, recalcitrant matter which he had not created himself.” *Religion and the Rise of Modern Science* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972), 3–4.
24. Brian J. Shanley in Thomas Aquinas, *The Treatise on the Divine Nature*, trans. Brian J. Shanley (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2006), 244 (italics added). Irving Singer says, “Aristotle’s ladder of existence starts with *pure matter* and culminates in *pure form*.” *The Nature of Love: Plato to Luther*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), 108 (italics in original). Romano Guardini says the ancients never attained to the Christian understanding of transcendence: “To the man of the ancient world, however, the universe itself was the whole of reality.” Even the philosophers “did not transcend the universe.” “The absolute essences [Forms] of ancient philosophy were enmeshed forever within the totality of being to which they gave stability and eternity.” For example, Plato’s concept of the Good “was not severed from the world; it remained immanent to it as its very eternity, as a ‘beyond’ within the final whole.” Likewise, “the Unmoved Mover of Aristotle, itself immobile, brought about all the change in the world. In the final analysis, it only had meaning when related to the whole of the eternally changing universe itself.” *The End of the Modern World* (Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 1998), 1–3, 8. Dooyeweerd calls Aristotle’s deity an “idol.” *New Critique*, I:122.
25. E. O. Wilson, *Consilience: The Unity of Knowledge* (New York: Vintage Books, 1998), 291. Wilson also writes on page 60, “Nature is organized by simple universal laws of physics to which all other laws and principles can eventually be reduced”; and Jerry Coyne, “Philosopher Thomas Nagel Goes the Way of Alvin Plantinga, Dismisses Evolution,” *Why Evolution Is True* (blog), October 13,

- 2012, <http://whyevolutionistrue.wordpress.com/2012/10/13/philosopher-thomas-nagel-goes-the-way-of-alvin-plantinga-disses-evolution/>.
26. John R. Searle, *Mind: A Brief Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 48; and Gordy Slack, "What Neo-Creationists Get Right," *The Scientist*, June 20, 2008, 26. Dallas Willard, "What Significance Has 'Postmodernism' for Christian Faith?," www.dwillard.org/articles/artview.asp?artID=70.
 27. "Tysonism," Facebook, <https://www.facebook.com/Tysonism>.
 28. In Marx's terms, economic relations form the base, while all other dimensions of society are merely superstructure. See my chapter on Marxism, "Does It Liberate?," in *How Now Shall We Live?* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale, 1999), chap. 24.
 29. David Hume, *Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. Charles Hendel (Pearson, 1995), 80.
 30. A report of the survey can be found in Anthony Gottlieb, "What Do Philosophers Believe?," *Intelligent Life*, spring 2010.
 31. See Donald T. Williams, "Kahless and Christ: On Faith, Fictional and Factual," *While We're Paused* (blog), June 11, 2012. Worf is expressing the fact/value split, which is a major theme throughout *Total Truth*.
 32. "There is simply no way to show that humans can gain knowledge of extra-mental realities if we are only directly aware of mental realities. Neither reason nor experience will allow us to bridge the chasm between our minds and the external world that looms if representationalism is true." C. Stephen Evans, *Natural Signs and Knowledge of God: A New Look at Theistic Arguments* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 28.
 33. *The Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, ed. John M. Robson, vol. 9 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963–91), 183. See Clouser, *Myth*, 144, 336.
 34. In philosophy, this is often dubbed the brain-in-a-vat problem: How do you know that you're not really just a brain in a vat that is being stimulated by electrical impulses administered by a mad scientist to make you *think* that you have a body and that you live in a real world of people and objects?
 35. David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature* (CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2012), 37.
 36. Ernst Mach, *The Analysis of Sensations*, in John T. Blackmore, *Ernst Mach: His Life, Work, and Influence* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1972), 327n14. See the discussion of Mach in Clouser, *Myth*, 149–50.
 37. To read about the impact of empiricism and rationalism on art and literature, see *Saving Leonardo*, chaps. 5 and 6.
 38. See Richard H. Popkin, *History of Skepticism: From Erasmus to Spinoza* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979); Harris Harbison, "The

- Struggle for Power,” chap. 3 in *The Age of Reformation* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1955).
39. Jeffrey Stout writes, “The crisis of authority made an absolutely radical break with the past seem necessary. Methodical doubt therefore sought complete transcendence of situation. It tried to make the inheritance of tradition irrelevant, to start over again from scratch, to escape history.” *The Flight from Authority: Religion, Morality, and the Quest for Autonomy* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981), 67. See *Total Truth*, appendix 1, “How American Politics Became Secularized”; *Saving Leonardo*, 137–40; and my lecture, “The Creation Myth of Modern Political Philosophy” (respondent to the Sixth Annual Kuyper Lecture, Washington, DC, 2000).
 40. Cited in Michael Oakshott, *Rationalism in Politics and Other Essays* (Indianapolis: Liberty, 1991), 15. See also A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller, ed., *The Cambridge History of English Literature* (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1919), 329.
 41. Bacon is known for his pithy saying that a little philosophy inclines a person toward atheism, but “depth in philosophy” brings a person to religion. *The Essays of Lord Bacon* (London: Longman and Green, 1875), 64. Descartes, a devout Catholic, was so certain that God had revealed to him the irrefutable logic of the cogito that he vowed to make a pilgrimage to the shrine of Our Lady of Loreto in Italy, which he did. See *Total Truth*, 39.
 42. Robert C. Solomon, *Continental Philosophy Since 1750: The Rise and Fall of the Self* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 5–6. In one sense, of course, everyone must start with conscious experience—with what we know. But there is a difference between an experiential starting point and a logical starting point. We all begin the search for knowledge from within our own experience. But a logical starting point refers to what we consider most ultimate and foundational—the basis for explaining all of reality.
 43. Karl Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge* (New York: Routledge, 1963, 2002), 20–21 (italics in original).
 44. Randall adds, “Their ideal was still a *system of revelation*, though they had abandoned the *method of revelation*.” John Herman Randall, *The Making of the Modern Mind* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940), 267 (italics in original). Similarly, Stout writes that the early modern philosophers who gave up traditional authority “merely substituted one class of privileged claims for another... They were not disputing the epistemological necessity for *something like sacred authority*.” Stout, *Flight*, 75 (italics in original).
 45. Cited in *Saving Leonardo*, 95. For additional background, see *Soul of Science*, 139–40.

46. Alvin Plantinga, "How to Be an Anti-Realist," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 56, no. 1. (September 1982): 48. For more on Kant's Copernican revolution, see *Saving Leonardo*, 181–83.
47. Immanuel Kant, *Philosophical Correspondence 1759–1799*, ed. and trans. Arnulf Zweig (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), 254.
48. Anthony Kenny, *An Illustrated Brief History of Western Philosophy* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006), 377. As Dooyeweerd says, empiricism leads to "epistemological nihilism." *New Critique*, II:332.
49. Alan Jacobs, "Psychological Criticism: From the Imagination to Freud and Beyond," *Contemporary Literary Theory: A Christian Appraisal*, ed. Clarence Walhout and Leland Ryken (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991), 99, 119, 98.
50. Ernest Lee Tuveson, *The Imagination as a Means of Grace* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1960). For sources for the quotations in this section by Coleridge, Herder, Wordsworth, and Yeats, see *Saving Leonardo*, 183.
51. Herman Dooyeweerd, *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought* (Ontario: Paideia, 1984), I:46.
52. B. R. Hergenhahn and Tracy B. Henley, *An Introduction to the History of Psychology* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2014). Every educational theory is likewise the application of a philosophy: See George R. Knight, *Philosophy and Education: An Introduction in Christian Perspective*, 4th ed. (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2006). Even mathematics, supposedly the most objective field of all, has been deeply influenced by philosophy: See *Soul of Science*, chapters 6 and 7; Clouser, *Myth*, chap. 7, and "Is There a Christian View of Everything, from Soup to Nuts?," *Pro Rege*, June 2003.
53. C. S. Lewis, *The Screwtape Letters* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996), 2.
54. From the 1984 edition.
55. See Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2008). The Old Testament likewise contains events that were public and open to empirical investigation. In Moses's confrontation with the Egyptian priests, his ability to perform miracles was the authentication that he spoke for the true God. In Elijah's confrontation with the prophets of Baal on Mount Carmel, a highly visible miracle constituted evidence for the true God. See also 2 Peter 1:16–17; Acts 1:21–22; 3:15; 4:20.

In our own day, empirical evidence continues to provide some of the most persuasive arguments for God's existence, such as the argument from design, arguments for the historicity of the Resurrection, and evidence for the reliability of Scripture from archaeology and the study of ancient manuscripts.

56. The first quotation comes from Justin Martyr, *Second Apology*, chap. 13. His actual wording was “Whatever things were rightly [or truly] said among all men, are the property of us Christians.” Yet the fullest truth, he said, is found in Christ. The second quotation was coined by Jerome. See E. K. Rand, *The Founders of the Middle Ages* (New York: Dover, 1928), 64.

PRINCIPLE #2: How Nietzsche Wins

1. The following account is from a personal interview with John R. Erickson, along with an article by Erickson titled “Mugged by Nietzsche” (unpublished) and his memoir, *Small Town Author* (unpublished).
2. Leil Lowndes, “How Neuroscience Can Help Us Find True Love,” *Wall Street Journal*, February 14, 2013. See also Helen Fisher, *Why We Love: The Nature and Chemistry of Romantic Love* (New York: Henry Holt, 2004).
3. Richard Rorty, “Thugs and Theorists,” *Political Theory* 15, no. 4 (November 1987): 564–80.
4. They also stole more than participants who were assigned to a neutral condition with control statements such as “Sugar cane and sugar beets are grown in 112 countries.” Jesse Bering, “Scientists Say Free Will Probably Doesn’t Exist, but Urge: ‘Don’t Stop Believing!’,” *Scientific American*, April 6, 2010. Another experiment is reported here: “The commonest criticism of reductionism—the idea that we are a pack of neurons and nothing more—is that it will lead us to treat our fellow human beings as if ... well, as if they were a pack of neurons and nothing more. John Evans, a sociologist of religion at University of California, San Diego, has set about testing whether the criticism has any merit.... He asked a series of questions designed to elicit their attitudes toward behavior. Were they in favor of allowing experiments on prisoners without their consent? Selling human organs for profit? Allowing suicide in the case of people who wanted to save money? Intervening to stop genocide? Sure enough, he found that people who hold the reductionist view—who deny the special status of the human species in nature, who believe behavior is determined by physical processes alone—were far more likely to agree with the maltreatment of humans. Evans can’t draw conclusions about whether determinism causes those views. But the correlations between them, he said, are unmistakable.” Andrew Ferguson, “The End of Neurononsense,” *Weekly Standard*, October 20, 2014.
5. Note that these findings actually offer evidence that free will is real. If I encouraged you to believe that you could fly, you still could not fly. Believing that you have the ability does not make it any easier to fly. By contrast, as these studies show, believing that you have the power not to cheat *does* make

it easier not to cheat. Conclusion: Belief makes no difference when you do not have the power to do something anyway. But it does seem to help you exercise a power that you do have. Thus these findings support the reality of free will. (Thanks to Angus Menuge for this insight.)

6. Francis Schaeffer analyzed the history of Western thought as a series of dualisms. See *Escape from Reason* and *The God Who Is There*. Schaeffer's analysis was inspired by Herman Dooyeweerd, who identified three major dualisms in Western thought: the Greek matter/form dualism, medieval nature/grace dualism, and Kantian nature/freedom dualism. (Kant defined nature in terms of a mechanistic, material machine while defining freedom in terms of moral norms that humans choose for themselves.) See Dooyeweerd's *Roots* and *New Critique*, passim, and *In the Twilight of Western Thought*, chapter 2 (Grand Rapids, MI: Paideia, 2012).
7. Nicholas Humphrey, "Consciousness: The Achilles Heel of Darwinism? Thank God, Not Quite," in John Brockman, ed., *Intelligent Thought: Science versus the Intelligent Design Movement* (New York: Vintage, 2006), 58.
8. Colin McGinn, "All Machine and No Ghost?," *New Statesman*, February 20, 2012.
9. Francis Crick, *The Astonishing Hypothesis: The Scientific Search for the Soul* (New York: Touchstone, 1994), 3; and Daniel Wegner, *The Illusion of Conscious Will* (Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2002). The interview with Wegner is by Dennis Overbye, "Free Will: Now You Have It, Now You Don't," *New York Times*, January 2, 2007.
10. Steven Pinker, *How the Mind Works* (New York: Norton, 2009), 24, passim; and "Is Science Killing the Soul?," Edge.org, April 7, 1999, www.edge.org/3rd_culture/dawkins_pinker/debate_p9.html.
11. The example is from Teed Rockwell, *Dictionary of Philosophy of Mind*, s.v. "Eliminativism," <http://philosophy.uwaterloo.ca/MindDict/eliminativism.html>.
12. Emergentism can be thought of as the opposite of reductionism. Instead of claiming that higher-level phenomena can be reduced to lower, less complex levels, it claims that lower levels can give rise to higher, more complex levels. Scientists identify two types of emergence: weak and strong. An example of weak emergence is water. At room temperature, hydrogen and oxygen are gases. If that were all we knew, we might not expect the product of their chemical reaction to be a liquid (H₂O). Yet the result is completely determined by ordinary laws of nature acting on the initial physical conditions.

By contrast, strong emergence is a claim regarding phenomena that cannot be explained by the ordinary laws of nature, such as mind and consciousness. As philosopher David Chalmers writes, strong emergence

would involve “phenomena whose existence is not deducible from the facts about the exact distribution of particles and fields throughout space and time (along with the laws of physics).” This “suggests that new fundamental laws of nature are needed to explain these phenomena.” However, no one has discovered those “new fundamental laws of nature.” (“Strong and Weak Emergence,” <http://consc.net/papers/emergence.pdf>.)

