

Christianity versus Skepticism

By Dr. Dallas Burdette

WEBSITE: freedominchrist.net

In our study of Christianity versus Skepticism, we come face-to-face with the reality of God. This chapter sets forth a defense of Christianity in order to elicit commitment to the One who died for us so that we might live for Him. Just a casual reading of Chapter 9 in defense of Christ having died in order that we might live through him deals with history, not mythology. Many individuals profess faith in God, but, at the same time, they live their lives as if God does not exist. This chapter focuses upon a defense of God's creation in order to bring about commitment to Jesus' death for the sins of humanity.

I truly believe that Jesus died that we might live through Him? We, as Christians, often times do not reflect seriously upon the teaching that Jesus died that we might live through Him and for Him. The question that confronts us all is: Is Christianity really and truly real? If so, we need to surrender ourselves to the One who rescued us from the fallen world of humanity. Even though we know the basis of our faith in God, we, sometimes, need to be reminded of the truthfulness of our faith. This reminder should generate greater devotion to the cause of Christ. My objective in adding this chapter as an epilogue to Chapter 9 is to increase our sensitivity to our call from God "in" and "through" Jesus. Hopefully, after reading this chapter, this reflection upon Christianity versus skepticism will cause each of us to contemplate more critically upon the One who died for us so that we might live for Him.

It is not uncommon for believers to live their lives as if God does not exist. We read about God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit. Yet, with all this knowledge about God's intervention on the part of lost humanity, we often are not committed to a life of dedication toward the One who died for us. Have we accepted the message of grace from God? Do we believe that Jesus died for us so that we might live *through* Him and *for* Him? If we have not accepted Christ, we are dead spiritually. Have we neglected God's great salvation offered to us through faith? Are our lives consumed with alcohol, illegal drugs, illicit sex, and the pleasures of the world? Do we place pleasures of the world before God? Where does God fit into our lives? Is Christ first or last in our lives?

It is necessary, so it seems to me, to address God's creation in order to develop our faith and confidence in the One who died for us so that we might be reconciled unto God the Father. These remarks concerning the truthfulness of Christianity are discussed in order to bring about a greater consciousness of the One who died so that we might live *through* Him and *for* Him. This reflection upon Christianity versus skepticism is discussed in order to create faith within us that will cause us to reflect upon our commitment to the One who gave Himself for us. Do we really and truly believe the Genesis account of Creation? Is this failure to believe the account of

creation in the Bible the reason for our ceasing to take action toward the One who died for us so that we might live through Him?

We should learn to reason and to think correctly in analyzing the Christian faith. The church lives in an age of skepticism, an age that denies the Genesis account of Creation and the denial of a Supreme Being. The words of Jesus are just as appropriate for citation for us today as it was in His own day. The Words of Jesus to the hypocrites are still relevant to the world today: “Why don’t you judge for yourselves what is right?” (Luke 12:57). This admonition applies to both believers and unbelievers alike. Peter later reflected the words of Jesus when he wrote: “But in your hearts set apart Christ as Lord. Always **be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have.** But do this with gentleness and respect” (1 Peter 3:15). If the church today had applied this principle of rational thinking, there would not be so many Christians who are lukewarm in their devotion to God. It goes almost without saying that right reason should precede belief itself.

We encounter a dialogue between Paul and unbelievers on Mar’s Hill as recorded by Dr. Luke in the Book of Acts (Acts 17:16-34). There still needs to be exchange of ideas today. Millions today are unconvinced of the Deity of Christ and all that flows from belief in Him—supernatural Conception, Resurrection, and miracles. Thousands upon thousands of so-called Christians are also indifferent toward spiritual things. But this disregard is nothing but unbelief, whether one professes faith in God or not. How can the church deal with such mental inertia, or passivity, when it comes to the defense of the faith? If we, as Christians, wish to win men and women to Christ, we must enter into rational talk as to our belief in God and the Deity of Christ. Numerous individuals today are kept away from the church because of the chilling influences of modern doubt advanced in secular schools and universities. In today’s society, children are taught evolution in the first grade.

