**What You Should Know from TH5 - Philosophical Theology 1**

Lakeside Institute of Theology

1. What is ***philosophy***?
	1. Literally, it is *a love of wisdom* – *phileo* is Greek for “love,” *sophos* means “wisdom.”
	2. Philosophy is the attempt to think rationally and critically about life’s most important questions in order to obtain knowledge and wisdom about them.
2. Why do people tend to have a negative connotation about philosophy?
	1. People wrongly believe you have to be super intelligent to do philosophy.
	2. Many people have become intellectually lazy, and philosophy requires us to think.
	3. Many students have no introduction to philosophy before college – which further encourages the idea that it is an advanced topic for the academically elite.
	4. People do not think it is practical.
	5. People don’t know what it really is, or how it can help them.
3. Why is philosophy important?
	1. Ideas matter. The ideas one believes largely determine the kind of person one becomes.
	2. Philosophy, rightly done, can give us a better worldview.
	3. Philosophy examines assumptions, asks questions, seeks to clarify and analyze concepts, and organizes facts into a rational system – for ALL disciplines.
	4. Philosophy gives us a clearer understanding of life and what is important in life by teaching us to examine our core beliefs and ideas.
	5. Philosophy makes us more human, as it is the exercise of one of the thinks that most distinguishes us as human.
4. What did Socrates mean by his statement, “An unexamined life is not worth living?”
	1. He meant that being able to examine our lives, to analyze and think critically, is necessarily at the core of what it means to be human. Without it, we are little more than beasts.
5. Why is Christian philosophy especially important?
	1. Philosophy has always played a crucial role in the nurture of believers, proclamation of a Christian worldview, and defense of the faith.
	2. Christians in modern times have tended to be anti-intellectual. R.C. Sproul has called this the most anti-intellectual period in the history of the Church. Charles Malik (former Secretary of the UN) warned that the greatest danger facing modern evangelicalism is a lack of cultivation of the mind, especially as it relates to philosophy.
	3. Philosophy asks critical questions about *other* fields of study, so philosophy is the most important discipline for integration of Christian theology with other fields of study.
	4. Philosophy is an aid in the task of **apologetics** – giving a reasoned defense of Christian beliefs in light of objections raised against it.
	5. Philosophy aids in **polemics** – the task of critically analyzing and refuting alternative, non-Christian worldviews.
	6. Philosophy is a **central expression of the image of God in us** – the ability to reason abstractly and critically, especially in areas of ethical and religious issues.
	7. Philosophy permeates and supports **systematic theology**.
	8. Philosophy encourages and facilitates the **spiritual discipline of study** (loving the Lord with our *minds*).
	9. Philosophy enhances the **confidence and boldness** of the Christian community in general.
	10. Philosophy is essential to the task of **integration** between our theological beliefs and other coherent, rational and intellectual perspectives.
6. What do we mean by the term ***metaphysics***?
	* 1. The philosophical study of reality – the origins and purpose of reality; nature of reality and existence; existence and nature of God and his relationship to the rest of reality; nature of humanity, especially what does it mean to be human?
7. What do we mean by the term ***epistemology***?
	1. The philosophical study of knowledge and truth claims – the nature and scope of knowledge; what can we know; how can we know it; how do we obtain knowledge; what *is* truth; how do we verify it; how do we justify truth claims or beliefs.
8. What do we mean by the term ***axiology***, *or* ***value theory***?
	1. The philosophical examination of values – good versus bad; what is right; what is beauty; what is the purpose of art.
9. What is meant by “2nd Order” disciplines of philosophy?
	1. The application of philosophical principles to other disciplines, as a way to gain understanding of foundations and processes within those disciplines – such as philosophy of science, philosophy of religion, philosophy of history, etc.
10. What are the “Laws of Logic,” and why are they important?
	1. They are a set of foundational, rational tools that help us think more clearly.
	2. If these Laws (*or first principles*) of logic are not true, then nothing else can make sense. They are (and must be) inherently self-evident and undeniable, requiring no further proof beyond themselves.
11. What are the three Laws of Logic, how are they represented, and what do they mean?
	1. The 1st Law of Logic is the **Law of Identity**, represented as P=P (or ***P equals P****)* The Law of Identity says something is what it is.  *Or*, that all true propositions are true, and all false propositions are false.
	2. The 2nd Law of Logic is the **Law of Non-Contradiction**, represented as ^(P +^P) or ***NOT (P and not-P)***. The Law of Non-Contradiction says something cannot both be and not be at the same time and in the same respect. *Or*, Something cannot be both true and false at the same time and in the same respect.
	3. The 3rd Law of Logic is the **Law of the Excluded Middle**, represented as P v ^P (or ***Either P or not-P)***. The Law of the Excluded Middle says something either is or it is not; there is no middle option. *Or*, a proposition is either true or false, it cannot be both.