13. See J. P. Moreland, “The Argument from Consciousness,” in *Debating Christian Theism*, ed. J. P. Moreland, Chad Meister, and Khaldoun A. Sweis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); and Douglas Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics: A Comprehensive Case for Biblical Faith* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2011), chap. 17.
14. Evan Fales, “Naturalism and Physicalism,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Atheism*, ed. Michael Martin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 120. Fales tries to solve the mystery by simply decreeing that consciousness *must* be natural: “Since such processes evidently *have* produced consciousness, ... consciousness is evidently a natural phenomenon” (italics in original).
15. Colin McGinn, *The Problem of Consciousness* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1993), 45; and *The Mysterious Flame* (New York: Basic Books, 1999), 13–14.
16. Mark A. Bedau, “Weak Emergence,” in J. Tomberlin, ed., *Philosophical Perspectives: Mind, Causation, and World*, vol. 11 (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1997), 375–99. For a detailed discussion of various versions of emergentism, see J. P. Moreland, *Consciousness and the Existence of God: A Theistic Argument* (New York: Routledge, 2008).
17. Galen Strawson, *Real Materialism and Other Essays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 6 (italics added).
18. Thomas Reid, *An Inquiry into the Human Mind*, ed. Derek R. Brookes (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), 215–16.
19. Philosopher Jaegwon Kim spells out the problem. On one hand, many philosophers who embrace materialism or naturalism deny that consciousness is real, holding that mental states are fictions. On the other hand, Kim writes, “contrast this lowly status of consciousness in science and metaphysics with its lofty standing in moral philosophy and value theory.” When philosophers discuss what is intrinsically good, what makes life worth living, most of the time the answer is happiness or love or significance or even simply pleasure. But these are all aspects of conscious experience. “It is an ironic fact that the felt qualities of conscious experience, perhaps the only things that ultimately matter to us, are often relegated in the rest of philosophy to the status of ‘secondary qualities,’ in the shadowy zone between the real and the unreal, or

- even jettisoned outright.” *Physicalism, or Something Near Enough* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005), 10–12.
20. Arthur Schopenhauer, *The World as Will and Representation*, vol. 2 (Mineola, NY: Dover, 1958), 13. Similarly, Catholic novelist Walker Percy writes, “The Self since the time of Descartes has been stranded, split off from everything else in the Cosmos, a mind which professes to understand bodies and galaxies but is . . . marooned in the Cosmos, with which it has no connection.” *Lost in the Cosmos: The Last Self-Help Book* (New York: Picador, 1983), 47.
 21. Ian Barbour, *Issues in Science and Religion* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), 67. For more detail on Romantic pantheism, see M. H. Abrams, *Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature* (New York: Norton, 1971). Seeking scientific support, the Romantics fastened on the work of Leibniz, a contemporary of Newton. For Newton, everything was composed of atoms, tiny hard particles of matter. For Leibniz, everything was composed of monads, tiny centers of spiritual or mental energy. The term *monad* derives from neo-Platonism, and Leibniz employed it to say that nature is a vast organism imbued with a soul or spirit. “The whole nature of bodies is not exhausted in their extension, that is to say their size, figure, and motion,” he wrote. Instead “we must recognize something that corresponds to soul.” See *Soul of Science*, 84.
 22. Randall, *Making*, 419.
 23. Walker Percy, *Signposts in a Strange Land* (New York: Picador, 1991), 278. The former pope John Paul II was a trained philosopher. “He points out that the radical separation between the two great currents in the Western philosophy [realism versus idealism] originated in the absolutization of one of the two aspects of human experience”—either outer experience (absolutizing the material world) or inner experience (absolutizing consciousness). Jaroslaw Kupczak, *Destined for Liberty: The Human Person in the Philosophy of Karol Wojtyla/John Paul II* (Washington, DC: Catholic University Press, 2000), 76. See also Rocco Buttiglione, *Karol Wojtyla: The Thought of the Man Who Became Pope John Paul II* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997), 68, 72. For a fuller discussion, see my chapter “*Evangelium Vitae*: John Paul II Meets Francis Schaeffer,” in *The Legacy of John Paul II: An Evangelical Assessment*, ed. Tim Perry (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2007).
 24. For a fuller treatment of these two philosophical traditions, tracing their expression through the arts and humanities, see *Saving Leonardo*, chapters 4–9.
 25. Arthur Lovejoy writes that a conspicuous aspect of Romanticism was “a revival of the direct influence of neo-Platonism.” *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964),

297. Paul Reiff writes: “If we are to speak of anyone at all as a ‘key’ to the understanding of Romanticism, one man only merits the term, Plotinus,” the founder of neo-Platonism. Cited in Abrams, *Natural Supernaturalism*, 428.

Neo-Platonism, which was founded by Plotinus, was the main avenue by which Greek thought influenced Christian theologians all through the Middle Ages (including Augustine, Origen, Pseudo-Dionysius, John Scotus Eriugena, and the Cappadocian fathers). Even other philosophies, such as Aristotelianism, were typically read through a neo-Platonic lens, until additional writings by Aristotle became available in the form of Arabic translations (twelfth century) and Greek copies from Constantinople (thirteenth century). Neo-Platonism was also at the heart of the Platonic Academy in Florence that did so much to launch the Renaissance. At the birth of modern science, neo-Platonism influenced such diverse figures as the early chemists Paracelsus and Van Helmont, the astronomers Copernicus and Kepler, and both Leibniz and Newton. (See *Soul of Science*.) So it is not surprising that the Romantics still considered neo-Platonism a viable intellectual option.

Lloyd Gerson summarizes: “In the writings of the Italian Renaissance philosophers, the 15th and 16th century humanists John Colet, Erasmus of Rotterdam, and Thomas More, the 17th century Cambridge Platonists, and German idealists, especially Hegel, Plotinus’ thought was the (sometimes unacknowledged) basis for opposition to the competing and increasingly influential tradition of scientific philosophy.” “Plotinus,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta, summer 2014 ed., <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2014/entries/plotinus/>.

26. See Lovejoy, *Great Chain*. Technically, neo-Platonism is not pantheism but panentheism. What’s the difference? In classic pantheism, the material world is an illusion. In panentheism, the material world is real, but it is a concretization of the divine and imbued with spirit. As an illustration, think of a cascading fountain in the winter when the top layer freezes: the ice is a solidification of the water itself, while the water continues to run below the surface.

How does a non-personal essence create the world, since it cannot consciously will or act? Neo-Platonism answered that the One was so “full” of being that it simply emanated other beings automatically, from necessity, without any conscious intention, like the sun radiating its light or a fountain gushing water. Some of these ideas were in the cultural air when the New Testament was being written, especially in early Gnosticism. In Colossians, when Paul speaks of “thrones, dominions, principalities, and authorities,”

he is referring to the spiritual entities (the higher levels) that emanate from the One out of the “fullness” of its being. In fact, “fullness” was a technical term (Greek: *pleroma*) describing the sum of these higher spiritual levels. So when Paul says that in Christ, “the whole fullness [*pleroma*] of the Deity dwells bodily” (Col. 2:9), he is appropriating that term from Gnosticism, proclaiming that the full range of divinity does not reside in multiple spiritual emanations from the One but rather resides solely in Christ.

27. Eagleton, *Culture and the Death of God*, 96; and Ralph Waldo Emerson, “The Over-Soul,” in *Self-Reliance, the Over-Soul and Other Essays* (Claremont, CA: Coyote Canyon, 2010), 56.
28. See Lovejoy, “The Temporalizing of the Chain of Being,” chap. 9 in *Great Chain*, 242–87. The escalator metaphor comes from Mary Midgley, *Evolution as a Religion* (London: Methuen, 1985). In chapters that I contributed to *How Now Shall We Live?*, I show that several modern ideologies are variations on the Escalator Myth, notably Marxism and the many liberation movements that are its offshoots. See chapters 23–29.
29. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, bk. 5, aphorism 357. Because of Hegel, many Europeans were already thinking in evolutionary categories prior to Darwin, and were just waiting for someone to fill in the biological piece of the puzzle; and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Philosophy Works (3 in 1)*, trans. William Wallace (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894), *Philosophy of Right*, sect. 342. The word “Mind” is the German word *Geist*, which is a cognate of the English *ghost* and is translated as either spirit or mind.
30. John Herman Randall, *Philosophy after Darwin* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977), 8.
31. “Just as the classical science ideal absolutized the aspect of mechanical motion, so the historical science ideal absolutized the aspect of history.” Dooyeweerd, *Roots*, 183. For precursors to Hegel’s historicism, see John Passmore, “Progress by Natural Development: From Joachim to Marx,” chap. 11 in *The Perfectibility of Man*, 3rd ed. (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2000).
32. Passmore, *Perfectibility*, 369.
33. Steven Pinker, “The Trouble with Harvard,” *New Republic*, September 4, 2014.
34. Solomon, *Continental Philosophy*, 57. For example, for Hegel, morality was not “a matter of rational principle, but part of a life of shared values, feelings, and customs” within particular communities (70); and Hegel, *Philosophy of Right*, sect. 344. “Hegel’s idealism saw history as an unfolding of absolute spirit through a necessary dialectical process, and this framework left little room for the freedom or significance of individual persons.” Thomas Williams and Jan

- Olof Bengtsson, "Personalism," in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, November 12, 2009.
35. The secularization of Hegel's thought was partly the work of his followers, several of whom were materialists, such as Marx. (Marx liked to say he "turned Hegel on his head" by proposing that material forces shape ideas instead of the other way around.) Others progressively cut the Absolute Mind down to size. First it became human consciousness: phenomenology absolutized human consciousness (Husserl spoke of consciousness as "absolute being"). Then it became individual consciousness: existentialism treated the self as absolute (Merleau-Ponty wrote, "I am the absolute source"). See Solomon, *Continental Philosophy*, chaps. 9, 12.
 36. For Hegel, "the individual can only exist as such within particular communities. The individual is a product rather than a premise of the social order." David West, *Introduction to Continental Philosophy*, 2nd ed. (Malden, MA: Polity, 2010), 40. For Hegel, even Christianity is merely a mythological way of talking about the evolution of consciousness: the real meaning of the narrative sequence of Jesus's death and resurrection "is that it represents the negation of individual consciousness (death) and ... the passage of individual consciousness into the general spirit which is the community-consciousness (resurrection)." Hans Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974), 318.
 37. Dooyeweerd, *Roots*, 179. Dooyeweerd was writing before the rise of postmodernism, but he saw clearly that the same trends were already evident in Romanticism: "Romanticism replaced the gospel of the autonomous and nondescript *individual* [from the Enlightenment] with the gospel of the autonomous and individual *community*." *Roots*, 178–79.
 38. Stanley J. Grenz, *A Primer on Postmodernism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 199), 8. Terry Eagleton says in postmodernism, culture "operates as a kind of absolute." He adds that in this regard postmodernism shows itself to be a successor to idealism, for whom "culture is a secular name for God." *Culture and the Death of God*, 191, 77. Rorty, "Solidarity or Objectivity," in *Objectivity, Relativism, and Truth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 23.
 39. Don Cupitt, *Is Nothing Sacred? The Non-Realist Philosophy of Religion* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2002), 34. According to J. P. Moreland and William Lane Craig, the two main streams of Western thought are "Enlightenment naturalism and postmodern anti-realism." *Philosophical*

- Foundations for a Christian Worldview* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2003), 1.
40. Nietzsche, "On Truth and Lie in a Nonmoral Sense" (1873), *Philosophy and Truth: Selections from Nietzsche's Notebooks of the Early 1870s*, trans. and ed. Daniel Breazeale (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities, 1979), 88.
 41. Philosopher Roger Scruton writes, "The assumption that there is first-person certainty, which provides a starting-point for philosophical enquiry ... has finally been removed from the centre of philosophy." *A Short History of Modern Philosophy: From Descartes to Wittgenstein* (New York: Taylor & Francis, 2002), 292. See the discussion by Roger Lundin, "Interpreting Orphans: Hermeneutics in the Cartesian Tradition," in *The Promise of Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999).
 42. Katherine Timpf, "Harvard Plans 'Mandatory Power and Privilege Training' for Poli-Sci Students," *Campus Reform*, May 13, 2014.
 43. "One would hope that any young person precocious enough to read Kant would have the ability to recognize historical context and to approach critically statements that sound unethical, bigoted, or scientifically dated to her modern ears. One would hope parents buying Kant for their kids could do the same without chiding from publishers." Josh Jones, "Publisher Places a Politically Correct Warning Label on Kant's *Critiques*," *Open Culture*, March 20, 2014.
 44. Dallas Willard, "What Significance Has 'Postmodernism' for Christian Faith?," www.dwillard.org/articles/artview.asp?artID=70.
 45. Richard Rorty, *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1999), 22.
 46. Rorty, *Contingency*, 21.
 47. Dooyeweerd, *New Critique*, I:58, n. 3.
 48. Nirvana "is a state beyond and without desire or personal, individual existence." "Despite the considerable differences between these two religions (and the pluralism within each religion), the enlightenment experience of both nirvana (Buddhism) and moksha (Hinduism) requires the negation of individuality, personality." The individual's personal existence "is dissolved into the impersonal divine." Groothuis, *Christian Apologetics*, 385–87.
 49. Ivan Granger, "Li Po—The Birds Have Vanished into the Sky [the title of the poem]," *Poetry Chaikhana Blog*, March 18, 2013, www.poetry-chaikhana.com/blog/2013/03/18/li-po-the-birds-have-vanished-into-the-sky-2/. Granger continues: "The 'mountain' is finally recognized as your true Self, your only self, eternal." That is, your individual self dissolves into the pantheistic deity.

50. Lit-sen Chang, *Zen-Existentialism: The Spiritual Decline of the West*, cited in Walter R. Martin, *Kingdom of the Cults*, revised, updated, and expanded (Grand Rapids, MI: Bethany, 2003), 309.
51. A philosophical movement called personalism pointed out that both Enlightenment and Romantic worldviews dehumanize the person: “Personalism ... emerged only in the context of the broad critical reaction against what can be called the various *impersonalistic* philosophies which came to dominate the Enlightenment and Romanticism in the form of rationalistic and romantic forms of pantheism and idealism.... Personalism thus arose as a reaction to impersonalist modes of thought which were perceived as dehumanizing. The impersonal dynamic of modern pantheism and monism in both their rationalistic and Romantic forms underlie many of the modern philosophies that personalism turns against, idealistic as well as materialistic.... Certain distinctive characteristics can be discerned that generally hold for personalism as such. These include an insistence on the radical difference between persons and non-persons and on the irreducibility of the person to impersonal spiritual or material factors.” Williams and Bengtsson, “Personalism,” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
52. In the Koran, the angel Gabriel is portrayed as claiming that he is “confirming previous scriptures” (Sura 2:97). Those previous scriptures are the Hebrew Torah, the psalms of David, and the Gospels of Jesus Christ (Sura 4:163; 5:44–48).
53. Sura 4:171.
54. Seyyed Hossein Nasr, *Islam: Religion, History, and Civilization* (New York: HarperOne, 2002), 3, 6; and see *Total Truth*, appendix 2. The French philosopher René Guénon (who converted to Islam) argued that the concept of the divine as a non-personal Absolute is a common core uniting neo-Platonism in the West, Hinduism in the East, and Islam in the Middle East. See Parviz Morewedge, ed., *Neoplatonism and Islamic Thought: Studies in Neoplatonism, Ancient and Modern*, vol. 5 (New York: SUNY, 1992); Majid Fakhry, *Al-Farabi, Founder of Islamic Neoplatonism: His Life, Works and Influence* (Rockport, MA: Oneworld, 2002); and Ian Richard Netton, *Muslim Neoplatonists: An Introduction to the Thought of the Brethren of Purity* (Ikhwan Al-Safa') (New York: Routledge, 2003). A helpful summary by Netton can be found in “Neoplatonism in Islamic Philosophy,” Islamic Philosophy Online, www.muslimphilosophy.com/ip/rep/H003.htm.
55. C. S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity* (New York: HarperOne, 2000), 174. The same intellectual weakness besets unitarianism and deism, which have functioned

for many people in the West as temporary stepping-stones from full-blooded Christian theism to outright atheism.