As believers, we affirm that unbelief is demonstrably unreasonable. When we, as believers, read books by atheists who deny the creation account in the Book of Genesis, we cannot help but recall the words of Jesus to the religious leaders: “You blind guides! You strain out a gnat but swallow a camel” (Matthew 23:24). Many present-day scientists and teachers strain out a gnat, but, at the same time are willing to swallow a camel. Whatever the difficulties of Christian belief are, we are acutely aware that the difficulties of unbelief are still greater. If we reject Christianity because miracles seem incredible, we must stand in awe at the miracles that unbelief is compelled to assert, which miracles, according to their assertions, are far more incredible. Refusal to accept belief in God and His creation commits us to even greater difficulties. It goes almost without saying that the rejection of Christian truth becomes correspondingly more irrational, or illogical.

Why should we reject the Incarnation brought about by miraculous Conception and the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead by God, and, at the same time, affirm the so-called miracle of the origin of the universe from an atheist’s perspective—nothing created something? Should we reject Christianity because the supernatural in Christianity is burdened with difficulties to the so-called scientific mind? When we take away the supernatural in Christianity, what is left behind is no longer Christianity. If we advance the notion that the supernatural in Christianity is regarded as incredible, it is demonstrably more incredible without the supernatural intervention of Deity. Unbelief on the part of the atheist can only uphold its

objections to Christian miracles by accepting an even greater and grosser miracle—nothing created something. From nothing comes nothing.

As we contemplate this universe, we are conscious that the present universe had a start, or beginning, somewhere. **Should we agree to the miracle of creation by a Creator or should we consent to the so-called greater and all-embracing miracle that some primordial nebulous allowed a multitude of atoms with their inherent forces and energies to create life as it is known today?** In other words, if the primordial nebulous concept is allowed to stand, we wonder how atoms, which stood apart from one another and that were not evenly distributed, could rearrange themselves in such a way that they were able to change the shapeless into the shapely and the simple into the more and more complex until the highest complexity reached its full development of living matter. For us to find staggering difficulties with the biblical creation account and to accept that differentiated atoms created the world as is known today is truly to vault over a mountain and to fall headlong over a straw.

As stated above, many modern scientists and teachers strain out a gnat, but, at the same time, they are willing to swallow a camel. When we come to the universe, we cannot but wonder which is the greater miracle—belief in God or belief that nothing created something. Yes, the greater miracle is to believe that matter made itself, that is to say, nothing created something out of nothing. For us to postulate that atoms—all being exactly alike—proceeded to make themselves into different things, which are entirely different from each other, is incredible. How did atoms develop into Carbon, Hydrogen, Nitrogen, Oxygen, and so on? Did the atoms endow themselves with all these potentialities? We wonder how these original atoms self-differentiated themselves to move into other forms of atoms. Did the atoms rearrange, or revamp, themselves through the function of mindless or unintelligent or brainless chance?

Since the world is made up of atoms, we cannot help but ask the question: did the atoms rework themselves by sheer force or energy through a self-created power, that is to say, through a mindless and senseless and aimless force? Did the unlike come out of the like? Did that which is shapely come out of the shapeless? Did the useful come out of the useless? Finally, did the living come out of the lifeless? Is this marvelous universe with all its beauty and with all its forms of life simply a product of blind chance? When we speak of the differentiation of atoms, we observe the vegetable and animal kingdoms—set apart atoms in observation.

In this world, we perceive order in the arrangement of atoms. Was there no guidance in the arranging of atoms in the creation of the animal and the plant kingdom? Did the blind chance of atoms create men and women as well as all known living creatures on the face of the earth? Can we truthfully postulate, or speculate, that cells separated themselves into the human, vegetable and animal kingdom without any outside guidance? For us to accept this philosophy of blind chance is to swallow a camel (evolution) after straining out a gnat (Christianity with its miracles).

The modern world concept of evolution is an unverifiable assumption of dogmatic beliefs. When we deny God and His creation, we indeed accept outrageous assumptions. In my judgment, the atheistical background is so nonsensical that I find it difficult to see how anyone can put it into words. It is a greater miracle to believe that those haphazard collisions of mindless atoms through aeons of time created male and female, the plant kingdom, and the

animal kingdom. For the evolutionist or atheist to cry out against biblical creation by Deity is to recall the words of Jesus: “You hypocrite, first take the plank out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to remove the speck from your brother’s eye” (Matthew 7:5).