1. What is it that formal logic provides for us?
	1. Logic employs established rules for correct reasoning, and so helps us think more clearly.
2. In formal logic, what is an ***argument***?
	1. A logical ***argument*** is a group of reasons which together achieve a conclusion.
3. What are the components of a logical argument?
	1. ***Premises*** – propositional statements that establish the terms of an argument.
	2. ***Conclusion*** – the final proposition in a logical argument, which is drawn (or *inferred*) from the premises.
	3. ***Inference*** – the evident relationship between the premises and the conclusion in an argument.
4. What can be said to be the central philosophical question of the postmodern age?
	1. “Is anything true?”
5. What is meant by philosophical ***relativism*** and what are its two most popular forms?
	1. ***Relativism***is the idea that all truth is relative; that there is no such thing as absolute truth.
	2. One popular form of relativism is ***subjectivism***, which says that truth is whatever a person decides it is, and all people can therefore be right even when they contradict one another.
	3. A second popular form of relativism is ***conventionalism***, which says truth is merely a social construct define by cultures, rather than by individuals.
6. What is meant by the term ***Objectivism***?
	* 1. ***Objectivism*** is the belief that truth is not merely a matter of subjective or cultural preference, but is a real feature of the world and is independent of what anyone may think about it. (This is consistent with Christianity.)
7. Why can we say that the Relativistic statement “There is no absolute truths!” cannot be true?
	* 1. The statement is ***self-defeating***, as this is a statement of supposed absolute truth, while claiming there are no absolute truths. So it must be false.
		2. Saying (as *subjectivism* does) “There are no absolute truths to me, but this may not be true for you” is ***meaningless*** – it simply does not say anything - there is no propositional content. That is, it’s like saying the sky may or may not be blue – it doesn’t *go* anywhere.
		3. Saying (as *conventionalism* does) “All truth claims are socially conditioned” is exactly like “No absolute truths for me, but this may not be true for you” – it is ***meaningless*** because there is no propositional content.
		4. SO – the Relativist claim that there are no absolute truths is either self-defeating or meaningless, so it must be false that there is no truth. Therefore, there must be such a thing as objective truth.
8. What are the three major philosophical theories about the meaning of ***truth***?
	* 1. ***Correspondence Theory of Truth*** – A proposition is true if and only if it corresponds to the way things actually are. (Note: this is about whether a proposition IS true; not about whether we KNOW it is true. A thing can be true whether we know it is true or not.)
		2. ***Coherence Theory of Truth*** – A proposition is true if and only if it coheres with the set of beliefs that a person holds.
		3. ***Pragmatic Theory of Truth*** – A proposition is true if and only if it is useful to the believer in achieving desirable results.
9. Why do we say we say the ***Correspondence Theory of Truth*** is almost certainly more accurate as a description of true?
	1. Both *Coherence* and *Pragmatic Theories* are completely subjective and so relativistic (allowing for contradictory statements to be subjectively or contextually accepted as truth), and – as we have seen – Relativism is either self-defeating or meaningless.
	2. Christianity holds to the *Correspondence Theory of Truth*.
10. What is philosophical ***Rationalism***?
	1. The belief that all knowledge ultimately comes through reason alone, and not from sense experience.
11. What is philosophical ***Skepticism***?
	1. The philosophical view that we cannot know anything for certain, or that our knowledge is at best very limited.
12. What was Rene Descartes’ famous philosophical statement, and what does it mean?
	1. *“Cognito, ergo sum”* – *“I think, therefore I am.”* In other words, I cannot be deceived unless I exist. The very fact that I am asking philosophical questions requires that I exist.

1. What is meant by philosophical ***Empiricism***?
	1. The belief that all knowledge ultimately arises from sense (or empirical) experience.
2. According to John Locke, what are the two kinds of empirical experience?
	1. ***Sensation*** is our immediate sensory encounter with objects through sight, hearing, touch, smell and taste.
	2. ***Reflection*** is how we combine memories of sensation experiences to create new ideas of things we never actually experienced.