56. Robert Letham, *The Holy Trinity: In Scripture, History, Theology, and Worship* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2004), 444–46. Similarly, theologian Peter Toon writes, “the Christian understanding of personhood flows from the Christian doctrine of the three persons who are God.... If God is simply a monad then he cannot be or know personality. To be personal, otherness must be present together with oneness, the one must be in relation to others.” *Our Triune God: A Biblical Portrayal of the Trinity* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 1996), 241. See also Anthony Thiselton, “Further Issues on ‘Interpreting God’: Christology and Trinity,” chap. 23 in *Interpreting God and the Postmodern Self: On Meaning, Manipulation and Promise* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995). Henri Blocher comments: “If God is caught in the perennial dipolarity of the One and the Many ... he cannot claim real independence, absolute primacy and ultimacy. He is defined by reference to another principle than himself, he is included together with the plural world in a broader totality—he is *correlative*. In order for God to be autarkic, self-sufficient, ‘self-contained’ ... he needs to be the foundation of both unity and diversity, holding them eternally within himself.” That is, God must be a Trinity. “Immanence and Transcendence in Trinitarian Theology,” in *The Trinity in a Pluralistic Age: Theological Essays on Culture and Religion*, ed. Kevin J. Vanhoozer (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997).
57. Williams and Bengtsson, “Personalism,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. This explains why many Islamic philosophers have adopted neo-Platonism, with its non-personal concept of the divine One.
58. Udo W. Middeldamm, “The Islamization of Christianity,” Francis A. Schaeffer Foundation, www.theschaefferfoundation.com/footnote4_1.php.
59. “No one thought it important for children to understand the meaning of the Koran—after all, even adults, even great theologians, understand only snippets of its total significance. What was important in education was memorization of the Word of God. The actual, spoken words should be learned by rote such that their recitation becomes second nature.... It was always recognized that the most essential formal learning was memorization of the divine Word, whether or not its meaning was understood.” Sachiko Murata and William C. Chittick, *The Vision of Islam* (New York: Paragon, 1994), xvi, xviii, xxxvii–xxxviii.

Sociologists tell us that a focus on mechanical ritual is typical of religions that have a less personal conception of God. These religions tend to stress precision in the performance of rituals and sacred formulas. (Placating the gods

- becomes similar to magic, which involves manipulating forces, not interacting with a personal being.) By contrast, religions with a highly personal God worry less about ritual precision because a personal Being with knowledge of the worshipper's inner intentions will respond to impromptu supplication and spontaneous prayer. See Stark, "Why Gods Should Matter in Social Science." See also Justin L. Barrett, "Smart Gods, Dumb Gods, and the Role of Social Cognition in Structuring Ritual Intuitions," *Journal of Cognition and Culture* 2, no. 3 (2002): 183–93.
60. Richard Schweder, "Atheists Agonistes," *New York Times*, November 27, 2006.
 61. See Stéphane Courtois, Nicolas Werth, Jean-Louis Panné, Andrzej Paczkowski, Karei Bartošek, Jean-Louis Margolin, *The Black Book of Communism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990). See also R. J. Rummel, *Death by Government* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction 1996); and Jung Chang and John Halliday, *Mao: The Unknown Story* (New York: Random, 2006).
 62. Gilson, *God and Philosophy*, 136.
 63. Aldous Huxley, *The Devils of Loudun* (New York: HarperCollins, 1952), 123.
 64. John Gray, "The Atheist Delusion," *Guardian*, March 14, 2008.
 65. Those enslaving yokes may even be demonic. The Bible often treats idols as fronts for spiritual forces. In the Old Testament, the psalmist says the Israelites sacrificed their children to demons: "They sacrificed their sons and their daughters to the demons ... whom they sacrificed to the idols of Canaan" (Ps. 106:37–38). In the New Testament, Paul warns that pagan sacrifices are "offered to demons" (1 Cor. 10:19–20). What does this frankly supernatural language mean? Many philosophies treat evil as merely the privation of good, as dark is the absence of light. But those who have suffered under oppressive, bloodthirsty regimes often speak of experiencing evil as an active malevolent force. The Romanian pastor Richard Wurmbrand, who was imprisoned by Communist authorities for fourteen years, reports that the guards would torture inmates, screaming, "We are the devil." Richard Wurmbrand, *Tortured for Christ* (Basingstoke, UK: Marshall Pickering, 1983), 35. In short, good and evil are not merely abstractions. Just as goodness has its source in a personal Being, so, too, much of the evil in the world is connected to powerful personal beings.
 66. Isaiah Berlin, *The Roots of Romanticism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), 3.
 67. G. K. Chesterton, *Orthodoxy* (Rockville, MD: Serenity, 2009), 54.
 68. Johnson, *First Step*, 33.
 69. See Hays, *Echoes*, 38.

PRINCIPLE #3: Secular Leaps of Faith

1. Deborah Mitchell blogs under the name TXBlue08. “Why I Raise My Children without God,” CNN iReport, January 14, 2013, <http://ireport.cnn.com/docs/DOC-910282>. Mitchell is the author of *Growing Up Godless: A Parent’s Guide to Raising Kids without Religion* (New York: Sterling Ethos, 2014).
2. The CNN author’s argument from evil fails logically as well. If my argument against God is that the world has too much injustice and cruelty, that presumes a moral standard by which we can identify injustice. But a purely material universe does not generate moral standards. It tells us only what *is*, not what *ought* to be. Therefore materialism does not give a basis for saying the world is unjust. Moreover, if humans are nothing but complex biochemical machines, then to call their actions evil is illogical. Machines do not have the capacity to choose good or evil, nor do we hold them accountable for their actions.
3. The phenomenologist Edmund Husserl is the origin of most of these phrases. See Richard Kearney, *Modern Movements in European Philosophy*, 2nd ed. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), 13–15. Dooyeweerd uses the terms “pre-theoretical experience” or “naïve experience.” This is not the same as “naïve realism” or a copy theory of knowledge; rather it refers to a “pre-theoretical datum, corresponding with the integral structure” of experience. *Twilight*, 14. Reformed epistemology gets at roughly the same idea in its concept of “properly basic” knowledge—what we know immediately, not as a result of logical inference or discursive argument. Reformed epistemology was in turn inspired in part by Thomas Reid’s common-sense realism. Reid argued that there are truths “which the constitution of our nature leads us to believe, and of which we are under a necessity to take for granted in the common concerns of life, without being able to give a reason for them.” *Inquiry*, 33. For more detail, see *Total Truth*, chapter 11.
4. Dooyeweerd, *New Critique*, I:83 and *Twilight*, 14. Through pre-theoretical, concrete experience, humans have access to “undeniable states of affairs” in the “cosmic order”—undeniable because they “force themselves on everybody.” And “it is the common task of all philosophical schools and trends to account for them.” *New Critique*, I:115–16; II:71–73.
5. J. P. Moreland, *The Recalcitrant Imago Dei: Human Persons and the Failure of Naturalism* (London: SCM, 2009), 4.
6. Alvin Plantinga writes: “Some people think of John Calvin himself, that *fons et origo* of Reformedom, as accepting determinism. But this is far from clear. Calvin did, of course, endorse predestination: but determinism doesn’t follow. Predestination, as Calvin thinks of it, has to do with salvation; it implies

nothing about whether I can freely choose to take a walk this afternoon.” Plantinga, “Bait and Switch,” *Books and Culture*, January/February 2013. Likewise with Luther. He wrote *The Bondage of the Will* arguing that humans can do nothing to contribute to their salvation. But he did not mean we cannot choose what to wear today.

7. Sean Carroll, “Free Will Is as Real as Baseball,” *Cosmic Variance* (blog), *Discover*, July 13, 2011, <http://blogs.discovermagazine.com/cosmicvariance/2011/07/13/free-will-is-as-real-as-baseball/#.VHSb7r4ULyx>. Carroll is paraphrasing from John Searle, *Freedom and Neurobiology: Reflections on Free Will, Language, and Political Power* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 11.
8. C. S. Lewis invokes the same argument in his argument from morality in *Mere Christianity*. His argument rests on the fact that humans unavoidably, irresistibly make moral judgments—and therefore we had better find a philosophy that accounts for this behavior: In his words, “We are *forced* to believe in a real Right and Wrong” (7). Morality is among those “things we are *bound* to think” (14). “Whether we like it or not, we believe in the Law of Nature” (8). “We *can not get rid of* the idea [of the Moral Law], and most of the things we say and think about men would be reduced to nonsense if we did” (20). For example, if we do not acknowledge a real right and wrong, then “all the things we said about the war [i.e., the evils of Nazism] were nonsense” (5). (All italics added.) Lewis’s argument (though he does not explicitly state it) is that there are certain ways of thinking and acting that are intrinsic to human nature, and that this bedrock human experience should inform our philosophy. In short, we had better find a philosophy that makes sense of how humans unavoidably behave.
9. Cited in Saul Smilansky, *Free Will and Illusion* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 169. Fundamentally, the power of choice is simply the ability to redirect the course of events. The entire world of human artifacts—cities and buildings, technology and computers, books and films—gives eloquent testimony to the human ability to use natural forces to create things that nature acting on its own would not create. Dooyeweerd notes that the concept of human culture “means essentially the free forming of matter.” *Roots*, 21.
10. Smilansky, *Free Will*, 284, 166.
11. Rick Lewis says, “The nature of consciousness is a philosophical problem which has come to centre stage mainly in the last few years.” “Consciousness,” *Philosophy Now*, July/August 2014. A third position, which is common among philosophers, is called compatibilism. It accepts determinism while claiming that humans nevertheless have free will. What kind of free will? The compatibilists’ definition of a free action is one that is driven from within by

one's own desires and reasons, with no external constraints. But those internal desires and reasons are themselves held to be determined. All of our mental states arise from other states outside of our minds and thus outside of our control. This is not what ordinary people mean by free will. For example, in discussing the compatibilism of Daniel Dennett, Michael Norwitz writes, "There is a sacrifice in that he loses track of our ordinary, common-sense views of what mind and free will are. Dennett claims he is doing ordinary language philosophy but I suspect he has been an academic so long he has forgotten what 'ordinary people' are concerned with." Dennett's compatibilism comes "at the cost of not really approaching what we worry about when we worry whether we have free will, or responsibility." "Free Will and Determinism," *Philosophy Now*, July/August 2014.

12. Galen Strawson, interview by Tamler Sommers, "You Cannot Make Yourself the Way You Are," *The Believer*, March 2003. By "radical free will," Strawson says he means the ordinary use of the term: "I mean what nearly everyone means. Almost all human beings believe that they are free to choose what to do in such a way that they can be truly, genuinely responsible for their actions in the strongest possible sense ... and so ultimately morally responsible when moral matters are at issue."
13. Galen Strawson, "On Free Will," *Richmond Journal of Philosophy* 4, summer, 2003.
14. Johnson, *First Step*, 11.
15. Edward Slingerland, *What Science Offers the Humanities: Integrating Body and Culture* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 6, 218, 289–95 (italics in original).
16. The term *dualism* is sometimes used to describe the biblical teaching of body and soul, but the crucial difference is that in the biblical view these two things are complementary, not contradictory. In Paul's words, the body is the "outer self," the means by which we interact with the material world, while the soul is the "inner self" (2 Cor. 4:16). At death humans do undergo a temporary splitting of body and soul, but that's why death is called "the last enemy" (1 Cor. 15:26)—because it separates what God intended to be unified. And in the new creation, they will be reunified, eternally.
17. Julie Reuben, *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 17.
18. Marvin Minsky, *The Society of Mind* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1986), 307 (italics in original in the first part of the quote, italics added in the last part of the quote).

19. An “existentialist leap” means holding that, on rational grounds, life has no meaning, yet asserting—without rational grounds—that it does. “On the one hand, the existentialist seeks to remain true to his original vision of the meaninglessness and futility of everything ...; on the other hand, his stark personal reality is that he finds himself unable to appropriate the truth of nihilism existentially, unable to affirm it as his personal truth,...: it is at this point that he clutches at the artifice of commitment, hoping to save himself from nihilistic despair by a desperate leap towards a faith that will restore purpose and meaning to his shattered world.” R. W. K. Paterson, *The Nihilistic Egoist: Max Stirner* (Oxford: 1971), 238.
20. Smilansky, *Free Will*, 6, 145, 187. For what Smilansky means by “morally necessary,” see 7–8, 153, 158, 278. We “cannot live” on the basis of determinism: 154, 170, 246, 296. We “ought” to foster the illusion of free will: 187–88 (italics in original).
21. The review is by Tom Clark, “The Viability of Naturalism,” Naturalism.org, www.naturalism.org/resource.htm. Similarly, Matt Ridley writes in his bestselling book *Genome*, “Full responsibility for one’s actions is a necessary fiction without which the law would flounder, but it is a fiction all the same.” *Genome: The Autobiography of a Species in 23 Chapters* (New York: HarperCollins, 1999), 309.
22. Richard Dawkins, “Let’s All Stop Beating Basil’s Car,” *Edge*, <http://edge.org/response-detail/11416>.
23. Dawkins’s remarks were made in a question-and-answer session at a bookstore in the Washington, DC, area. They are described in *Saving Leonardo*, 152–53. Of course, even the concept of a machine malfunctioning has no place in Dawkins’s materialist philosophy because it implies teleology—that something has a purpose or standard that it is failing to meet. Dawkins is trying to avoid the moral language of good and evil, but the concept of malfunctioning requires some standard of right functioning.
24. Cited in Walter Isaacson, *Einstein: His Life and Universe* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2007), 391, 392 (italics added). What Einstein overlooked is that even his scientific work depends on free will: “If Einstein did not have free will in some meaningful sense, then he could not have been responsible for the theory of relativity—it would have been a product of lower level processes but not of an intelligent mind choosing between possible options.” George Ellis, interview by John Horgan, “Physicist George Ellis Knocks Physicists for Knocking Philosophy, Falsification, Free Will,” *Scientific American*, July 22, 2014.

25. Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. Werner Pluhar (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1996), A811. Additional examples of Kant's *as if* reasoning: In theology, we can never know whether God is the cause of the world, but we can view "all objects *as if* they drew their origin from such an archetype" (CPR A673/B701). In cosmology, we can never know whether the world has a beginning or an end, but we are able to function "*as if* it had an absolute beginning, through an intelligible cause" (CPR A685/B713). We cannot know whether there is a Creator, but we can "consider every connection in the world according to principles of a systematic unity, hence *as if* they had all arisen from one single all-encompassing being, as supreme and all-sufficient cause" (CPR A686/B714). In psychology, we can not explain the soul or the self, but we can "connect all the appearances, all the actions and receptivity of our mind, *as if* the mind were a simple substance which persists with personal identity" (CPR A672/B700). See Howard Caygill, ed., *A Kant Dictionary*, s.v. "As-if" (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1995), 86. Kant labels *as if* reasoning "regulative principles."

Chemist and philosopher Michael Polanyi denounces *as if* thinking as a form of prevarication—the "modern intellectual prevarication first systematized by Kant in his regulative principles." He explains why: "Knowledge that we hold to be true and also vital to us, is made light of, because we cannot account for its acceptance in terms of a critical philosophy. We then feel entitled to continue using that knowledge, even while flattering our sense of intellectual superiority by disparaging it. And we actually go on, firmly relying on this despised knowledge to guide and lend meaning to our more exact enquiries, while pretending that these alone come up to our standards of scientific stringency." *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy* (New York: Routledge, 1962), 354.