The atheist or agnostic has no answers as to the origin of *homo sapiens*, that is to say, human beings—male and female. Only the inspired Scriptures, given by the Holy Spirit, account for the beginning, or start, of humanity. **A perusal of the literature of unbelievers reveals that they do not distinguish between the animal kingdom and the kingdom of humanity—all are one and the same.** Evolution is the common name assigned to justify such absurdities. Yes, skeptics who deny the existence of God and His supernatural Revelation also disavow, or repudiate, that men and women are privileged beings in this world. There is a confessed ignorance of atheists as they seek to account for the source of matter, the principle of motion in matter, the specific origin of the earth with its unique environment to sustain animal life, plant life, human life, and so on.

The unbeliever has to admit much ignorance and to believe more mysteries than believers. **For the atheist, unbelief is a far greater miracle than belief in the biblical account of creation for the Christian.** The miracle of unbelief is that “nothing” created “something.” This mindset of unbelief is to swallow a camel and strain out a gnat, that is, the belief that God created the heavens and the earth. On planet Earth, how does one account for both male and female in evolution? Did both evolve at the same time as infants or did they both evolve at the same time as full grown male and female?

Were both male and female produced as coordinates with the existence of the earth as infants with no parents? If so, they could not have arrived to maturity. Do infants survive today without care? No! Experience teaches that the first pair must have been adults when they were first ushered into being. For us to deny the plain evidence concerning the survival of infants, we have to suppose, contrary to all experience, that the first pair (male and female) were not the same as the species known today, otherwise they would not have reached adulthood.

The age-old question is still around: which came first the chicken or the egg? We know that the chicken had to exist before the egg. If not, where did the egg come from? Did the acorn, or seed, exist before the tree? In the vegetable kingdom, there had first to be the plant before a seed could fall to the earth. Even in the animal kingdom, there first had to be the male and female in its prime before there could be offspring. Nature cannot now produce a new genus, or classification, in the vegetable kingdom nor produce a new species, or variety, in the animal kingdom. By what rational evidence can it be shown or demonstrated that nature ever had such power? If the first male and female were infants, they could not have reached maturity; they would have perished. We can only conclude that both must have been adults that were created with reason, the ability to speak, and knowledge without experience (fully mature at the time of creation).

How do we account for the idea of God that is so universally known among the various races of the world? How do we account for the motion of matter? How do we account for the earth revolving around the sun? What brought about this action? Some planets have more than one moon—some revolving clockwise (in the same direction as the rotating hands of a clock) and others in the reverse (counterclockwise). How do we account for

this phenomenon? What gives regularity to motion? Why do the planets choose to move in a uniform course, or order?

Another question that confronts everyone concerns the five senses of humanity. How did the five senses come into existence? The five senses are essential for life. Even though some may be lacking in some of the five senses, nevertheless, they must depend upon others who possess these senses in order to survive. How do we account for the eye? How do we account for the sense of smell? How do we account for the sense of hearing? How do we account for the sense of taste? How do we account for the sense of feel?

For us to believe that the five senses created themselves is utterly unthinkable by the powers of human reason. It is unthinkable that they should have issued fortuitously out of a lifeless, mindless, or self-created nebulousity. **The idea that the five senses created themselves can only find a place in the minds of men and women where reason has been dethroned.** I state emphatically that “I am not credulous, or gullible, enough to be an unbeliever.”

The atheist thinks that the five senses just came about through blind and mindless chance. Which is the greater miracle—blind chance or God? There is not one single instance of “blind laws” or “mindless chance” creating anything. Did the blind laws of nature produce the computer, the space craft, the dictionary, the watch, the automobile, the airplane, and so on? If not, why should individuals assert that which is contrary to all experience and observation. If the universe was so irregular at one time, what caused its regularity? **If the atheist or agnostic will reason from effect to cause, he or she will be confounded with an indissolubility of the following questions:** (1) were the first man and woman infants or adults? or (2) was there an acorn or an oak first? If we deal with these questions, we must also deal with other questions. For example, did the first man and woman invent language themselves and then pass this on to their offspring? Or, was there a convention of men and women co-existent who agreed upon names for every thing even before they could speak? It goes almost without saying that no one has ever spoken who was not first spoken to. Atheists are ignorant of the origin of language. Only those who believe in God can account for the origin of language.