1. What is the ***Representational Theory of Perception***?
	1. The philosophical suggestion that we do not *directly* experience anything in the external world, but instead only experience images or ideas our minds produce to tell us about those objects.

1. Why is Scottish philosopher David Hume (1711-1776) important, and what did he say about knowledge?
	1. An empiricist and radical skeptic, Hume went further than other empiricists to say we can have *no* significant knowledge of the external world. According to Hume, nothing is really *knowable* – we only have impressions *about* things in the world, or logical relations *between ideas* produced by those impressions.
	2. Hume also questioned ***necessary causality*** – the idea that we can reliably predict events based on past experience. He instead insisted that all we can say is that something happened a certain way *in the past*, without any real assurance that – given the same circumstances – the results will be the same in the future.
	3. This all means we can have no metaphysical knowledge – no certain knowledge of reality beyond our own immediate, personal, sense experience. Therefore everything is completely subjective; God is unknowable; there are no absolute *moral* truths; cause-and-effect cannot be predicted; and we cannot be certain of the existence of anything – only that we have an impression of things.
	4. Hume’s skepticism is the logical conclusion of a purely empirical perspective, and is at the core of modern naturalism and skepticism.
2. What is meant by the expression ***propositional knowledge***?
3. Our ability to know whether the contents of a statement are true or false.
4. What is the meaning of ***Justified True Belief*** (or *JTB*, or the “traditional tripartite analysis”) regarding knowledge?
5. The traditional proposal that we have knowledge *if and only if* the proposition in question is true, if we believe it is true, and if we are justified in this belief.
6. What are some of the kinds of questions that ***metaphysics*** (the branch of philosophy concerned with the *nature of reality*) seeks to answer?
7. What is the nature of the world – what is it made of?
8. Is what we see, hear and touch the real world; or is this only the shadow of something else that is more real and significant?
9. Is there reality beyond the physical universe? Is there a God? Are there other spiritual beings? Do humans have a soul that is eternal? Is anything eternal?
10. What is the meaning of ***ontology***?
	1. Ontology is a subset of metaphysics that deals with *being* – that is, what does it mean to exist, or to *be*?