26. Eric Baum, *What Is Thought?* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004), 433–34. "Not even wrong" is a phrase coined by physicist Wolfgang Pauli. Once when reading a paper by a young physicist, Pauli remarked, "This paper is so bad, it's not even wrong." In other words, it is not even in the ballpark of possible answers.
27. McGinn, "All Machine and No Ghost?" (italics added).
28. Francis Schaeffer, *The God Who Is There*, in the *Francis A. Schaeffer Trilogy* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1990), sect. 2, chaps. 2–4.
29. Slingerland, *What Science Offers*, 255, 289. Slingerland, "Mind-Body Dualism and the Two Cultures," in *Creating Consilience: Integrating the Sciences and the Humanities*, ed. Edward Slingerland and Mark Collard (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 83, 84.
30. Rodney Brooks, *Flesh and Machines: How Robots Will Change Us* (New York: Pantheon, 2002), 174. For more on the themes in this chapter,

- see *Total Truth*, study guide edition, and my article “Intelligent Design and the Defense of Reason,” in *Darwin’s Nemesis: Phillip Johnson and the Intelligent Design Movement*, ed. William A. Dembski (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2006).
31. On the way idols lead to dualisms and disharmonies, Dooyeweerd says, “The cosmic order passes an internal judgment on the theoretical absolutizations” of idol-based philosophies. “The Divine world-order ... avenges itself on every deification” of the temporal creation. *New Critique*, II:334, 363. That is, as God gives people up to their idols, their philosophies increasingly contradict the cosmic order itself.
 32. G. K. Chesterton, *The Everlasting Man* (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1993), 143, 141. Yet, ironically, these same secularists claim to be “free thinkers.” Nonsense, Chesterton responds. We must vigorously protest when secularists “close all the doors of the cosmic prison on us with a clang of eternal iron, tell us that our emancipation is a dream and our dungeon a necessity; and then calmly turn round and tell us they have a freer thought.”
 33. Schopenhauer, *The World as Will and Representation*, 421.
 34. Rorty, *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*, 3.
 35. Dallas Willard, “Truth in the Fire,” presented at the C. S. Lewis Centennial, Oxford, July 21, 1998, www.dwillard.org/articles/artview.asp?artID=68.
 36. Rorty, *Contingency*, 5.
 37. William Lane Craig, “God Is Not Dead Yet,” *Christianity Today*, July 3, 2008 (italics in original). Explaining this dichotomy between facts and values is a major theme of *Total Truth*.
 38. Ernest Gellner, *Legitimation of Belief* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 193–95.
 39. “Seeking Christian Interiority: An Interview with Louis Dupré,” *Christian Century*, July 16–23, 1997.
 40. Derek Parfit, “Reductionism and Personal Identity,” in *Philosophy of Mind: Classical and Contemporary Readings*, ed. David J. Chalmers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 661 (italics added).
 41. Karsten Harries, “The Theory of Double Truth Revisited,” in *Politics of Practical Reasoning: Integrating Action, Discourse, and Argument*, ed. Ricca Edmondson and Karlheinz Hülsner (Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2012), (italics added).
 42. Francis Crick, interview by Roger Highfield, “Do Our Genes Reveal the Hand of God?,” *Telegraph*, March 20, 2003.
 43. Francis Schaeffer called this strategy “taking the roof off”—removing the shield of denial that people erect to protect themselves from the dangerous

and unsettling implications of their own worldview. See *The God Who Is There*, 140–42.

PRINCIPLE #4: Why Worldviews Commit Suicide

1. The following account is from a personal interview with Michael Egnor, along with an article by Egnor, “A Neurosurgeon, Not a Darwinist,” *Forbes*, Feb 5, 2009.
2. Michael Ruse, *Darwin and Design: Does Evolution Have a Purpose?* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2003), 268 (italics added).
3. Darwin proposed the mechanism of variation plus natural selection as the means by which material forces might mimic the effects of design. As historian Neal C. Gillespie writes, Darwin hoped to show “how blind and gradual adaptation could counterfeit the apparently purposeful design” of living things, which on the surface seem so obviously “a function of mind.” *Charles Darwin and the Problem of Creation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 83–85.
4. Czesław Miłosz, “The Discreet Charm of Nihilism,” *New York Review of Books*, November 19, 1998 (italics added).
5. Greg Koukl, “Suicide: Views That Self-Destruct,” chap. 7 in *Tactics: A Game Plan for Discussing Your Christian Convictions* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2009).
6. There is one exception. Idol analysis tells us that every worldview deifies one part of creation and denigrates the rest. Therefore the single worldview that does not denigrate reason is the one that deifies it—namely, rationalism. Of course, rationalism has other problems (e.g., it cannot explain where reason comes from), but it does not self-destruct because it does not reduce reason to something less than reason.
7. Logical positivism is also called verificationism. Craig continues: “Its downfall meant that philosophers were free once again to tackle traditional problems of philosophy that verificationism had suppressed. Accompanying this resurgence of interest in traditional philosophical questions came something altogether unanticipated: a renaissance of Christian philosophy.” Craig, “God Is Not Dead Yet.”
8. See the section on Marxism in *Total Truth*, 134–37, and my chapter on Marxism in *How Now Shall We Live?*, chapter 24. Though Marxism has been discredited in the economic realm, neo-Marxist knockoffs are endemic, especially on the university campus. Radical liberation movements of many stripes apply Marxist categories of analysis.

9. "The origin of the holy lie is the *will to power*." Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, trans. Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale (New York: Random House, 1967), sect. 142.
10. Skinner rejected the very concept of "conscious intelligence" on the grounds that "evolutionary theorists ... have never shown how a *nonphysical* variation could arise to be selected by *physical* contingencies of survival." "Can Psychology Be a Science of Mind?," *American Psychologist*, November 1990 (italics added).
11. Paul Ricoeur dubbed the triumvirate of Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud "the masters of suspicion," and the phrase has stuck. These thinkers practiced a "hermeneutics of suspicion" that treated ordinary statements as expressions of "false consciousness." See *Freud and Philosophy*, trans. D. Savage (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1970).
12. Alvin Plantinga, *Where the Conflict Really Lies: Science, Religion, and Naturalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 271.
13. Slingerland, *What Science Offers*, 257.
14. C. S. Lewis, "Is Theology Poetry?" in *The Weight of Glory* (New York: HarperCollins, 1976), 139; and *Case for Christianity*, 32. See also Victor Reppert, *C. S. Lewis's Dangerous Idea: In Defense of the Argument from Reason* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2003); and Stewart Goetz and Charles Taliaferro, "The Argument from Reason," appendix in *Naturalism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008).
15. Lewis, *Miracles*, 36; and the phrase "angelic observer" is from Charles Taylor, *Hegel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 564.
16. John Gray, *Straw Dogs: Thoughts on Humans and Other Animals* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2003), 26. Similarly, Edward O. Wilson writes, "All that has been learned empirically about evolution ... suggests that the brain is a machine assembled not to understand itself, but to survive." *Consilience: The Unity of Knowledge* (New York: Vintage, 1998), 105. More recently, John Gray has finally recognized the problem: "If the human mind has evolved in obedience to the imperatives of survival, what reason is there for thinking that it can acquire knowledge of reality, when all that is required in order to reproduce the species is that its errors and illusions are not fatal? A purely naturalistic philosophy cannot account for the knowledge that we believe we possess." Gray even quotes Arthur Balfour, whom C. S. Lewis credited as a source of his own critique of naturalism as self-defeating. "Balfour's solution was that naturalism is self-defeating: humans can gain access to the truth only because the human mind has been shaped by a divine mind. Similar arguments can be found in a number of contemporary philosophers, most notably Alvin Plantinga. Again,

- one does not need to accept Balfour's theistic solution to see the force of his argument. A rigorously naturalistic account of the human mind entails a much more skeptical view of human knowledge than is commonly acknowledged." "The Closed Mind of Richard Dawkins," *New Republic*, October 2, 2014.
17. Francis Crick, *The Astonishing Hypothesis: The Scientific Search for the Soul* (New York: Touchstone, 1994), 262. This idea is not new. Back in 1903, philosopher F. C. S. Schiller wrote that human reason is nothing but "a weapon in the struggle for existence and a means of achieving adaptation." "The Ethical Basis of Metaphysics," in *Humanism: Philosophical Essays* (London: Macmillan, 1903), 7–8.
 18. Baum, *What Is Thought?*, 226. Steven Pinker, *How the Mind Works* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1997), 305. Again, this idea is not new. Philosopher Charles Peirce wrote, "It is probably of more advantage to the animal to have his mind filled with pleasing and encouraging visions, independently of their truth; and thus ... natural selection might occasion a fallacious tendency of thought." "The Fixation of Belief," *Popular Science Monthly* 12 (November 1877).
 19. Leon Wieseltier, "The God Genome," *New York Times*, February 19, 2006. Alvin Plantinga writes that "what evolution guarantees is (at most) that we behave in certain ways—in such ways as to promote survival.... It does not guarantee mostly true or verisimilitudinous beliefs." *Warrant and Proper Function* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 218. Philosopher Roger Trigg writes: For evolution, "it does not matter if a belief is true or false, as long as it is useful, from a genetic point of view." *Philosophy Matters* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 83. See also Angus Menuge, *Agents under Fire: Materialism and the Rationality of Science* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004).
 20. Thomas Nagel, *The Last Word* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 135–36 (italics in original). See also Douglas Groothuis, "Thomas Nagel's 'Last Word' on the Metaphysics and Rationality of Morality," *Philosophia Christi* (series 2) 1, no. 1 (1999).
 21. The context of Darwin's remarks clearly reveals the selective nature of his skepticism. From a personal letter: "Nevertheless you have expressed my inward conviction, though far more vividly and clearly than I could have done, that the Universe is not the result of chance. But then with me the horrid doubt always arises whether the convictions of man's mind, which has been developed from the mind of the lower animals, are of any value or at all trustworthy. Would any one trust in the convictions of a monkey's mind, if there are any convictions in such a mind?" C. R. Darwin to William Graham, July 3, 1881, Darwin Correspondence Project, www.darwinproject.ac.uk/letter/entry-13230.

From Darwin's *Autobiography*: "Another source of conviction in the existence of God, connected with the reason and not with the feelings, impresses me as having much more weight. This follows from the extreme difficulty or rather impossibility of conceiving this immense and wonderful universe, including man with his capacity of looking far backwards and far into futurity, as the result of blind chance or necessity. When thus reflecting I feel compelled to look to a First Cause having an intelligent mind in some degree analogous to that of man; and I deserve to be called a Theist.

"This conclusion was strong in my mind about the time, as far as I can remember, when I wrote the *Origin of Species*; and it is since that time that it has very gradually with many fluctuations become weaker. But then arises the doubt—can the mind of man, which has, as I fully believe, been developed from a mind as low as that possessed by the lowest animal, be trusted when it draws such grand conclusions? May not these be the result of the connection between cause and effect which strikes us as a necessary one, but probably depends merely on inherited experience? Nor must we overlook the probability of the constant inculcation in a belief in God on the minds of children producing so strong and perhaps an inherited effect on their brains not yet fully developed, that it would be as difficult for them to throw off their belief in God, as for a monkey to throw off its instinctive fear and hatred of a snake." "Recollections of the Development of My Mind and Character," Darwin Online, <http://darwin-online.org.uk/content/frameset?pageseq=116&itemID=CUL-DAR26.1-121&viewtype=side>.

22. Stephen Jay Gould, *Ever Since Darwin: Reflections in Natural History* (New York: Norton, 1977), 12–13.
23. Kenan Malik, "In Defense of Human Agency," in *Consciousness, Genetics, and Society* (Stockholm: Ax:son Johnson Foundation, 2002).
24. Cited in Victoria Gill, "Big Bang: Is There Room for God?," *BBC News*, October 19, 2012. C. S. Lewis described evolution as a "Great Myth" and said, "The Myth asks me to believe that reason is simply the unforeseen and unintended by-product of a mindless process at one stage of its endless and aimless becoming. The content of the Myth thus knocks from under me the only ground on which I could possibly believe the Myth to be true. If my own mind is a product of the irrational—if what seem my clearest reasonings are only the way in which a creature conditioned as I am is bound to feel—how shall I trust my mind when it tells me about Evolution?" "The Funeral of a Great Myth" in *Christian Reflections* (Grand Rapids: MI: Eerdmans, 1967), 89. Elsewhere Lewis writes that those who describe human thought "as an evolutionary phenomenon"

- always have to make “a tacit exception” for their own thinking—at least, at the moment they are making the claim. *Miracles*, 36.
25. Phillip E. Johnson writes, “We still see the reductionists complacently describing religious belief either as a meme or as the product of a ‘God module’ in the brain without realizing that they are sawing off the limb on which they themselves are sitting. If unthinking matter causes the thoughts the materialists *don’t* like, then what causes the thoughts they *do* like?” *The Wedge of Truth: Splitting the Foundations of Naturalism* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2000), 149 (italics in original).
 26. Richard Cohen, “Alternative Interpretations of the History of Science,” in *The Validation of Scientific Theories*, ed. Philipp G. Frank (Boston: Beacon, 1956), 227; and Christopher Kaiser, *Creation and the History of Science* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991), 10.
 27. Here’s how Johannes Kepler expressed the idea: The same God who founded the world according to mathematical norms “also has endowed man with a mind which can comprehend these norms.” Why? “God wanted us to perceive [those mathematical laws] when he created us in his image in order that we may take part in his own thoughts.” Cited in Robert Nadeau, *Readings from the New Book on Nature* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1981), 28. See also *The Soul of Science*, chapters 3 and 6.
 28. Eugene Wigner, “The Unreasonable Effectiveness of Mathematics in the Natural Sciences,” in *Mathematics: People, Problems, Results*, vol. 3, ed. Douglas M. Campbell and John C. Higgins (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth International, Brigham Young University, 1984). See my discussion in *The Soul of Science*, 159.
 29. Morris Kline, *Mathematics: The Loss of Certainty* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 35.
 30. The quote is from Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method* (New York: Continuum, 1989), 459. Similarly, Roland Barthes writes, “For us, too, it is language which speaks, not the author.” “The Death of the Author,” in *Image—Music—Text* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977). Martin Heidegger writes, “Language speaks.... Man acts as though he were the shaper and master of language, while in fact language remains the master of man.” *Poetry, Language, Thought* (New York: HarperCollins, 1971), 194, 144. It was Wittgenstein who redefined questions in philosophy as questions in language, “transforming Kantian questions about reason into ones about language.” Solomon, *Continental Philosophy*, 148.
 31. Jean-François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of

- Minnesota Press, 1984, originally published in French in 1979), 36. Lyotard borrows the term *language games* from Wittgenstein and says: "What he means by this term is that each of the various categories of utterance can be defined in terms of rules specifying their properties and the uses to which they can be put—in exactly the same way as the game of chess is defined by a set of rules determining the properties of each of the pieces, in other words, the proper way to move them" (10).
32. The charge that postmodernism "gets caught in a performative contradiction" was made by Jürgen Habermas, *Philosophical Discourse of Modernity* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1987).
 33. Barthes, "Death of the Author"; and Derrida, cited in Solomon, *Continental Philosophy*, 201.
 34. Barthes, "Death of the Author."
 35. Alan Jacobs, "Deconstruction," *Contemporary Literary Theory: A Christian Appraisal*, ed. Clarence Walhout and Leland Ryken (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991), 192.
 36. In the words of literature professor John Ellis, "the race-gender-class scholar's commitment to his or her truths ... is as rigid as anything could be." *Literature Lost: Social Agendas and the Corruption of the Humanities* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997), 191.
 37. Mark C. Taylor, *Disfiguring: Art, Architecture, Religion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 261. Taylor is referring specifically to architecture, though he generalizes to the other arts: "Inasmuch as the author-architect is made in the image of God, the death of God implies the disappearance of the author-architect."
 38. Lyotard, *Postmodern Condition*, 81–82; and Eagleton, *Culture and the Death of God*, 192.
 39. West, *Introduction to Continental Philosophy*, 40.
 40. Jacobs, "Deconstruction," 190.
 41. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 27, 1997, B13, cited in Carl P. E. Springer, "The Hermeneutics of Innocence: Literary Criticism from a Christian Perspective," Leadership U, www.leaderu.com/aip/docs/springer.html#ref6.
 42. Frank Lentricchia, "Last Will and Testament of an Ex-Literary Critic," *Lingua Franca*, September/October 1996, 64.
 43. Bruno Latour, "Why Has Critique Run Out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern," *Critical Inquiry*, 30 (winter 2004): 237–39. As Latour remarks, "One thing is clear, not one of us readers would like to see *our own most cherished objects treated in this way*" (italics in original).