Atheists are also ignorant of the origin of matter. Who made me? Where did I come from? Where did memory come from? How does the brain store information? Without memory, life could not function? These are questions that confront the inquiring mind. **The atheists or agnostics have no reason to believe themselves privileged beings in the scale of creation over any creature of the animal kingdom.** According to their philosophy, a human is no better than a bee, a beaver, a dog, a cat, an elephant, an ant, and so on. Is this belief true according to our experiences in life? For instance, do laboratories use live human beings to dissect, or separate into pieces, as they do animals? If not, why not? **Again, how did the first couple know what to eat?** This information had to come directly from special revelation—revelation from Deity. Once Adam and Eve received this kind of data, they were able to narrate the information received by Divine revelation about the origin of things—creation of the universe, the creation of humanity, the creation of the animal kingdom, and the creation of the plant kingdom.

We wonder how the first pair could remember the first time they saw the sun and, at the same time, not be able to know the Author of their existence who had dialogue with both. The Author of their existence revealed Himself to both. In the original state of the first man and the

first woman, they were able to talk with their Creator. The human race, as is well known, is inferior to the animal kingdom in “instinctive powers.” But, on the other hand, men and women are governed by reason, not instinct, which, too, sets a gulf between humanity and the animal kingdom. Remember, whatever the difficulties of Christian belief might be, the difficulties of unbelief are far greater. The rejection of Christian truth is more irrational than Christian belief in the supernatural. The atheistic idea concerning the origin of the universe and humanity is so nonsensical that we find it difficult to put it into words. We find it troublesome to accept that “reason” in human beings and “instinctive powers” in animals originated through the result of blind chance. To accept this kind of philosophy is to swallow a camel after straining out a gnat.

When the first man and the first woman opened their eyes, their reason and senses were at their meridian, or peak, strength. From Adam and Eve, testimony was passed on to each generation concerning the origin of the universe and the existence of God. The ability to rely upon testimony distinguishes and elevates humanity above the brute beast. It goes almost without saying that without testimony there could be no improvability in the world of humanity. Without testimony, both men and women would cease to be progressive beings. In the world of the atheist and the agnostic, we observe readiness or willingness to believe anything that is totally outside the bounds of reason. We, as Christians, are asked to swallow a camel (atheism) instead of straining out a gnat (Christianity). Is it more reasonable to believe that God created something or that nothing created something? Paul writes to the Romans concerning proof for God’s existence. Pay attention to him as he writes with finality concerning proof for God’s existence, which belief should alter our lifestyles:

The wrath of God is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and wickedness of men who suppress the truth by their wickedness,¹⁹ since what may be known about God is plain to them, because God has made it plain to them.²⁰ For since the creation of the world God’s invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse.²¹ For although they knew God, they neither glorified him as God nor gave thanks to him, but their thinking became futile and their foolish hearts were darkened.²² Although they claimed to be wise, they became fools²³ and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images made to look like mortal man and birds and animals and reptiles.²⁴ Therefore God gave them over in the sinful desires of their hearts to sexual impurity for the degrading of their bodies with one another.²⁵ They exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served created things rather than the Creator—who is forever praised. Amen. (Romans 1:18-25)

CHRISTIANITY FOUNDED UPON FACTS

As we approach the subject of Christianity, we confront two different philosophies—Christianity is true or it is false. Is there a way to determine with certainty the truth of Christianity? Is Christianity based upon facts or myths? Is Christianity based upon facts or is it based upon someone’s opinion? What is meant by the word *fact* as it is employed in our quest for the genuineness of the Old Testament as well as the truthfulness of the New Testament? What does the word fact mean? Is our *opinion* the same as *fact*? Is something that exists a fact? If we do not define “fact” correctly, then our understanding concerning the truthfulness of Christianity may be flawed or weak. The following definition of “fact” by *Collins English Dictionary* is helpful in dealing with our exploration into the authenticity, or

realness, of God's dealing with the Jews under Moses and with both Jews and Gentiles during the days of Christ's ministry to the nation of Israel. The word *fact* is defined as: "An event or thing known to have happened or existed. 2. a truth verifiable from experience or observation."¹