1. What do we mean when we say one of the most basic challenges to metaphysics is to understand “the one and the many” aspect of reality?
	1. The question of how it is that the many *diverse* things in the world seem to be both different, and yet part of *almost universal subsets*? (For example, the many VASTLY DIFFERENT types and sizes of dogs – but all of which are *still* dogs.)
2. What, within the discipline of metaphysics, are the three primary philosophical approaches to explaining the nature of reality?
	1. ***Dualism*** – the belief that reality is made up of TWO fundamental types of things, substances or realms – the imperfect, material realm; and the perfect, spiritual realm. *(Platonism* and *Christianity).*
	2. ***Materialism*** – the belief that all that exists is physical matter, and the fixed laws that govern the behavior of that matter – with no option to believe in the spiritual, whether God, angels, the human soul, etc.
	3. ***Idealism*** – the belief that physical matter does not exist, and that all reality is made up only of ideas that exist in the mind – even if, perhaps, this mind is the Mind of God. *(Berkeley)*
3. Why might we say we believe ***Dualism*** is the most accurate description of the nature of reality?
	1. Dualism seems to provide the most accurate description and best explanation of what we humans experience and can know of reality.
	2. Dualism readily explains *“the one and the many”* – the diversity and constant change in the world, and yet our ability to perceive *classes* (or *categories* or *subsets* or *forms*) of things.
	3. Dualism seems best able to accurately describe both our sensory experiences (color, sound, pain), and the abstract and non-material aspects of our lives (beliefs, desires, emotions).
	4. Dualism supports and grants permission for belief in the non-material world – including belief in God, the human soul (body/soul dualism), life after death, etc.
4. Why has ***Materialism*** become perhaps the dominant approach to the nature of reality in the Western world?
	1. Materialism would *seem* (at least on the surface) to be a simpler explanation for the nature of reality.
	2. Materialism is most consistent with Darwin’s theory of evolution by natural selection, the dominant scientific belief system regarding the origin of life, as both propose that all things are explained as the result of “natural” causes.
	3. Because of the dominant belief in the *progress of science* – that science continues to find explanations for the nature and operation of the universe, and that eventually ALL explanations will be found in the material world (the hypothetical *Theory of Everything* that will link together all the physical aspects of the universe).
5. Why might we – especially as Christians – say we find ***Materialism*** to be untenable?
	1. Materialism does not allow the existence of any non-material beings – so there cannot be a God under materialism beliefs.
	2. Materialism fails exactly where all naturalistic attempts to explain the universe fail – it is logically impossible to believe the universe came from nothing, whether the proposition is that the universe always existed, or that it started as a Big Bang explosion of an extraordinarily dense speck of matter (which came from ???).
	3. Science is unable even to begin to begin to conceive how the physical brain can be *the same* as the human mind, or any other concrete-abstract connection.
	4. Materialism inevitably destroys any belief in or appeal to human moral responsibility, or any moral values of any kind.
	5. The *progress of science* is uncertain at best, and even if science does provide us with an accurate picture of the physical universe, it still would not prove materialism.
	6. Materialism asks us to accept that the only *real* things are in the physical world, without recourse to beliefs or concepts – yet materialism is a belief and a concept, and so asking us to accept it is logically self-defeating.
	7. The dependence of materialism on Darwinian evolution demands that all human faculties and beliefs exist only as a result of natural selection, which means all beliefs are linked to and motivated by our instinct for survival. Since *false* beliefs can contribute to survival as readily as true beliefs, there is as much reason to think belief in materialism is false as to think it is true. So, again, materialism is logically self-defeating.
6. In metaphysics, what is meant by ***essences***, or ***essential properties***?
	1. Those universal properties without which a thing would not exist. (*being a dog*, *being a human*, etc.)
7. In metaphysics, what is meant by ***non-essential***  or ***contingent properties***?
	1. Those properties which are *not* necessary for the existence of a thing. (*having red hair*, *being tall*, etc.)
8. Some metaphysical approaches deny the existence of *essential properties*, saying instead that things are just sums of their *non-essential properties*. Why do we say this belief has ***radical ethical consequences***?
	1. If there are no *essential* differences between a person and a tree, there is no justification for valuing the life of a person over that of a tree.
	2. We see this reflected in our culture – for example, if a fetus does not have an inherent “personhood,” because personhood is *contingent rather than essential*, then there is no ethical reason why it must be treated as a “person” according to social custom.
9. In the Philosophy of Religion, why do we say the question of the existence or non-existence of God affects EVERYTHING else?
	1. If God exists, there are reasons, purposes, meaning and hope attached to human existence.
	2. If God does not exist, everything is random, nothing has ultimate meaning or significance, and there is not reason to hope for anything better.
	3. But believing in God – at least a Christian God – does have its downside, in that it demands accountability.
10. What is the meaning of ***natural theology***?
	1. The belief that God can be known by human reason and experience.
11. What is ***Anselm’s Ontological Argument*** for the existence of God?
	1. A logical argument that the very *idea* of God logically proves His existence. (*“ontological”* means “being” or “existence”)
	2. The Ontological Argument goes like this:

1. I can conceive of a greatest conceivable being (GCB).

2. What is real and concrete (outside my mind) is *greater* than what exists

only in my mind.

3. If the greatest conceivable being exists ONLY in my mind, then it would

*not* be the greatest conceivable being (because I can conceive of the

GCB existing in reality, and *not* just in my mind).

4. Therefore, the greatest conceivable being – by definition – MUST exist in

reality.

1. What is ***Aquinas’ Cosmological Argument*** for the existence of God?
2. The “argument from causation,” suggesting that, since every effect must have a cause, and there cannot logically be an infinite regression of causes, there must be a First Cause (or Prime Mover) which started everything.
3. The Cosmological Argument goes like this:

1. There is an order of causes in the world.

2. Nothing can be the cause of itself.

3. Therefore, everything that is caused must be caused by something else.

4. There cannot be an infinite regression of causes (this leads to logical absurdities and so cannot be the case).

5. Therefore, there MUST be a first, uncaused cause (i.e., God).

1. What is ***Paley’s Teleological Argument*** for the existence of God?
2. The “argument from design,” or “watchmaker argument,” says that the complexity of the world demands belief in a Creator, in the same way that the complexity of a watch demands belief in a watchmaker.
3. The argument goes like this:

1. A watch has many complex parts, works a specific and intentional

function, and is intelligently designed to achieve that function.

2. Similarly, the world has many complex parts, works a specific and intentional function (esp. the sustaining of life), and is intelligently designed to achieve that function.