44. Karen Swallow Prior, "'Empathetically Correct' Is the New Politically Correct," *Atlantic*, May 23, 2014.
45. Jean-Paul Sartre, "Existentialism and Humanism," in *The Modern Tradition: Backgrounds of Modern Literature*, ed. Richard Ellmann and Charles Fiedelson Jr. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), 828.
46. Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History," in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York, Pantheon, 1984), 81, 94. The philosopher is John McCumber, *Time and Philosophy: A History of Continental Thought* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2011), 323. An example might be helpful: Judith Butler illustrates both the dissolution of the subject and the idea that the self is a product of group identity. She argues that a person has no core gender identity—in fact, there is no "stable subject" to "have" a gender. Instead gender is continually being created through the very acts by which it is expressed: "Gender is always a doing.... There is no gender identity behind the expressions of gender; ... identity is performatively constituted by the very 'expressions' that are said to be its result." Moreover, "gender intersects with racial, class, ethnic, sexual, and regional modalities of discursively constituted identities." *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 25, 3.
47. See *Total Truth*, 132–33, 138, and 408, n. 17.
48. From the 1984 edition.
49. The first part of the quote is from an interview with Slavoj Žižek in *The Believer*, July 2004. The second part of the quote is from Slavoj Žižek, *The Fragile Absolute, or Why Is the Christian Legacy Worth Fighting For?* (London: Verso, 2002), 129.
50. See Dennis Hollinger, "The Church as Apologetic: A Sociology of Knowledge Perspective," in *Christian Apologetics in a Postmodern World*, ed. Timothy R. Phillips and Dennis L. Okholm (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1995), 183.
51. Francis Schaeffer, *The Mark of the Christian*, 2nd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2006), *passim*.
52. Materialism's low view of the material world has powerful real-world implications for issues such as abortion and homosexuality. See *Saving Leonardo*, chapter 3, and "Transgender Politics vs. the Facts of Life," The Pearcey Report, www.pearceyreport.com/archives/2013/07/nancy_pearcey_transgender_politics_vs_facts_of_life.php.
53. Alvin Plantinga, *Warrant and Proper Function* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), esp. chap. 5, "Perception."
54. See *The Soul of Science*, chap. 1.

PRINCIPLE #5: Free-Loading Atheists

1. “Barna Survey Examines Changes in Worldview among Christians over the Past 13 Years,” March 6, 2009, www.barna.org/barna-update/21-transformation/252-barna-survey-examines-changes-in-worldview-among-christians-over-the-past-13-years#.VC1nu_ldWSo. Only one question in the survey addresses a genuinely worldview issue: belief “that absolute moral truth exists.”
2. Hume, *Inquiry*, 77. Hume consistently pits reason (philosophy) against nature (“instinct or natural impulse”), complaining that nature keeps us from following our thoughts to their logical conclusions. See *Treatise of Human Nature*, 101.
3. Johnson, *First Step*, 25. This section draws on a lecture of mine titled “Sexual Identity in a Secular Age,” presented August 5, 2013, Houston Baptist University, Summer in the City lecture series.
4. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America: Historical-Critical Edition of “De la démocratie en Amérique,”* vol. 3, ed. Eduardo Nolla, trans. James T. Schleifer (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2010), 733.
5. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, sect. 765.
6. Luc Ferry, *A Brief History of Thought: A Philosophical Guide to Living* (New York: Harper Perennial, 2011), 77 (italics in original).
7. Richard Rorty, “Moral Universalism and Economic Triage,” presented at the Second UNESCO Philosophy Forum, Paris, 1996. Reprinted in *Diogenes*, vol. 44, issue 173 (1996).
8. Richard Rorty, “Postmodernist Bourgeois Liberalism,” *Journal of Philosophy* 80, no. 10 (October 1983): 583–89. “Free-loading” is what I called “philosophical cheating” in *Total Truth*, 319–21. Francis Schaeffer calls it “intellectual ‘cheating’” in “A Review of A Review,” *The Bible Today*, October, 1948, 7–9.

Robert Kraynak, professor of political science, notes that the number of people who are free-loading is increasing: “What is so strange about our age is that demands for respecting human rights and human dignity are *increasing* even as the foundations for those demands are disappearing. In particular, beliefs in man as a creature made in the image of God . . . are being replaced by a scientific materialism that undermines what is noble and special about man, and by doctrines of relativism that deny the objective morality required to undergird human dignity.” “Justice without Foundations,” *New Atlantis*, www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/justice-without-foundations. Kraynak adds: “Post-modern relativists like Rorty and Darwinians like Dennett and Pinker have commitments to social justice, understood as democracy, human rights, and respect for human dignity, that are completely inconsistent with

their philosophical and scientific views. Darwinian evolution does not support democracy and human rights or the inherent dignity of the individual—if it supports any kind of moral code, it would be a code of the strong dominating the weak” (<http://darwinianconservatism.blogspot.com/2012/01/kraynaks-nietzschean-attack-on.html>).

9. A. R. Hall, *The Scientific Revolution, 1500–1800: The Formation of the Modern Scientific Attitude* (Boston: Beacon, 1954), 171–72. Moreover, the concept of laws in nature was not considered metaphorical, a mere figure of speech, but literally true. As historian John Randall explains, “Natural laws were regarded as real laws or commands, decrees of the Almighty, literally obeyed without a single act of rebellion.” John Herman Randall, *The Making of the Modern Mind* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940), 274. See also Stephen F. Mason, *A History of the Sciences*, originally published under the title *Main Currents of Scientific Thought* (New York: Collier Books, 1962), 173, 182.
10. Mary Midgley, “Does Science Make Belief in God Obsolete? Of Course Not,” John Templeton Foundation, www.templeton.org/belief/.
11. Paul Davies, “Physics and the Mind of God: The Templeton Prize Address,” *First Things* 55 (August/September 1995): 31–35.
12. Many people mistakenly think science arose only after the Enlightenment had liberated Europe from its former Christian influence—that science is therefore a product of secularism. Not so. Sociologist of religion Rodney Stark goes so far as to say, “The ‘Enlightenment’ [was] conceived initially as a propaganda ploy by militant atheists and humanists who attempted to claim credit for the rise of science.” *For the Glory of God: How Monotheism Led to Reformations, Science, Witch-Hunts, and the End of Slavery* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003), 123.
13. John Gray, *Straw Dogs* (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007), xi–xii, xiii, 4, 49. Gray argues that the whole of Western liberalism is actually parasitic on Christianity. He maintains, for example, that liberalism’s high view of the human person is derived directly from Christianity: “Liberal humanism inherits several key Christian beliefs—above all, the belief that humans are categorically different from all other animals.” No other religion has given rise to the conviction that humans have a unique dignity. Think of it this way: If Darwin had announced his theory of evolution in India, China, or Japan, it would hardly have made a stir. “If—along with hundreds of millions of Hindus and Buddhists—you have never believed that humans differ from everything else in the natural world in having an immortal soul, you will find it hard to get worked up by a theory that shows how much we have in common with other animals.” The West’s high view of human dignity and

human rights is borrowed directly from Christianity. “The secular world-view is simply the Christian take on the world with God left out,” Gray concludes. “Humanism is not an alternative to religious belief, but rather a degenerate and unwitting version of it.” John Gray, “Exposing the Myth of Secularism,” *Australian Financial Review*, January 3, 2003.

In another article, Gray writes, “The idea of free will that informs liberal notions of personal autonomy is Biblical in origin (think of the Genesis story). The belief that exercising free will is part of being human is a legacy of faith.” Thus virtually every variety of atheism today “is a derivative of Christianity.” Gray, “The Atheist Delusion,” *Guardian*, March 14, 2008. To read more, see *Total Truth*, 320.

14. Thomas Nagel, *Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature Is Almost Certainly False* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 48–52.
15. Nagel, *Mind and Cosmos*, 18–19. Nagel writes that we need an alternative view of the cosmos that makes “mind, meaning, and value as fundamental as matter and space-time in an account of what there is” (20). See also Thomas Nagel, “The Core of ‘Mind and Cosmos,’” *New York Times*, August 18, 2013.
16. Nagel, *Mind and Cosmos*, 128. “Nagel was immediately set on and (symbolically) beaten to death by all the leading punks, bullies, and hangers-on of the philosophical underworld. Attacking Darwin is the sin against the Holy Ghost that pious scientists are taught never to forgive.” David Gelernter, “The Closing of the Scientific Mind,” *Commentary*, January 1, 2014.
17. Thomas Nagel, *The Last Word* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 130–31. Nagel proposes that the same cosmic authority problem “is responsible for much of the scientism and reductionism of our time.”
18. Nagel, *Mind and Cosmos*, 15. My goal is “not to offer an alternative” but merely to show why an alternative is needed (12). “All that can be done at this stage in the history of science is to argue for recognition of the problem, not to offer solutions” (33). Nagel hopes to find an explanation that involves some kind of teleology (purpose) immanent in the material cosmos, to avoid the need for a transcendent Purposer. He writes of his “ungrounded intellectual preference” for an immanent teleology, or what he calls a “naturalistic teleology.” “My preference for an immanent natural explanation is congruent with my atheism” (12, 26, 93). He admits that he is not confident that the concept of “teleology without intention makes sense” (93), and his hunch is correct: it does not.

One philosophy that Nagel considers—but does not embrace—is the idea of a mind permeating the universe from within. This view is called panpsychism.

It is the neo-Platonic notion that everything is permeated by a rudimentary form of mind or consciousness. Panpsychism is being revived today especially among proponents of process thought and process theology. They argue that life and consciousness could not emerge from sheer matter. Therefore there must be some rudimentary form of life and consciousness even at the lowest levels of matter. Read this description by an adherent: “The type of panpsychism I find compelling is that developed into a comprehensive system by Alfred North Whitehead, Henri Bergson, Charles Hartshorne, David Ray Griffin, and many others during the 20th Century. It is growing in popularity, but still a minority view. The basic idea is that all components of the universe have at least some rudimentary type of consciousness or experience, which are just different words for subjectivity or awareness.... No modern panpsychist that I know of argues that a chair or a rock is conscious. Rather, the molecules that comprise the chair or rock presumably have a very rudimentary type of consciousness.” Tam Hunt, “The C Word—Consciousness—and Emergence,” *Santa Barbara Independent*, January 8, 2011. In the recent book *Consciousness and Its Place in Nature*, British philosopher Galen Strawson defends panpsychism, and it has also been supported by Australian philosopher David Chalmers and Oxford physicist Roger Penrose.

19. Raymond Tallis, *Aping Mankind: Neuromania, Darwinitis, and the Misrepresentation of Humanity* (Durham: Acumen, 2011), 212–13 (italics in original).
20. Tallis, *Aping Mankind*, 317. On neuroethics, Tallis is quoting Paula Churchland in *Neurophilosophy*. On neuroeconomics, see, for example, Dan Monk, “Nielson (NLSN) clients use neuroscience to craft better commercials,” WPCO Cincinnati. Copyright 2013 Scripps Media.
21. Tallis, *Aping Mankind*, 332; 59–71 and chap. 8; and 348.
22. Emily Wax, “Thinking Man’s Therapy,” *Washington Post*, August 22, 2011.
23. Eagleton, *Culture and the Death of God*, 204.
24. Luc Ferry, *A Brief History of Thought: A Philosophical Guide to Living* (New York: Harper, 2011), 6.
25. Pierre Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), 103, 83.
26. Pierre Hadot, *Plotinus, or the Simplicity of Vision* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993, originally published in French in 1989), 75–76.
27. Alain de Botton, “Can Tolstoy Save Your Marriage?,” *Wall Street Journal*, December 18, 2010; Samuel Muston, “Too Cool for Night School?,” *Independent*, January 9, 2014. For a review of Botton’s book, see Douglas Groothuis, “Religion for Atheists: A Nonbeliever’s Guide to the Uses of Religion,” *Denver Journal*, 16 (January 24, 2013).

28. André Comte-Sponville, *The Little Book of Atheist Spirituality*, trans. Nancy Huston (New York: Penguin, 2006).
29. "Britain's First Atheist Church," *Huffington Post UK*, July 1, 2013; and "Atheist 'Mega-churches' Take Root across US, World," *Newsmax*, November 10, 2013.
30. Wilfrid Sellars, *Science, Perception, and Reality* (Atascadero, CA: Ridgeview, 1991), 173; and Bertrand Russell, *Science and Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1935), 235.
31. John Gray, "A Point of View: Can Religion Tell Us More Than Science?," *BBC News*, September 16, 2011.
32. Michael Bond, "Atheists Turn to Science during Times of Stress," *New Scientist*, June 7, 2013.
33. W. R. Thompson, "Introduction," in Charles Darwin, *Origin of Species* (New York: Dent, 1956), 12.
34. "Evolution, akin to religion, involves making certain a priori or metaphysical assumptions, which at some level cannot be proven empirically." Michael Ruse, "Nonliteralist Antievolution," AAAS Symposium: "The New Antievolutionism," February 13, 1993, Boston, www.leaderu.com/orgs/arn/orpages/or151/mr93tran.htm. Cf. Tom Woodward, "Ruse Gives Away the Store," <http://simpleapologetics.com/tomwoodward.html>.
35. The piece was composed by Gregory Brown. Watch a performance here: www.gregorywbrown.com/missa-charles-darwin/.
36. Stuart Kauffman, "Beyond Reductionism: Reinventing the Sacred," *Edge*, November 12, 2006. Kauffman goes on: "This God brings with it a sense of oneness, unity, with all of life, and our planet—it expands our consciousness and naturally seems to lead to an enhanced potential global ethic of wonder, awe, responsibility within the bounded limits of our capacity, for all of life and its home, the Earth, and beyond as we explore the Solar System.... Shall we use the God word? It is our choice. Mine is a tentative 'yes.' I want God to mean the vast ceaseless creativity of the only universe we know of, ours." Francis Schaeffer warned that undefined religious words like "God" can be used for their connotations to manipulate people emotionally. See *The God Who Is There* and *Escape from Reason*.
37. Views like Kauffman's are sometimes labeled religious naturalism. Examples of religious naturalism include Jerome A. Stone, *Religious Naturalism Today* (New York: State U. of New York Press, 2008); Chet Raymo, *When God Is Gone, Everything Is Holy: Making of a Religious Naturalist* (Notre Dame, IN: Sorin Books, 2008); Loyal Rue, *Religion Is Not about God* (Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2006).