Even though the above definition is helpful, we must also analyze carefully the meaning of this word as is frequently summarized by individuals or dictionaries. We must seek to define our terms with awareness, or cautiously. **For example, we should not define the word *fact* as something that exists. For instance, stones, trees, flowers, stars, opinions, and so on exist, but are these substances "facts"? No! A "fact" is something done.** Christianity is based upon facts. Alexander Campbell (1788-1866), in his debate with Robert Owens (1771-1858) in 1829, commented upon the facts of Christianity as the bedrock of the proof of Christianity. He clears away all underbrush of unclear thinking about the word *fact* as he seeks to drive home the point that Christianity is founded upon facts:

As we have advanced thus far toward the true point on which Christianity is founded, I deem it important to aid my opponent by adducing facts, additional to his twelve, in evidence of the verity of the Christian religion. I require the concession of only one postulatam in order to establish the verity of the Christian religion. That postulate I will couch in the following terms: The Christian religion, as well as the Jewish, is founded upon certain matters of fact, it follows that, if these facts be true, the whole system of the Christian religion must be true.²

How do we determine the truthfulness of facts as stated in the Old and New Testament books? How do we know that the Exodus from Egypt actually occurred? How do we know that Jesus truly lived? How do we know that Jesus, in point of fact, rose from the dead three days after His crucifixion? Are there certain criteria that we can rely upon in order to determine the reality, or truth, of the asserted facts as reported in Holy Scripture? Since Moses led the children of Israel out of Egypt (1446 BC) thirty-five hundred years ago and Jesus lived and rose from the dead two thousand years ago, are there undeniable measurements that enable us to determine the faithfulness of the events claimed? Yes! There are four criteria that set forth an irrefutable way to determine the certainty of the facts declared:

1. The facts relied upon were *sensible* facts.
2. The facts were of remarkable *notoriety*.
3. There now exist standing monuments in perpetual *commemoration* of the alleged facts.
4. These existing *commemorative* attestations have continued from the time the asserted events transpired until the present—AD 2009.

What are *sensible* facts? *Sensible* facts are facts that the eyes of the onlooker, or eyewitness, beholds taking place at a given time in history. In addition to the eyes, the other

¹*Collins English Dictionary*, electronic ed., Logos Research Systems, Inc. (Glasgow: HarperCollins, 2000).

²Alexander Campbell and Robert Owen, *The Evidences of Christianity: A Debate Between Robert Owen and Alexander Campbell* (Nashville: McQuiddy Printing Company, 1957, reprint edition), 183. I am deeply indebted to Alexander Campbell for many insights concerning the authenticity, or genuineness, of Christianity. Even though this book is long (504 pages), nevertheless, this book is one of the most informative treatises of the defense of Christianity that I have ever read—four times.

senses also play an important role in establishing the historicity of the facts. In other words, the *sensible* facts must be of such a nature that we are cognizant of through our senses. The writings of the Bible concern facts, not fables, or myths. J. P. Moreland, in his first defense for the Christian faith with Neilson (atheist), tells the story of a young Jewish convert to Christianity. This individual came to saving faith because of his reading the Gospel of Luke from the Greek New Testament. What is significant about this story is that this young man was convinced of the truthfulness of Christianity because Luke's Gospel had a ring of truth. His expertise was in the field of myths. Yet, when he actually read from the "common" Greek, he came to the conclusion that the story of Jesus is real, not mythology. The following citation is taken from this debate:

One more point about the historicity of the New Testament, and then I'll sit down. In my doctoral program, I was walking into the library one day, and I ran across a student who was reading the Septuagint, the Greek Old Testament. I went over to him and I said, "What in the world are you doing?" And he said, "I have a master's degree from Harvard in business, and I have a master's from UCLA in classics, and an undergraduate degree in classics from Harvard. I'm finishing my Ph.D. degree from UCLA in classics, and I was reading the Greek New Testament here recently." He was Jewish, and he went on to say, "I became a committed follower of Jesus of Nazareth. And I just wanted to come over here to USC because I knew there were Christian graduates students studying philosophy." I asked, "How did you become a Christian?" He said, "Dr. Moreland, I have studied myth most of my education. I know the earmarks of myth; that's all I study. My undergraduate training was in mythology; my graduate training has been in mythology. And I was practicing Koine Greek reading the Gospel of Luke, and I got halfway through it, and as a Jew, I said, 'My God, this man really did these things. What am I going to do? This is history. It reads like history. It doesn't read like myth. I know what myth tastes like because all I do is read it, and that is not myth.'"³

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

In the eighteen hundreds, Alexander Campbell addressed the idea of the existence of God in terms of where the idea of God originated. Since everyone has a concept of God, the question is: where did this idea come from? This is the query of Campbell to a group of atheists' publishers, publishers of a magazine called *New Harmony Gazette*.

A PROBLEM

To the Editors of the *New Harmony Gazette*

You think that reason cannot originate the idea of an Eternal First Cause, or that no man could acquire such an idea by the employment of his senses and reason—and you think correctly. You think also that the Bible is not a supernatural revelation—not a revelation from a Deity in any sense. These things premised, gentlemen, I present my problem in the form of a query again.

The Christian idea of an Eternal First Cause uncaused, or of a God, is now in the world, and has been for ages immemorial. You say it could not enter into the world by reason, and it did not enter by

³J. P. Moreland and Kai Nielsen, *Does God Exist: The Great Debate* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1990), 60.

revelation. Now, as you are philosophers and historians, and have all the means of knowing, how did it come into the world?⁴

The Christian idea of an Eternal First Cause uncaused is the only answer for human existence. The question that confronts everyone is: how did men and women come into existence. We know that men and women did not make themselves. If they did not make themselves, then we must ask ourselves the above question: how did men and women come into existence? The answer: God created Adam and Eve. Another question that we are confronted with in our search for God: where did the idea of God come from? The answer: God revealed Himself through supernatural revelation. Neither man nor woman could have originated the concept of God through imagination or reason.

Why? Humanity lives, as stated earlier, in a world of five worlds—seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, and feeling. It is quite evident that human beings could not have invented the idea of God through the five senses. The idea of God had to come from outside the sphere of this world of time and space. **It is through the five senses that we acquire our ideas of the universe;** it is not through the senses that our idea, or concept, of God exists. **Men and women could never, without the aid of Divine Revelation, have originated the idea of Deity.** God revealed Himself to Adam and Eve, and this revelation came to Adam and Eve through direct disclosure from God, not Adam's and Eve's five senses. God's existence had to come to both through direct revelation, not through the five worlds of nature.

After God revealed Himself through direct interaction, we then see God in creation. The five senses, in and of themselves, do not reveal the existence of God by themselves. God had first to reveal Himself through revelation. **Today, all humanity has some concept of God, which notion came through God disclosing Himself to Adam and Eve.** Once God unveiled Himself, mankind is then able to see evidence of God's existence and creation. For example, within the five senses of humanity, we discover design, which design suggests the idea of supreme intelligence. Without the sense of smell, life often times would be destroyed. Next to smell is that of taste. Through the world of taste, one is able to discriminate between that which is agreeable or disagreeable to health.

The Author of nature wisely ordered the locale, or geographical location, of the sense taste. If this sense had been located somewhere else, this world would be valueless to humankind. Within this world of taste, one is also cognizant that saliva is associated with the world of taste. This action enables the tongue to discriminate the qualities of the food, or substance, as pleasing or displeasing. **Feeling** is another world of humanity that exhibits design in creation. We, through this sense, are able to determine the roughness, smoothness, hardness, softness, coolness, hotness, and so on, of objects, which ability is essential to our well being. If we were born without these three avenues of intelligence, these three worlds would be closed and we would remain forever in ignorance. Without these three worlds, we could never originate the idea of material tangibility, that is to say, something that is sensible, touchable, verifiable, graspable, well-rounded, and so on.

