

James White, True Bible Apologist versus William Lane Craig, PART 2

sermonaudio.com

By Larry Wessels

Bible Text: John 14:6; Jude 3
Preached on: Wednesday, November 18, 2020

Christian Answers of Austin, Texas
9009 Martha's Drive
Austin, TX 78717

Website: www.biblequery.org
Online Sermons: www.sermonaudio.com/christiananswers

James White. Two articles that I see. Well, the first was from William Lane Craig, April 14, 2019. Reasonable faith number 626. We don't believe in Christ because we believe in the Bible. No, Andy Stanley did not write this, William Lane Craig did but we've been saying for a long time Andy Stanley is just simply following after that apologetic methodology that is very popular. I have criticized it many times and we will continue to do so and that will keep us from being invited to a lot of places but there's nothing we can do about it because it's just unbiblical and corrosive to the Christian faith. So I'm going to continue to say what I've said and people keep saying we need to debate Dr. Craig on that. I stand ready but he's the one who won't do it. So don't talk to me about that.

And so, here's, hello Dr. Craig. "I appreciate your work. I'm going through Defender podcasts. I enjoyed your interview with Eric Jonas of Grace Evangelical Free in January, 2019. In that interview you said we believe in the Bible because we believe in Christ, we do not believe in Christ because we believe in the Bible. Can you explain what you meant by that statement." It sounds like an Andy Stanley statement. "Sure," he says. "What I'm expressing in a pithy way by this [unintelligible] which is not original to me is that in order to rationally believe in Christ as Savior and Lord," and just stop right there. What does rationally believe in Christ as Savior and Lord mean if you don't know what Christ means because that's a biblical term? That's the Hebrew term Mashiach translated into Greek. It means the anointed one. There is an entire theology behind that that must be there to even explain what Christ means. It has to come from the Bible and the Bible has to be consistent with itself for you to even know what the very first word of the object of faith is, right? Or do you just assume it? "Believe in Christ as Savior," again Savior from what? How? In what context? Words are supposed to have meaning. There has to be a source to those meanings. "And Lord," ditto, same thing even more. Hey, at least I'm glad he said Lord. A lot of people wouldn't even say that. "You need not embrace biblical inspiration or inerrancy." Oh, okay, so to rationally believe in this lengthy descriptor of who Jesus is, all of which is derived from an interpretation of the text of Scripture, you don't have to believe in biblical inspiration or inerrancy.

"So," and here's, again, we've covered this a million times before, we're covering it again because it keeps coming up, it's vitally important and we have new listeners all the time. "So long as the New Testament documents are sufficiently reliable to establish the

historicity of Jesus' radical personal claims and the historicity of his crucifixion, burial, empty tomb, postmortem appearances and the origin of the disciples' belief in his resurrection, then you are warranted by the evidence in believing that Jesus rose from the dead and so was who he claimed to be, that suffices for a Christian commitment."

Okay, now I appreciate having a nice, pithy, short description of what is absolutely indefensible. It's so assumes a body of definitional language and revelation that it stands as its own self-refutation. I mean, think about it. So if you have, and who gets to determine sufficiently reliable, not inerrant, not even God speaking, they're just historical documents. The problem here is, you know, I see how this works in people who don't read a lot of historical documents, but years ago I debated Dr. Price who likewise reads all sorts of historical documents and then brings them up as examples of why Christianity isn't unique or shouldn't be believed. And so, you know, if all you've ever read is portions of the New Testament as far as works of antiquity, then I guess I could see how you might buy into something like this, but there are all sorts of religious writings out there and all sorts of people who make claims for themselves.

Can you imagine Dr. Craig accepting the argumentation that, "Well, as long as the Koran and Hadith are historically, are reliable enough to establish the historical claims that Mohammad made, then that's a sufficient ground for believing he was a prophet of God." Why not? Why not? And then once you believe that Mohammad was a prophet of God, then you accept the Koran and you go, you're a Muslim, right? Why not? There have been all sorts of folks who have made claims like this.

Today we have an entire cadre of young William Lane Craig wannabes who have embraced the mere Christianity model, that Christianity can be boiled down to sort of the Trinity, the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus, and some kind of generic supernaturalism, and so you minimize the target and you get your historical minimal facts arguments together and you get your cosmological argument all tuned up and ready to go, and off you go to war. We have criticized this movement many many times and we've been very consistent over the decades of saying that's not enough because that's not apostolic, that's not what the apostles did. That wasn't the apostolic message. The apostolic message was never a bare theism, it was never a classical theism. Not only was it a Trinitarian theism, it was a theism that involved God in time, so much so that Paul after only a short number of sentences in speaking to the Athenian philosophers informed them that God would judge them by a man whom he had appointed, a man whom he had raised from the dead which ended his sermon very quickly. The point was that the gospel and what Christ did, not just, the irony of the mere Christianity movement is that you can absolutely insist that Christ had to have been crucified and risen from the dead but you can't tell anybody what that actually means. It means he was a special person unlike anybody else but you can't tell anybody that that death, burial and resurrection actually accomplishes anything because that gets you into the gospel and there's just too many differences of opinion and so we're just not going to go there.