38. Jeremy Rifkin, *Algeny* (New York: Viking, 1983), 188, 195, 244.
39. C. S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man* (New York: HarperCollins, 1947), 29.
40. Richard Dawkins, *River Out of Eden: A Darwinian View of Life* (London: Orion, 1995), 155.
41. On solipsism, see Principle #1 in this book. Philosopher Stephen Thornton notes that much of modern philosophy would lead to solipsism, if followed out to its logical conclusion: “While no great philosopher has explicitly espoused solipsism, this can be attributed to the inconsistency of much philosophical reasoning. Many philosophers have failed to accept the logical consequences of their own most fundamental commitments and preconceptions. The foundations of solipsism lie at the heart of the view that the individual gets his own psychological concepts (thinking, willing, perceiving, and so forth.) from ‘his own cases,’ that is by abstraction from ‘inner experience.’
- “This view, or some variant of it, has been held by a great many, if not the majority of philosophers since Descartes made the egocentric search for truth the primary goal of the critical study of the nature and limits of knowledge. In this sense, solipsism is implicit in many philosophies of knowledge and mind since Descartes and any theory of knowledge that adopts the Cartesian egocentric approach as its basic frame of reference is inherently solipsistic.” “Solipsism and the Problem of Other Minds,” *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, www.iep.utm.edu/solipsis/.
42. Bertrand Russell, “A Free Man’s Worship,” 1903, in *Mysticism and Logic* (New York: Routledge, 1986).
43. From a debate between William B. Provine and Phillip E. Johnson at Stanford University, April 30, 1994, titled “Darwinism: Science or Naturalistic Philosophy?,” www.cjas.org/~leng/provine.txt.
44. Lewis adds that the hunger for truth will “force you not to propound, but to *live through*, a sort of ontological proof” for God’s existence. Lewis, *The Pilgrim’s Regress: An Allegorical Apology for Christianity, Reason and Romanticism*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1981), 204–5 (italics added).
45. Bradley Wright, “Why Do Christians Leave the Faith? The Fundamental Importance of Apologetics,” *Patheos*, November 17, 2011; “Why Do Christians Leave the Faith? The Problem of Responding Badly to Doubt,” *Patheos*, December 1, 2011; and “Why Do Christians Leave the Faith? The Relative Unimportance of Non-Christians,” *Patheos*, December 8, 2011. See also Larry Taunton, “Listening to Young Atheists,” *Atlantic*, June 6, 2013.
46. Harper Lee, *To Kill a Mockingbird* (New York: Grand Central, 1960), 39.
47. Ravi Zacharias and R. S. B. Sawyer, *Walking from East to West* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006), 36.

48. “What I Wish I’d Known before I Went to University,” *Beyond Teachable Moments* (blog), June 25, 2014, http://beyonddtm.wordpress.com/2014/06/25/what-i-wish-id-known-before-i-went-to-university/?utm_content=bufferb7f07&utm_medium=social&utm_source=twitter.com&utm_campaign=buffer.

PART 3—How Critical Thinking Saves Faith

1. Nancy Pearcey, “How Critical Thinking Saves Faith,” *The Pearcey Report*, December 22, 2010. When *Christianity Today* published the article, the editors changed the title to “How to Respond to Doubt,” www.christianitytoday.com/women/2010/december/nancy-pearcey-how-to-respond-to-doubt.html?paging=off.
2. G. K. Chesterton, *Heretics* (Radford, VA: Wilder, 2007 [1905]), 115.
3. For more detail, along with sources, for the art movements described in the following section, see *Saving Leonardo*, chapters 4–9.
4. These words are from a description of all-black paintings by Ad Reinhardt. Walter Smith, “Ad Reinhardt’s Oriental Aesthetic,” *Smithsonian Studies in American Art* 4, no. 3/4 (summer-autumn 1990). See also Jack Flam, “Ad Reinhardt’s Black Paintings, the Void, and Chinese Painting,” *Brooklyn Rail*, January 16, 2014.
5. Ravi Zacharias, *Can Man Live without God?* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1994), 21.
6. Cited in Richard M. Gamble, *The War for Righteousness: Progressive Christianity, the Great War, and the Rise of the Messianic Nation* (Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 2003), 30.
7. Gustavo Gutiérrez, “Two Theological Perspectives: Liberation Theology and Progressivist Theology,” *The Emergent Gospel: Theology from the Developing World*, eds. Sergio Torres and Virginia Fabella (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1978), *Papers from the Ecumenical Dialogue of Third World Theologians*, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, August 5–12, 1976, 227–55, quote 241.
8. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Bread Not Stone: The Challenge of Feminist Biblical Interpretation* (Boston: Beacon, 1984), 145.
9. See William Hasker, “The Problem of Evil in Process Theism and Classical Free Will Theism,” *Process Studies* 29, no. 2 (fall-winter 2000).
10. Myron Penner, *The End of Apologetics: Christian Witness in a Postmodern Context* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2013), 99. Penner does offer some qualifications: The fact that human knowledge is “finite, fallible, and contingent” does not mean that the gospel truths “are therefore *false or relative* in any absolute and final way” (120, italics in original). However, throughout the book, Penner endorses postmodern thinkers and concepts in an uncritical manner that makes it problematic to explain how (as he tentatively writes) “it may just be possible after all to speak about Christian truth” (40).

11. C. S. Lewis, "On Learning in Wartime," in *The Weight of Glory* (New York: Macmillan, 1980), 28.
12. Dallas Willard, "The Redemption of Reason" (speech, Biola University, La Mirada, CA, February 28, 1998), www.dwillard.org/articles/artview.asp?artID=118.
13. Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (New York: Touchstone, 1987), 58.
14. Lecrae, interviewed by Dustin Stout, "Lecrae on Engaging Culture for Jesus: #R12," *ChurchMag*, October 24, 2012, <http://churchm.ag/r12-lecrae-engaging-culture/>.
15. "Interview: Lecrae Talks about Going from 'Crazy Crae' to Christian Rapper," *Complex*, June 8, 2012.
16. Lecrae Moore, "Because Jesus Lives, We Engage Culture," Resurgence Conference, October 9–10, 2012, http://cdn.theresurgence.com/files/R12_Newsprint_web.pdf. For additional places where Lecrae quotes *Total Truth*, see the Liberty University Convocation, March 22, 2013, www.youtube.com/watch?v=aCVBUA8SMTs; Matt Perman, "Lecrae and the Doctrine of Vocation," *What's Best Next*, October 6, 2013, <http://whatsbestnext.com/2013/10/lecrae-doctrine-vocation/>.
17. Cited in Emma Green, "Lecrae: 'Christians Have Prostituted Art to Give Answers,'" *Atlantic*, October 6, 2014.
18. To read the context of the quotes in this section, see *Total Truth*, 35, 75–76, 83–84.
19. Cited in Andrew Greer, "Lecrae: Defying Gravity," *Today's Christian Music*, September 1, 2012.
20. Cited in Chad Bonham, "A Conversation with Christian Hip-Hop Artist Lecrae," *Beliefnet*, <http://features.beliefnet.com/wholenotes/2012/06/a-conversation-with-christian-hip-hop-artist-lecrae.html#ixzz2IjfeLe91>.
21. Lecrae, interview, "We Engage Culture for Jesus," *Encouragements through the Word*, March 4, 2013, <http://encouragementsthroughtheword.wordpress.com/2013/03/04/we-engage-culture-for-jesus-an-interview-of-christian-artist-lecrae/>.

APPENDIX

Romans I:I–2:I6

1 Paul, a servant of Christ Jesus, called to be an apostle, set apart for the gospel of God, 2 which he promised beforehand through his prophets in the holy Scriptures, 3 concerning his Son, who was descended from David according to the flesh 4 and was declared to be the Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord, 5 through whom we have received grace and apostleship to bring about the obedience of faith for the sake of his name among all the nations, 6 including you who are called to belong to Jesus Christ,

7 To all those in Rome who are loved by God and called to be saints:

Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

8 First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for all of you, because your faith is proclaimed in all the world. 9 For God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the gospel of his Son, that without ceasing I mention you 10 always in my prayers, asking

that somehow by God's will I may now at last succeed in coming to you. 11 For I long to see you, that I may impart to you some spiritual gift to strengthen you— 12 that is, that we may be mutually encouraged by each other's faith, both yours and mine. 13 I do not want you to be unaware, brothers, that I have often intended to come to you (but thus far have been prevented), in order that I may reap some harvest among you as well as among the rest of the Gentiles. 14 I am under obligation both to Greeks and to barbarians, both to the wise and to the foolish. 15 So I am eager to preach the gospel to you also who are in Rome.

16 For I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. 17 For in it the righteousness of God is revealed from faith for faith, as it is written, "The righteous shall live by faith."

18 For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who by their unrighteousness suppress the truth. 19 For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. 20 For his invisible attributes, namely, his eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly perceived, ever since the creation of the world, in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse. 21 For although they knew God, they did not honor him as God or give thanks to him, but they became futile in their thinking, and their foolish hearts were darkened. 22 Claiming to be wise, they became fools, 23 and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man and birds and animals and creeping things.

24 Therefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, to the dishonoring of their bodies among themselves, 25 because they exchanged the truth about God for a lie and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever! Amen.

26 For this reason God gave them up to dishonorable passions. For their women exchanged natural relations for those that are contrary to nature; 27 and the men likewise gave up natural relations with women and were consumed with passion for one another, men committing shameless acts with men and receiving in themselves the due penalty for their error.

28 And since they did not see fit to acknowledge God, God gave them up to a debased mind to do what ought not to be done. 29 They were filled with all manner of unrighteousness, evil, covetousness, malice. They are full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, maliciousness. They are gossips, 30 slanderers, haters of God, insolent, haughty, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, 31 foolish, faithless, heartless, ruthless. 32 Though they know God's righteous decree that those who practice such things deserve to die, they not only do them but give approval to those who practice them.

1 Therefore you have no excuse, O man, every one of you who judges. For in passing judgment on another you condemn yourself, because you, the judge, practice the very same things. 2 We know that the judgment of God rightly falls on those who practice such things. 3 Do you suppose, O man—you who judge those who practice such

things and yet do them yourself—that you will escape the judgment of God? 4 Or do you presume on the riches of his kindness and forbearance and patience, not knowing that God’s kindness is meant to lead you to repentance? 5 But because of your hard and impenitent heart you are storing up wrath for yourself on the day of wrath when God’s righteous judgment will be revealed.

6 He will render to each one according to his works: 7 to those who by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, he will give eternal life; 8 but for those who are self-seeking and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, there will be wrath and fury. 9 There will be tribulation and distress for every human being who does evil, the Jew first and also the Greek, 10 but glory and honor and peace for everyone who does good, the Jew first and also the Greek. 11 For God shows no partiality.

12 For all who have sinned without the law will also perish without the law, and all who have sinned under the law will be judged by the law. 13 For it is not the hearers of the law who are righteous before God, but the doers of the law who will be justified. 14 For when Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature do what the law requires, they are a law to themselves, even though they do not have the law. 15 They show that the work of the law is written on their hearts, while their conscience also bears witness, and their conflicting thoughts accuse or even excuse them 16 on that day when, according to my gospel, God judges the secrets of men by Christ Jesus.

STUDY GUIDE

The purpose of this study guide is to help you interact more deeply with the ideas in *Finding Truth*. As you paraphrase what you have read, searching for your own words to restate the ideas, you will process the material more fully. You will also connect the new ideas you are learning to the store of knowledge you already have, which gives the new material greater sticking power.

The key to making the best use of a study guide, then, is not simply to state your own views and opinions. When you do that, you are repeating what you already know instead of learning something new. Our thinking is stretched and deepened by grappling with unfamiliar ideas. The most effective strategy is to start each answer by referring to the text. First summarize what you have read. Then feel free to offer your own thoughts. (Some questions specifically ask for your views.)

The goal of apologetics is to learn how to communicate your Christian convictions more clearly and persuasively. As you fill out the study guide, then, do not think only of getting the “right answers.” Think of how you would explain the idea to someone

who does not accept Christianity. Use the study guide as practice for real conversations you will soon be having.

Questions: For each question, write a short paragraph answer. Subheads are given to indicate which section you should refer to in answering each question. Some questions include multiple parts. Be sure your answer addresses all the parts.

Dialogues: Many assignments ask you to compose sample dialogues. This is the same training used by professional apologists like Greg Koukl. In a real conversation, you cannot simply dump an entire paragraph on someone; you have to unfold your ideas bit by bit, in response to the other person's questions and objections. So strive to make your dialogues as realistic as possible to prepare yourself for real conversations with real people. Dialogues do not need to be long (about four comments by each character), but they should reflect a plausible conversation.

Each dialogue should start with a hypothetical person stating an objection based on the topic in the assignment. You think of an answer that keeps the discussion going. Have fun by giving your characters creative names. The dialogues will help you bridge the gap between *knowing* something and knowing how to explain it to others.

In a classroom or discussion group, participants should bring two copies of each dialogue and read them aloud dramatically with a partner. (Depending on the time, you may decide that each participant will choose only one dialogue to present, while answering the other dialogues as ordinary questions.)

PART ONE

.....

“I Lost My Faith at an Evangelical College”

Give Me Evidence / Evidence from Life

1. The atheist philosopher Bertrand Russell was once asked what he would say if he died, stood before God, and God asked him, “Why didn’t you believe in Me?” Russell replied, “I would say, ‘Not enough evidence, God! Not enough evidence!’” Summarize the evidence from physical nature described in the text:

Origin of the universe:

Origin of life:

Do you find this evidence persuasive? Why or why not?

Evidence from Personhood

2. What are the philosophical meanings of the terms *personal* and *non-personal*? How does the fact that humans are personal beings function as evidence for God? Do you find that evidence persuasive? Why or why not?

Atheists’ Children and Their God

3. Explain the concept of common grace. What are the implications for apologetics?

Tug of War

4. What is an “epistemological sin”? Do you agree that at the heart of the human condition is an epistemological sin (i.e., sin related to knowledge)? Why or why not?

How Humans Hide

5. “An atheist professor once told me that the Bible teaches polytheism because the first commandment speaks of ‘other gods.’” This claim is made frequently on atheist Internet sites. Practice explaining what the first commandment really means to someone who claims that it teaches polytheism.

6. The text says that the easy-to-diagnose, surface-level sins are often driven by the more hidden sin of idolatry. Think of examples in your own life. Discuss if you feel comfortable doing so.