⁴Alexander Campbell, *The Evidences of Christianity: A Debate Between Robert Owen, of New Lanark, Scotland and Alexander Campbell, President of Bethany college, VA*—Held in Cincinnati, Ohio, in April 1829—(reprinted—Nashville: McQuiddy Printing Co, 1957), 123.

The fourth world of the five senses is **hearing**. With this faculty, we are able to discriminate vibrations and motions of the air. Every impression made upon the outward ear reaches the middle ear. If one is born deaf, that person has no idea of the nature of sound; therefore, this one cannot learn the art of speaking. One who is deficient of this world of hearing cannot communicate his or her ideas to others. Finally, the fifth world is **seeing**. This world is one of the most perfect and delightful of all senses. This is the avenue of intelligence through which all our ideas of color, magnitude, and distance are derived. The impressions made upon this sense reach the sensorium, or brain, through the optic nerve. Our ideas of colors, sounds, odors, tastes, and touch are derived through these five senses.

This study of the five senses is important in answering the question: where did the idea of God come from? It is obvious that there is nothing in the five senses that could have revealed God without God first having revealed Himself through Divine Revelation. We could not acquire such knowledge without revelation from God. It would be just as rational to talk of seeing by the hand, or hearing by the tongue, as for us to talk of knowing God without a communication from God Himself. What is revelation? Revelation cannot be applied to anything done upon the earth.

Revelation is a communication of something that the person to whom it is revealed did not know before. **Revelation is supernatural.** It means Divine communication concerning spiritual and eternal things—a knowledge that we could never have attained by the exercise of our own reason upon material, or sensible, objects. **The human intellect has no creative powers. It can only rearrange in new images the data already received through the world of senses.** The world of spirits is outside our world of five senses.

Another endowment, or special capacity, of humanity is the faculty of speech. **Where did the ability to speak come from?** No one has ever spoken who was not first spoken to. Language is purely an imitative thing. How do infants learn to speak? Do they speak as naturally as they see or smell? The answer is no! Speech is the result of training; it is an imitative faculty of men and women. Without God, the Divine instructor, one could not have communicated to others. God first spoke to Adam and Eve, and this ability has been passed on to mankind through copying, or echoing, speech patterns. Speech, like faith, comes by the ear. Whatever comes by the ear is derived; therefore, human language is acquired. Human language is not natural.

There must be the existence of something before one can assign a name. In other words, the idea of anything must necessarily be prior to the invention of a name for it. Why is this concept important? All nations have had a mental impression of Deity before the word *God*, in their respective languages, could have been invented. For example, the word *steamboat* did not exist prior to steamboats. So it is in the spiritual realm. For example, words such as God, Spirit, altar, priest, and sacrifice are common words to mankind. How were these words, or names, derived by men and women? All these conceptions must have existed previously to the invention of names to express them. Speech is as legitimately the subject of Divine Revelation as religion itself, both came from God.

CONCLUSION

It is time that we, as members of the body of Christ, reexamine the truthfulness of Christianity. Hopefully, this investigation of Christianity versus skepticism will assist us in escaping what I call “practical atheism.” Practical atheism is one’s failure to live for God in his or her daily life. Another name for practical atheism is “lukewarmness,” which is the sin for which Jesus rebuked the church in Laodicea (Revelation 3:14-22). As believers in Christ, we must cooperate with the grace of God. If our faith does not issue in good works, our faith is not biblical faith. True faith is commitment to His teachings. Biblical faith does not exempt us from good works. In our acceptance of Christ through baptism, we determined to leave the old life and enter upon the new life.

Did the universe create itself out of nothing? Did nothing create something? Did our five senses come from chance? Did the blind laws of nature create the computer, the space craft, the dictionary, the watch, the automobile, or the airplane? Did the atoms develop into Carbon, Hydrogen, Nitrogen, and Oxygen? Did the atoms endow themselves with all these potentialities? Did the atoms rearrange, or revamp, themselves through the function of mindless or unintelligent or brainless chance? The answer to all these questions is NO! **The biblical account says, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth” (Genesis 1:1).** We have a choice. We can swallow a camel (atheism) or strain at a gnat (Christianity). Which is the greater miracle: (1) nothing created something, or (2) God created matter?