

## Session 1: Skepticism Or Faith: Which Is Reasonable?

### 1. The Anatomy of Skepticism:

Skepticism by design is a poorly conceived \_\_\_\_\_.

The central premise of all skeptical inquiry is the \_\_\_\_\_ of belief  
apart from (or in the face of) \_\_\_\_\_ verifiable proof.

But is the premise true?

### 2. The Problem of Skepticism: The Failure of Internal Critique.

Skepticism holds that we prove everything to be true based upon a process of  
\_\_\_\_\_ verification.

The Skeptic's thesis in all cases would be \_\_\_\_\_ is true because \_\_\_\_\_ is the proof.

Key Example: \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_.

T is true because \_\_\_\_\_ is the proof.

M is true because \_\_\_\_\_ is the proof.

E is true because \_\_\_\_\_ is the proof.

Z is true because \_\_\_\_\_ is the proof.

R is true because...

Example Reversal:

Z is uncertain because \_\_\_\_\_ can't be proven.

E is uncertain because \_\_\_\_\_ can't be proven.

M is uncertain because \_\_\_\_\_ can't be proven.

T is uncertain because \_\_\_\_\_ can't be proven.

It is \_\_\_\_\_ to independently verify the existence of anything!

"There is no model-independent test of reality, [by which we can independently verify the existence of anything]." (The Grand Design; brackets mine)

### 3. The Skeleton in The Skeptic's Closet:

We don't \_\_\_\_\_ to believe. We \_\_\_\_\_ to prove.

#### 4. The Skeptic's Trilemma.

A. The \_\_\_\_\_ Regress. [The Problem of Inifinitism]

"Even in the absence of a strongly satisfying explanation [for the origin of the universe]...we are not justified in inferring [intelligent] design as the best explanation, for...then a new problem arises, namely, who designed the designer?"  
(The God Delusion)

"If God made the world than \_\_\_\_\_ made God?"

If everything, including God, has a maker, than it would take an \_\_\_\_\_ number of God's to create our world.

"Someone made the God who made the God who made the God who made God who made the God who made the God...[ad infinitum]...who made the world."

B. The \_\_\_\_\_ Argument. [The Problem of Coherentism]

The skeptic assumes that:

T is true because M is the proof. M is true because E is the proof. E is true because Z is the proof. Z is true because R is the proof. R is true because Z is the proof.

Excursis: The Skeptic's Secret Weapon: Always Ask Why.

The Skeptic knows that in order to win the argument, all he/she must do is keep asking why, so as to force the opponent into an infinite regress.

"Light has come into the world, but people loved darkness instead of light because their deeds were evil." (John 3:19; NIV)

C. The Skeptic's Trilemma Concluded: The Axiomatic Argument.

Axiom (Definition): A self-evident, irreducible prime.

The skeptic must \_\_\_\_\_ to some kind of acceptable premise upon which he bases all his arguments.

These would be things that the skeptic \_\_\_\_\_ not to question.

## 5: Session Summary:

### *Key Thesis:*

Skepticism holds that contingent proposition \_\_\_\_ is proven by \_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_ is proven by \_\_\_\_, and so forth extending to \_\_\_\_.

However, once \_\_\_\_ is reached, we become faced the aforementioned Trilemma. In this event, either:

- \_\_\_\_ is true because \_\_\_\_ is the proof. (*Infinitism*)
- \_\_\_\_ is true because \_\_\_\_ is the proof. (*Coherentism*)
- \_\_\_\_ is true because \_\_\_\_ is the proof. (*Foundationalism*)

### *Remarks:*

Infinitism cannot possibly be right. For taken into its logical conclusion, it holds that nothing is ultimately probative.

Coherentism holds that rather than continuing our regress of proofs, we argue that our proofs are coherent with each other. Notice above that the last proof simply affirms its adjacent member. We have thereby asserted that coherence rather than independence is to be favored when settling a matter as probative.

Finally, Foundationalism holds that there must be certain things we choose not to prove. For if we don't choose something not to question, then the first two problems cannot be reasonably avoided and ultimately, nothing is probative. "Surely that absurd," the Foundationalist argues. "We must choose something to rest our arguments upon."

## 6. Conclusion:

In the final analysis, Coherentism and Foundationalism can assume two forms:

Coherentism can either argue that:

- Members \_\_\_\_\_ together warrant a proof of Z.
- The warrant for “Z” is passed like a basketball between\_\_\_\_\_.

Foundationalism can either argue that:

- We presuppose that \_\_\_\_\_ doesn’t need to be proven.
- We show that \_\_\_\_\_ may be axiomatically proven.

What is the difference between an axiom and a presupposition?

- A presupposition is blindly assumed.
- An axiom is a self-evident irreducible prime.

That is, it is something which cannot be reasonably disproven. (example:  $a + b = b + a$ )

So what does Christianity choose?

*Axiomatic Foundationalism!*

Session Answers:

1. System
2. Suspension, independently
3. Independent
4. X, Y
5. T, M, E, Z, R
6. M, E, Z, R
7. R, Z, E, M
8. Impossible
9. Prove, believe
10. Infinite
11. What
12. Infinite
13. Circular
14. Assent
15. Chooses
16. A, B, B, C, Z.
17. Z
18. Z, A1
19. Z, Y
20. Z, Z
21. A thru Y
22. A thru Z
23. Z
24. Z