When Good Gifts Are False Gods

7. How can even good things become idols? Describe something good that you have been tempted to turn into an idol. Discuss if you feel comfortable doing so.

Idols Have Consequences

8. What does the Greek word *nous* mean? How does that give richer meaning to scriptural verses such as these: “God gave them up to a debased mind” (Rom. 1:28); “Be transformed by the renewal of your mind” (Rom. 12:2)? Add your own examples.

9. In debates over moral issues such as homosexuality, most people today use the word *nature* to mean behavior patterns observed among organisms in the natural world. What is the older meaning of the word *nature*, as in the phrase “human nature”? How is this traditional meaning expressed in Romans 1?

Five Strategic Principles

Principle #1: *Identify the Idol*

10. The text says that every nonbiblical religion or worldview starts with an idol. It must locate an eternal, uncaused cause within the created order. Explain why, and list some examples. Can you think of any exceptions to this principle?

Principle #2: *Identify the Idol's Reductionism*

11. Define reductionism. In what way is reductionism like trying to stuff the entire universe into a box? Give an example.

12. How does reductionism affect one's view of human nature? In your answer, explain this principle: “Every concept of humanity is created in the image of *some* god.” Use materialism as an example.

Principle #3: *Test the Idol: Does It Contradict What We Know about the World?*

13. “We can be confident that every idol-based worldview *will* fail.” It will be unable to account for what is knowable by general revelation. Explain why. Illustrate by using materialism as an example.

14. Explain how every idol-based worldview leads people to cognitive dissonance—a gap between what their worldview tells them and what they know from general revelation.

15. Explain how reductionism is a strategy of suppression. How is it used to suppress the evidence for God from general revelation?

Principle #4: *Test the Idol: Does It Contradict Itself?*

16. Define self-referential absurdity. Give an example of how the argument works.

17. Explain why idol-based worldviews refute themselves. The text says that adherents of reductionist worldviews “have to borrow Christianity’s high view of reason in order to give reasons for their view.” Explain what that means.

Principle #5: *Replace the Idol: Make the Case for Christianity*

18. “What a powerful image of people caught in cognitive dissonance, reaching out to grab on to truths that their own worldviews deny—truths that only a biblical worldview logically supports.” Unpack this sentence. Explain how secular thinkers are trying to hold on to truths that are logically supported only by Christianity.

Liberated Minds

19. Dialogue: When *Finding Truth* was in manuscript form, I taught a class using it as a text. One student, a father of pre-teens, said, “Your book is convicting me that I brush off my kids when they have questions about Christianity. I have made a commitment

that from now on, I will listen to my children and treat their questions seriously.”

But another student, a young woman from El Salvador, rejected the very idea of apologetics. In her view, the use of reason to defend Christianity is a matter of “pride” and “the flesh.” “Christians should rely on the Holy Spirit,” she said, quoting Paul: “Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world?” and “I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified” (1 Cor. 1:20; 2:2).

Write a dialogue as if you are speaking with the young woman from El Salvador. How would you persuade this woman that it is valid for Christians to defend their convictions?

PART TWO

PRINCIPLE #1

.....

Twilight of the Gods

Leaving Teens Vulnerable

1. Summarize the sociological research on young people who report having doubts or questions. Do you know anyone with doubts who is struggling to find answers? Are you struggling yourself?

Principle #1: *Identify the Idol*

2. How is the biblical word *heart* often misunderstood? What is its correct meaning?

3. “Atheism is not a belief. Atheism is merely the lack of a belief in God or gods.” Because this is a common line among atheists today, you should know how to respond. Based on the text, what could you say?

4. What are the two advantages of using the biblical term *idols* for both secular and religious worldviews? (The second one is under the next subhead.)

Religion without God

5. As you read through the rest of this chapter, make a diagram like the one presented here. On the left side, write the features that most people associate with religion. On the right side, explain why that feature is not a necessary part of the definition of religion. Give examples.

Common Definitions of Religion	Why Isn't That Definition Adequate?

6. Why are Buddhism, Taoism, and Confucianism described as atheistic religions?

Religion without Morality

7. Give examples of amoral and even immoral religions.

Search for the Divine

8. What is the one thing that characterizes all religions as well as all secular philosophies? Can you think of any exceptions?

Philosophers and Their Gods

9. As you read through the rest of this chapter, make a diagram like the one presented here. On the left side, write the name of each ism discussed. On the right side, identify its idol. Go back and start with the section titled "Search for the Divine."

Philosophy	What Is Its Idol?

10. What does the Greek word *arché* mean? Do you agree that the early Greek philosophies qualify as idols under the definition in Romans 1? Give your reasons.

The Church of Physics: Idol of Matter

11. Dialogue: I once had a Facebook discussion with a young fan of Richard Dawkins, who was outraged that I would suggest secularism had *anything* in common with religion. To this young man, religion represented blind faith while science stood for reason and facts. Imagine yourself in a conversation with a young man like that. Write a dialogue in which you level the playing field by showing that all belief systems share the same basic structure.

12. Explain the logical steps that lead from materialism to Marxism's economic determinism.

Hume Meets the Klingons: Idol of the Senses

13. Like Data in *Star Trek*, atheists often charge that Christianity is "irrational" simply because it accepts the existence of a realm beyond the empirical world. Based on the text, how could you answer that charge?

Inside the Matrix

14. Dialogue: Explain to an empiricist how his or her philosophy involves a divinity belief.

Sensational Bacon, Dubious Descartes

15. One philosopher says that Enlightenment epistemologies set up “the first-person standpoint” as the only path to certainty. They turned the self into “the locus and arbiter of knowledge.” Explain what that means and what the end result was.

Signposts or Dead Ends

16. Philosophers like Karl Popper and John Herman Randall pointed out the “religious character” of Enlightenment epistemologies. Explain what they meant.

Kant’s Mental Prison: Idol of the Mind

17. What was Kant’s “Copernican revolution”? What was his God substitute? Define solipsism, and explain why philosophies that start within the human mind end in solipsism.

The Artist as God: Idol of the Imagination

18. Describe the evidence showing that, for the Romantics, the imagination was their God substitute, and art was their substitute religion.

Cure for Blind Philosophers

19. Read “The Blind Men and the Elephant” by John Godfrey Saxe on the following pages. How does it illustrate the origin of idols?

“The Blind Men and the Elephant”

It was six men of Indostan
To learning much inclined,
Who went to see the Elephant
(Though all of them were blind),
That each by observation
Might satisfy his mind.

The *First* approached the Elephant,
And happening to fall
Against his broad and sturdy side,
At once began to bawl:
“God bless me! but the Elephant
Is very like a WALL!”

The *Second*, feeling of the tusk,
Cried, “Ho, what have we here,
So very round and smooth and sharp?
To me ’tis mighty clear
This wonder of an Elephant
Is very like a SPEAR!”

The *Third* approached the animal,
And happening to take
The squirming trunk within his hands,
Thus boldly up and spake
“I see,” quoth he, “the Elephant
Is very like a SNAKE!”

The *Fourth* reached out an eager hand,
And felt about the knee
“What most this wondrous beast is like
Is mighty plain” quoth he:
“’Tis clear enough the Elephant
Is very like a TREE!”

The *Fifth*, who chanced to touch the ear,
Said: “E’en the blindest man
Can tell what this resembles most;
Deny the fact who can,
This marvel of an Elephant
Is very like a FAN!”

The *Sixth* no sooner had begun
About the beast to grope,
Than seizing on the swinging tail
That fell within his scope,
“I see,” quoth he, “the Elephant
Is very like a ROPE!”

And so these men of Indostan
Disputed loud and long,
Each in his own opinion
Exceeding stiff and strong,
Though each was partly in the right,
And all were in the wrong!

The Joy of Critical Thinking

20. How does Christianity affirm what is good and true in these philosophies?

Materialism:

Rationalism:

Empiricism:

Romanticism:

The Good, the True, and the Pagan

21. “Paul was making the astounding claim that Christianity provides the context of meaning for the Greeks to understand *their own* culture.” Explain what that means. Choose one example from our own day, and explain how the same principle can be applied.

PRINCIPLE #2

.....

How Nietzsche Wins

Principle #2: *Identify the Idol's Reductionism*

1. The text argues that an idol-centered worldview is always dehumanizing. Explain why. In your answer, include an explanation of this sentence: "Every concept of humanity is created in the image of *some* god."

Dehumanize Thy Neighbor

2. Reductionism is not just a philosophical concept. Think of ways your own tendency to live for idols has led you to use others for your own needs and goals. Discuss, if you feel comfortable doing so.

The Science of Cheating

3. Read endnote 4 to learn about another study that was similar to the one reported in *Scientific American*. How did these findings support Romans 1? Read endnote 5. How do these studies implicitly affirm the reality of free will?

The Psychology of Suppression

4. Explain how reductionism functions as a strategy for suppression. Why do people suppress whatever does not fit into their worldview box?

5. Why does an idol-centered worldview always produce a dualism or dichotomy in people's thinking?

6. The text says we will identify the dehumanizing impact of two worldviews (materialism and postmodernism), in two religions, and in two political theories. As you read the chapter, make a diagram like the one presented here. On the top horizontal line, write the name of the worldview or religion being discussed. Under the line, answer two questions: What is its idol? What is its form of reductionism?

NAME						
IDOL						
REDUCTIONISM						

Crick: "Nothing but a Pack of Neurons"

7. Define eliminative materialism. What reasoning does it use to reach its conclusions? How does it refute itself?

"Deepest Irrationality"

8. Galen Strawson writes that eliminative materialism shows "that the capacity of human minds to be gripped by theory, by faith, is truly unbounded." It reveals "the deepest irrationality of the human mind."

Unpack what he means. Describe Thomas Reid's response. What do you think of Reid's view?

Revenge of the Romantics

9. Dialogue: What did Schopenhauer mean when he said, “Materialism is the philosophy of the subject who forgets to take account of himself”? Some Christian apologists have adapted this argument to support a biblical worldview. Try your hand at using the argument in an imagined dialogue with a materialist.

Emerson’s Over-Soul

10. Define neo-Platonism. Why does it qualify as an idol-belief? Read endnote 26 and explain what Paul means when he writes about the “fullness” of divinity. How is he taking the term from the early Gnostics and claiming it for Christianity?

The Great Chain of Being in Shakespeare’s day: Note that it has been Christianized so that the One is identified with the biblical God, and the spiritual entities are identified as angels. Christian neo-Platonism was widely held in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.



Hegel's Evolutionary Deity

11. Explain how Hegel altered the Great Chain of Being. Why did Nietzsche say that "without Hegel, there would have been no Darwin"?
12. Define historicism. How does historicism undercut itself? In what way did Hegel make a tacit exception for himself? How did that create a new problem?

Triumvirate of Race, Class, Gender

13. Explain the logical link leading from Hegel to postmodernism. What is the idol in postmodernism?

Roots of Political Correctness

14. Dialogue: Engage with a postmodernist to show where you agree and where you disagree. Make a case that postmodernism is reductionistic, that it reduces individuals to products of society, race, class, gender, etc.

The Fall of Postmodernism

15. Dialogue: Based on the text, explain to a postmodern Christian the reasons for not accepting a postmodern interpretation of Christianity.

Pantheism versus You

16. Dialogue: Many people who embrace pantheism claim that it gives greater meaning to life by causing us to see ourselves as part of an interconnected whole. In a conversation with a New Age friend, explain why pantheism is reductionistic and dehumanizing, and why

it does not give people the dignity and meaning that your friend is looking for.

Islam versus Human Dignity

17. Dialogue: Practice explaining to a Muslim where Christianity and Islam agree and where they differ, and why the difference is crucial.

From Secular Idols to Death Camps / From Liberators to Despots

18. Describe the secular idols that led to Nazism and Communism, and their political consequences. In your view, what are today's political idols?

More Than Is Dreamed of in Your Philosophy

19. What biblical meaning is most often associated with the phrase "put to shame"? How does that change our understanding of Romans 1:16?

20. Turn back to this diagram on page 113.

Western philosophy divides into two philosophical "families"

ROMANTICISM

The Box of Mind

ENLIGHTENMENT

The Box of Things

(A) Review Principles #1 and #2. Make a diagram like the one presented here. Under ENLIGHTENMENT fill in all the isms we have discussed that belong to the Enlightenment category (the analytic tradition). Under ROMANTICISM fill in all the isms we have discussed that belong in the Romantic category (the continental tradition). As you read through the rest of the book, for every ism you encounter, decide which tradition it belongs to and write it in.

ROMANTICISM (continental tradition)

ENLIGHTENMENT (analytic tradition)

By mastering these two basic categories, you will find it much easier to make sense of the diversity of modern Western worldviews. Worldviews are not a scattershot of disconnected ideas to memorize, master, and slot into a grid. They form ongoing traditions that move along the same path, in the same basic direction, following the same map—either the Enlightenment map or the Romantic map. Or you can think of them as two genealogical lines connected by family resemblances. To make sense of any particular worldview, the first step is to identify the family lineage it belongs to and the common themes it shares.

(B) What are those common themes? To get you started, here is a segment from the text: “The analytic tradition traces its roots

to the Enlightenment and tends to highlight science, reason, and facts. The continental tradition traces its roots to the Romantic movement and seeks to defend mind, meaning, and morality.”

Make a second diagram. As you review Principles #1 and #2, look for common themes or family resemblances within each of the two traditions and write them in:

Connecting themes in the continental tradition



Connecting themes in the analytic tradition

PRINCIPLE #3

.....

Secular Leaps of Faith

1. Endnote 2 says the argument from evil fails logically. Explain why.

The Gravity of Fact

2. The text says that when we apply the practical test, “we can be confident that all idol-centered worldviews *will* be falsified.” Explain why. Use the CNN article as an example.

I, Robot—We, Machines

3. Should Christians argue in favor of free will? Some Calvinists are not so sure. Read endnote 6. What do you think? Explain the difference between predestination and determinism.

Principle #3: *Test the Idol: Does It Contradict What We Know about the World?*

4. Why is free will such an enduring question in philosophy? Which distinctively human abilities depend on free will? Can you think of any additional abilities that depend on free will beyond those mentioned in the text?

Why Secularists Can't Live with Secularism

5. What are some phrases showing that a worldview has bumped up against a reality it cannot explain? How does that serve to falsify the worldview?

Double-Minded Secularists / Losing Total Truth

6. Why does every idol-centered worldview lead to a mental dichotomy or dualism? How is dualism a signal that evidence from general revelation is being suppressed?

A Leap of Doubt

7. We have come far enough to detect important patterns. As you read through the rest of this chapter, make a diagram like the one presented here. Go back to the sections titled "Why Secularists Can't Live with Secularism" and "Double-Minded Secularists," so you can include Strawson and Slingerland in your diagram.

A. List the name of each thinker discussed in the text.

B. List the ism that each thinker embraces.

C. List the phrases he uses that are clues to general revelation—the ideas that bubble up inescapably and irresistibly no matter which worldview he holds. I'll give you the first one: Galen Strawson says he "can't really live with" his own philosophy. The key phrase is what humans "can't live with." A worldview is supposed to be a guide to living in the world. When people cannot live on the basis of their worldview, that means they have bumped against the hard

edge of a reality that does not fit their professed system of thought.