3. Therefore, there is a very high probability that the world – like the watch – was intelligently designed by a Creator.

1. What is the ***Fine-Tuning Teleological Argument*** for the existence of God?
2. A version of the teleological argument, based on scientific discoveries of “cosmic constants” which have existed since the Big Bang. If the values of the cosmic constants were even *very* slightly different, life on earth would not be possible, such as:

1.  **Rate of Expansion of the Universe**. If this were different by as little as 1/1060 the universe would either have collapsed or would have expanded too rapidly for stars to form.

**2. Strong Nuclear Force**. If the force that binds protons and neutrons together had been even 5% stronger or weaker, life would not have been possible.

**3. Force of Gravity**. If gravity had been stronger or weaker by even 1/1040 then stars which can support life (like our sun) would not have been formed.

1. What is the ***Kalam Cosmological Argument*** for the existence of God?
	1. The argument goes like this:
		1. The universe had a beginning. (To say the universe had no beginning would require an infinite number of past, concrete events – which creates logical absurdities and so is not possible.)
		2. Science now confirms the universe had a beginning.
		3. The beginning of the universe was *caused*. (Something cannot come from nothing. Whatever exists must have some cause for its existence.)
		4. The cause of the beginning of the universe was God. (Given the nature of the universe and the requirements for creation, the cause of the universe would have to have been *transcendent, immutable, immaterial, uncaused, exceedingly powerful, personal/volitional*, and *good/moral.) (Sounds like God…)*
2. What is meant by the term ***Reformed Epistemology***?
	1. ***Reformed epistemology*** proposes that – while we do have strong logical evidence for the existence of God – we also are justified in insisting that belief in God is ***properly basic***to humanity (like visual sight and the other senses, which require no justification), and that those who do not have such belief are broken and blinded (by sin).
3. What are some of the traditional beliefs that have been held about God, describing what God is like?
	1. **Omnipotent** – having the power to do anything that is logically possible; that is, anything that is *not inherently contradictory*.
	2. **Atemporal** – transcending time; that is, not being limited by time, since time is necessarily relative (to space, velocity, mass, etc.), and an absolute God could not be so limited.
	3. **Omniscient** – all-knowing. (Raises the question of how God can know everything, including the future, and yet people still have free will.)
	4. **Impassibility** – Is God affected by outside forces; especially, can God experience emotions?
4. How is the Problem of Evil and Suffering presented as a logical argument against the existence of God?
	1. God is omniscient; He knows all things that are logically possible to know.
	2. God is omnipotent; He is able to do anything that it is logically possible to do.
	3. God is omnibenevolent; He desires to do every good thing that can possibly be done.
	4. If God is omniscient, He is fully aware of all the pain and suffering that occurs.
	5. If God is omnipotent, He is able to prevent all pain and suffering.
	6. If God is omnibenevolent, He would want to prevent all pain and suffering.
	7. **Yet pain and suffering continue**; *therefore*, God is either NOT all knowing, or NOT all-powerful; or NOT all-good; or He doesn’t exist.
5. How does the Christian faith respond to the argument from the Problem of Evil and Suffering?
6. By challenging premises 4, 5, and 6 of the argument, as follows:
	* 1. Premise 4: If God is omniscient, He is fully aware of all the pain and suffering that occurs.
			+ Yes, and God has shown His awareness and His compassion – most especially by sharing in our humanity and suffering through Jesus; and also by limiting the suffering He allows (i.e., Job); and in lessening the suffering by providing healing and comfort, especially by the presence of His Holy Spirit.
7. Premise 5: If God is omnipotent, He is able to prevent all pain and suffering.
	* + - Evil and suffering exist as a direct result of the misuse of human free will. For God to remove all suffering would irrevocably compromise human will and freedom – the consequences of which we cannot even imagine.
8. Premise 6: If God is omnibenevolent, He would want to prevent all pain and suffering.
	* + - God’s benevolence means He desires the greatest good – which *may not* be the immediate relief of suffering. Pain often directs people back to God; people often grow best through suffering; and – again – much of what it means to be freely human seems almost to require the existence of suffering. We simply may not see far enough or clearly enough to understand.
			- This assumes physical suffering is the greatest evil, and stopping it is the greatest good – both of which are wrong. The greatest evil is human rejection of God and His love; and the greatest good is in our returning to Him, to love and serve Him.
			- Our human lives are only a breath in God’s eternity, and God will eventually make all things right in a heaven free from suffering – perhaps even (as C.S. Lewis suggests) to the point of God working retroactively to turn all past suffering into glory.