D. List the phrases he uses showing that evidence from general revelation is being suppressed. For example, Marvin Minsky says, “We’re virtually forced to maintain that belief, even though we know it’s false.” He is suppressing a truth that he is “forced to maintain” by reducing it to the status of a necessary falsehood—by putting it in the upper story.

Name	ism	Clues to general revelation (phrases)	Clues to suppression (phrases)

When you have finished filling in your diagram, answer this question: Why do secular thinkers suppress the evidence from general revelation?

Atheism versus Civilization

8. Smilansky acknowledges that his deterministic worldview is socially destructive. Explain why determinism has socially harmful consequences. How does Smilansky propose to get around those negative consequences? What do you think about his proposal?

Dawkins’s “Intolerable” Worldview

9. How does Dawkins show that he has bumped up against the hard edge of a reality that does not fit his worldview? Why would the consequences of his worldview be “intolerable”?

Einstein's Dilemma

10. What does the phrase “as if” signal? Why did Kant propose the phrase? Read endnote 23 and explain why even Einstein’s scientific work depends on free will.

Secular Mysticism

11. Why did Francis Schaeffer claim that any worldview that contains an epistemological dualism leads to “mysticism”? Explain how the examples in the text support Schaeffer’s claim.

Darwinian Psychopaths

12. The text says, “We can picture worldviews falling along a continuum: The more consistently people work out the logic of their worldview, the more reductionistic the result will be, the wider the gap, and the further its leap into irrational mysticism.” How does Edward Slingerland exemplify this ever-widening gap?

13. How do the Greek terms for “futile” and “foolish” throw new light on how Romans 1:21 can be applied to today’s secular worldviews? How can Paul’s statement that those who worship idols are “without excuse” be applied to secular worldviews?

MIT Prof: My Children Are Machines

14. Brooks’s worldview contradicts his own lived experience so sharply that he says he “maintains two sets of inconsistent beliefs.” The text calls this “the tragedy of the postmodern age.” Why is it a tragedy?

Chesterton: Christianity “Too Good to Be True”

15. How does a biblical view of humanity lead to a unified, logically consistent worldview? Explain why Chesterton says secularists reject Christianity not because it is a bad theory but because it seems “too good to be true.”

Walking Off the Postmodern Map

16. Dialogue: Imagine talking with a postmodernist. Based on the text, how could you argue against his or her anti-realism?

Don't Impose Your Facts

17. How do most people apply postmodernism selectively? How does that lead to a dualism or dichotomy in the way people think and act? (If you've read *Total Truth*, how does this dichotomy represent the fact/value split?)

A Harvard Professor's Admission

18. The text quotes two philosophers (Parfit and Harries) who admit outright that they hold inconsistent beliefs. Summarize what they say. Then make the case that Christianity offers a unified view of truth. Keep in mind that, as the introduction says, you should use the study guide answers to practice doing apologetics with real people.

19. Explain the religious motivations that drove Francis Crick and James Watson in their search for reductionist theories.

Secularism Is Too Small for Secularists

20. Dialogue: The text says, “We should begin by expressing solidarity with their deepest longings for meaning and significance—and then show that in a biblical worldview, those longings are not merely illusions or useful fictions.” Write out a conversation modeling what this would look like.

PRINCIPLE #4

.....

Why Worldviews Commit Suicide

1. Explain reverse engineering. How do biologists use it? How does it provide evidence of design?
2. How is Michael Ruse's thinking an example of cognitive dissonance?

It's Not Brain Surgery ... Oh Wait, Yes It Is

3. Explain how Freud's notion that religion is wish fulfillment can be turned against his own theory.

Tests for Truth

4. Explain self-referential absurdity. Explain *why* idol-based worldviews commit suicide.

Principle #4: *Test the Idol: Does It Contradict Itself?*

5. Define logical positivism. How was it discredited? Do you still hear emotivist views expressed today? Give an example.
6. As you read through this chapter, make a diagram like the one presented here. For each school of thought that commits suicide: List the ism. Describe its form of reductionism. Explain why it refutes itself. Start with logical positivism.

Name the ism	Describe Its Reductionism	How Does It Undercut Itself?

Hitting the Marx

7. Dialogue: Choose one of the theories discussed in this section. Create a realistic dialogue with someone who holds that theory. Help the person to see how the theory undercuts itself.

Debunking the Debunkers

8. How do reductionist worldviews try to avoid committing suicide? How does that “solution” create yet another problem?

9. The text says “all worldviews have to borrow a Christian epistemology.... They have to function *as if* Christianity is true, even as they reject it.” Summarize the biblical basis for epistemology, and then explain why other worldviews have to borrow it.

C. S. Lewis Unmasks Materialism

10. Dialogue: Imagine a conversation with a materialist. Help him or her see that the position commits suicide and is therefore untenable.

Evolution Cannot Survive Itself

11. Dialogue: Imagine a conversation with an avid supporter of evolutionary epistemology. Craft a realistic dialogue in which you explain how it undercuts the very basis for rationality—and therefore undercuts itself.

Darwin's Selective Skepticism

12. The passage by Darwin about his “horrid doubt” is typically misinterpreted to mean he himself realized that his theory committed suicide. Explain how Darwin applied his doubt selectively. Then explain why Darwinism undercuts not only itself but also the entire scientific enterprise.

Why Science Is a “Miracle”

13. Dialogue: You are talking to a secular person who insists that Christianity has always stood in the way of science and progress. Explain how Christianity provided the philosophical underpinnings for the rise of modern science. Then explain why even today, anyone who wants to pursue science has to adopt an epistemology derived from a Christian worldview—at least in practice.

Postmodern Prison

14. Dialogue: Argue in a polite and respectful manner with your university literature professor who is a postmodernist, showing that the theory commits suicide. In your explanation, include the concept of “performative contradiction.”

Barthes Busted

15. Explain what “deconstructionism” means, the logic behind it, and how it contains a fatal internal contradiction. How do deconstructionists try to avoid that contradiction? Does it work?

Postmodernism and Terror

16. Where did many postmodernists get their opposition to meta-narratives? What did they propose as a solution? What is the problem with that solution? Why does postmodernism lead to complicity with evil and injustice?

The Tyranny of Diversity

17. Explain how postmodernism became imperialistic and coercive. Describe any examples that you have encountered.

Losing Your Self

18. Explain the difference between a modernist and a postmodernist view of the self. How does a postmodern view refute itself?

The Trinity for Postmoderns

19. Practice explaining how the Christian concept of the Trinity offers a better answer than either modernism or postmodernism to the balance of individual and community.

Escape from Reductionism

20. Dialogue: Choose one example from this section and imagine a conversation in which you make the positive case that Christianity offers better answers than any competing worldview.

PRINCIPLE #5

.....

Free-Loading Atheists

Principle #5: *Replace the Idol: Make the Case for Christianity*

1. Dialogue: Imagine a conversation with someone who holds moral relativism or skepticism or some other position that you think of yourself. Create a realistic dialogue in which you show such persons that their behavior contradicts their own worldview, and that in practice they “borrow” from a biblical worldview.

The Confession of Richard Rorty

2. Why does Richard Rorty call himself a “free-loading atheist”? Do you agree that Christianity is the only source of universal rights? Why or why not? (Read endnote 8 for more background.)

3. As you read through the chapter, make a list of the truths that free-loading atheists borrow from Christianity. (Go back to the beginning of the chapter and include any examples you find up to this point.) When you are finished, take one of those truths as an example and make a persuasive case that Christianity provides its only adequate philosophical basis.

4. Dialogue: The text says, “Atheists often denounce Christianity as harsh and negative. But in reality it offers a much more positive view of the human person than any competing religion or worldview. It

is so appealing that adherents of other worldviews keep free-loading the parts they like best.” Drawing on the text, how could you make a positive case for Christianity?

What Makes Science Possible?

5. Dialogue: Write a dialogue making the case that (in the words of Paul Davies) “science can proceed only if the scientist adopts an essentially theological world view.”

An Atheist Decries Humanism

6. Dialogue: Imagine having a conversation with someone who is a “humanist” in John Gray’s definition of the term. Make a persuasive case that his or her high view of human dignity derives from Christianity and is a case of free-loading. (Read endnote 13 for more detail from Gray.)

Nagel: Darwin “Almost Certainly False”

7. Explain the reasons Thomas Nagel gives for “why the materialist neo-Darwinian conception of nature is almost certainly false.”

8. What reasons does Nagel give for rejecting theism? Explain how he is free-loading.

Problems of a “Proud Atheist”

9. Raymond Tallis says that “something rather important about us is left unexplained by evolutionary theory”—or rather, several things.

Choose two things and in your own words tell why they are “left unexplained by evolutionary theory.”

10. Choose an example of “neuro-evolutionary reductionism” (in art, literature, legal theory, philosophy, economics, politics, theology, or any other field), research it, and write a description of its claims. How would you critique those claims?

11. Why does Tallis reject neurotheology as applied to Christianity? Do you think his objection is a good one?

Gimme That Old-Time Philosophy

12. The text describes several examples of atheists who seek to hijack the spiritual and emotional benefits of religion. Choose one, research it in greater depth, and describe how it seeks to make secular ideas fulfill spiritual aspirations.

A Mass for Charles Darwin

13. Define scientism. Explain how it goes beyond anything that science could possibly establish.

14. How does evolution itself sometimes function as a religion? Listen to a segment from “Missa Charles Darwin.” This is the Kyrie eleison (“Lord have mercy”) with words from Darwin substituted: www.gregorywbrown.com/missa-charles-darwin/.

Evolutionary Religion

15. What is Stuart Kauffman’s definition of “God,” and why does he retain the word at all?

16. Summarize Jeremy Rifkin's spiritualist view of evolution. In what way do religious views of evolution give a clue to general revelation?

Losing Faith, Finding God / Bertrand Russell

17. Make two lists, side by side. Based on my personal story, list the consequences of giving up Christianity. On the left, summarize Christian teaching. On the right, summarize the secular view that results when Christianity is given up.

Think of additional consequences of giving up Christianity beyond those mentioned in the text, and add them to your list.

18. Dialogue: Imagine a conversation with someone like I was as a teenager, ready to give up Christianity. Choose some of the consequences described in the text and paraphrase them in your own words. Gently help this person recognize that the consequences of abandoning Christianity are far-reaching, and encourage him or her to think twice about it—as no one did for me!

What Is *Your* Answer?

19. The text says, "When people raise questions about Christianity, often the best response is not to shut them down, but precisely the opposite." Explain why, then choose an example and illustrate what that approach might look like.

Lesson from *To Kill a Mockingbird*

20. The text says that learning other people's worldviews should be motivated by love for them. Readers of *Finding Truth* have told me they had not connected apologetics with love before. Practice explaining to another person why the two are connected.

PART THREE

.....

How Critical Thinking Saves Faith

1. Chesterton wrote that ideas are actually *more* dangerous to the person who has never studied them—that a new idea will “fly to his head like wine to the head of a teetotaler.” Do you agree? Why or why not?

Churched but Not Prepared

2. Summarize in your own words the five strategic principles described in *Finding Truth*.

Principle #1

Principle #2

Principle #3

Principle #4

Principle #5

Stealth Secularism

3. Choose one movement in art or literature, research it, and describe in greater detail the worldview that motivates it. (You can use *Saving Leonardo* for your research.)

What Wags Your Theology?

4. Make a diagram like the one presented here. On the left side, list the names of the theological schools discussed in the text and summarize each one's basic tenets. On the right side, write the philosophy each one was influenced by. Do you know any additional examples of theologies that were influenced by some school of philosophy? If so, explain.

Theological School	Which philosophy helped shape it?

5. Choose one form of liberal theology, research it, and describe in greater detail the philosophy that motivates it.

Critique and Create

6. The text says, "Christians often have a habit of defining themselves by what they are against. Yet to oppose what is wrong, it is most effective to offer something better." Choose an example from the text, or one that you think of yourself, and suggest principles for being a redemptive force in that area of life.

A Total Book for Total Truth

7. All systems of thought are structurally the same: they start with certain foundational assumptions that color everything else. How does that common structure help make sense of Scripture's claim that *all* truth—not just spiritual truth—begins with God?

Crazy Crae: How Do We Break Free?

8. Do you recognize a sacred/secular split in your own thinking?
9. Where did the sacred/secular split come from?
10. What did you appreciate most in the section about Lecrae?

SAMPLE TEST

Total Possible Points: 100

Name: _____

Write short paragraph answers to the following questions.

1. What is Principle #1? (Points: 15)

First state what the principle is. Then explicate it in greater detail.

In your answer, be sure to cover these questions:

- What is an idol, according to Romans 1?
- Give at least one verse from Romans 1 supporting your definition of an idol.
- Give at least 3 examples of worldviews and their idols.
- Use the poem of the blind men and the elephant to illustrate what an idol is.
- Write anything else you think is important for applying Principle #1. (This is where you have a chance to show everything you know beyond what was covered in the questions.)

2. What is Principle #2? (Points: 20)

First state what the principle is. Then explicate it in greater detail.

In your answer, be sure to cover these questions:

- What does the term *reductionism* mean?
- Why do idol-based worldviews lead to reductionism?

- Give a passage from Romans 1 that explains why idols lead to a lower, less humane view of humanity.
- How does the process of reductionism explain why idols lead to treating people badly (the long list of destructive behaviors at the end of Romans 1)?
- Give at least 3 examples of reductionism. In each case, explain what the idol is, and how it leads to reductionism.
- Write anything else you think is important for applying Principle #2.

3. What is Principle #3? (Points: 35)

First state what the principle is. Then explicate it in greater detail. In your answer, be sure to cover these questions:

- What is general revelation?
- How can we use general revelation to test worldviews?
- Why do idol-based worldviews typically get some things right?
- Why do they always get some things wrong? (Use the concept of reductionism in your answer.)
- What do they do with the things they cannot explain?
- How do they lead to dualism—holding two inconsistent and contradictory views?
- Which concept from Romans 1 explains the motivation for creating a dualism?
- Give at least 3 examples of thinkers whose philosophy leads to dualism.

- Write anything else you think is important for applying Principle #3.

4. What is Principle #4? (Points: 20)

First state what the principle is. Then explicate it in greater detail.

In your answer, be sure to cover these questions:

- What does it mean for a worldview to be self-refuting (it is self-referentially absurd, it commits suicide)?
- Why are idol-based worldviews self-refuting?
- Give at least 3 examples of worldviews that are self-refuting.

In each case, explain why.

- How do people try to avoid the problem of self-refuting worldviews? Why doesn't that strategy work?
- Write anything else you think is important for applying Principle #4.

5. What is Principle #5? (Points: 10)

First state what the principle is. Then explicate it in greater detail.

In your answer, be sure to cover these questions:

- Why do so many non-Christians reach over and borrow from Christianity?
- Give at least 3 examples of free-loading.
- How does free-loading suggest a strategic starting point in making a case for Christianity?
- One way to highlight the attractive features of Christianity is to show where secularists borrow from it. Another way is to ask

what you lose when you give it up. Choose at least 2 elements of a Christian worldview and explain the consequences of giving them up.

- Write anything else you think is important for applying Principle #5.