1. What is meant by the term ***scientism***, and what is the primary reason we belief it is not true?
	1. ***Scientism*** is the extreme view that only what can be empirical verified can be known. (*“If you can’t see, feel or hear something, it doesn’t exist!”)*
	2. ***Scientism*** is self-defeating, because it demands that all knowledge be empirically verified while *the principle itself* *cannot be empirically verified*.
2. What are a few of the ***numerous assumptions*** that science (and all other disciplines) accept as true, but which cannot be empirically verified:
	1. The laws of thought.
	2. The general reliability of sense perception.
	3. The law of causality.
	4. The uniformity of nature.
	5. The existence of values, that support scientific reporting, etc.
3. What are the two fundamental perspectives regarding the relationship of science and truth?
	1. ***Scientific Realism*** is the view that scientific theories properly aim to give a true account of the physical world.
	2. ***Scientific Nonrealism*** insists that science is not ultimately about truth, and is not concerned with providing accurate descriptions of reality.
4. What is ***inductivism***?
	1. The idea that science properly begins by simply observing and gathering data, followed by generalizations about those observations, leading to an hypothesis or theory which explains the data, followed by experiments to test the theory, which produces more data – until the theory is proven either true or false.

1. In the Philosophy of Science, what is meant by the principle of ***falsification***?
	1. The idea that science can (or should be) more in the business of proving what is *false* than proving what is *true*, both because it’s easier to test for falseness than for truth, and in order to make a clear delineation between science and pseudo-sciences, since the latter cannot be verified or falsified.
2. Within Scientific Nonrealism, what is ***instrumentalism***?
	1. The belief that the point of science is in its practical achievements, and not in any effort to demonstrate truth.
3. Why, as Christian, might we say that “a humble Realist” view of science appears to be the best approach?
	1. Given the wondrous things science has accomplished, it’s hard to account for these without believing science more or less describes or corresponds to the physical world, and in that way does represent truth.
	2. But science is also about other things and serves other functions than simply the search for truth; to that extent *nonrealism* has *some* validity.
4. Given that science must necessarily accept the Laws of Nature (gravity, nuclear forces, conservation of matter & energy, thermodynamics, aerodynamics, etc.) as constants, how can this be seen as an argument for the fact that everyone has faith of some kind?
	1. Laws of nature as constants are necessary for life to exist – without gravity, thermodynamics and other laws human life (or any life) would not be possible.
	2. Since natural laws are necessary for human survival, they may be seen as evidence of the existence of a purposeful, intelligent, powerful and benevolent mind at work behind the scenes.
	3. If natural laws are the product of a benevolent God, we can be sure they will continue – meaning that the future will be consistent with the past.
	4. Therefore, given the dependence of science on the assumption of natural laws as constants, it can be seen that rational scientific investigation inherently presupposes reliance upon God, and that all scientific inquiry implicitly demonstrates this faith. **The question is not *whether* scientists exhibits faith, but *what kind of faith* is being exhibited.**
5. What is the meaning of ***Scientific Naturalism***, and what are the two types of Scientific Naturalism?
	1. ***Scientific Naturalism*** is the belief that it is inappropriate and counterproductive to bring theological convictions or beliefs into the practice of science.
	2. ***Metaphysical naturalists*** believe only the physical world exists – no supernatural beings of any kind can exist.
	3. ***Methodological naturalists*** believe science should be practiced without reference to theological concepts (even if the supernatural *does* exist), because the goal of science is to explain natural phenomenon in terms of other natural phenomenon, without recourse to theological premises.
6. What is the meaning of ***Theistic Science***?
	1. The pursuit of science that is willing to take theological considerations into account, while still maintaining a rigorous scientific discipline.
	2. As Alvin Plantinga has said: *“The rational thing is to use all you know in trying to understand a given phenomenon.”*
7. Why might we say that, from a purely practical point of view, ***Theistic Science*** is a better approach to science that ***Scientific Naturalism***?
	1. Properly done, Theistic Science can be and is open to ALL evidence that is found through scientific inquiry, without any presumption of some facts being unacceptable.
	2. Scientific Naturalists, on the other hand, are *by definition* prevented from any consideration of evidence that might suggest non-naturalistic causes*.*