So there are a lot of, what I'm saying is I am very concerned about the spiritual health of a lot of what calls itself Christian apologetics in the United States today, and this is true

not only for those who just want to sort of do the atheist, theist thing over and over and over and over and over again, but for those involved in ministry to Muslims, for example. There are many who are excellent at going after the Koran or going after Mohammad and talking about the Hadith and everything else, but when it comes to gospel, when it comes to the message of life that must be delivered to the Muslim people, that which will actually set them free, all of a sudden not so clear, not so compelling at all.

Larry Wessels. Our subject today is on a person who is supposed to be, has been proclaimed to be by a lot of people, maybe not everybody, I'm one of those people that don't say he's the number one Christian apologist in the world but a lot of people would agree with that. I think the number one Christian apologist in the world is Dr. James White of Alpha & Omega Ministries based out of Phoenix, Arizona, and I'll have a little information about that as you can see, but our real subject today is not about him, it's about William Lane Craig [unintelligible] ministry, and you can see on your screen we have a Wikipedia profile here of William Lane Craig and he has a website called Reasonable Faith, defending biblical Christianity. Now I think that's kind of a contradiction but anyway, we'll explain that later as we get into it. But it talks about Reasonable Faith provides a Christian perspective on the most important issues, find a deep library of resources featuring the work of Dr. William Lane Craig. You can see his picture there and on the following pages you have a lot of background information, institutions, other people mentioned, sort of like Dr. Norman Geisler and so forth. And then on this third page you see his life and career. I'm not going to read all that but if you want to freeze frame your YouTube screen, you can read all about his theological background and profile. It's all right there.

So this is the person we're going to discuss, and as I said, he has been proclaimed as the number one Christian apologist in the world, and Rob and myself are going to delve into is that really true, and then we're going to get into what is William Lane Craig actually saying. Is he really defending biblical Christianity or is he defending something else? Is he really proclaiming the biblical gospel or is he proclaiming something else? We want to find out what this man teaches and what he says.

James White. Remember, William Lane Craig is Christologically weak. I mean, heretical in being some of his rejections of certain things.

Larry. He says that William Lane Craig is heretical. He is heretical. Now Rob, what does the word "heretical" mean?

Rob Zins. Well, the word "heretical" means that the teachings and thought patterns and propositions set forth by a philosopher or a theologian are not in line or do not represent what the Bible actually teaches, so they are not, they're more than unorthodox, they are heretical, they're contrary to the teachings of Scripture.

Larry. So would you say when you see references in the Scripture that refer to false prophets, would you consider false prophets to be heretical?

Rob. False prophets are heretical. Their proclamations are heretical because they're false, they're not true. Anything that's not true is a heresy. Anything that is pressed as truth that isn't truth is a heresy.

Larry. Right. Now we wouldn't, you know, at least, I've been doing Christian ministry and apologetics since 1981. It's been a while. I got saved in 1981 but before the year was even out, I was already doing apologetics and Walter Martin's ministry and all that stuff, but I've got other videos on that subject. But anyway, I have learned over all those years, I guess that makes me at the time of this recording in the faith as a born again Christian for 38 years. So in fact, it's interesting, I just turned 62 the other day when we did some other videos, and I just passed Walter Martin. Walter Martin made it to 61, you see, and I made it to 62 already so he was a big mentor for me in Christian apologetics. And I had the same feeling when I turned 59 because at 59 Charles Haddon Spurgeon died at 58, and I was going, "Wow, I've already made it past Spurgeon, and now I've made it past Walter Martin." You know, and it's sort of like it's kind of one of those things, you know, and they're in glory right now. I'm looking forward to seeing them whenever kind of my time is over with with Jacob's ladder.

But anyway, having done apologetics in Christianity for so long, closing in on 40 years as a true born again Christian, I have learned that when it comes to false prophets and heresies, there's kind of a difference between some heresies you can have but they aren't critical to your salvation, but then there's other heresies that are like damnable heresies like we find in Galatians 1:6-9. You can have a damnable heresy where if you add something to the gospel or you change the gospel, well, that's a damnable heresy, you go to hell for that. But there's other things where you can be wrong maybe about headcoverings or, you know, some of the lesser things, you could be actually heretical a little bit on some of these more minor issues and it's not going to cost you your soul.

Rob. Right. Normally you wouldn't use the word "heresy" for differences of opinion that are what Luther called adiaphora. For instance, Paul writes in Romans 14 that there are going to be disagreements in the body of Christ over issues that are not of significant importance, and I like that chapter in Romans because so many churches seem to collapse or split or get all bent out of shape over...

Larry. Minor issues.

Rob. ...minor issues and all they need to do is put an invisible box in the back of the church and label it with invisible ink, Romans 14, and every time some of these issues come up that we don't fully understand or can't fully press on the conscience of a Christian, just toss it in the box and then go on with the things that we do understand. So normally heresy is reserved for an out-and-out denial of obvious biblical truth that has significant importance.

Larry. When it comes to salvation.

Rob. Oh, especially salvation, or when it comes to what is the word of God. The Bible alone, for instance, as the only word of God and justification by faith alone, in Christ alone, as the essence of the gospel. We don't negotiate those kinds of things away and you can't say of the important matters that it's okay for good men to disagree. It's not okay to disagree on these matters otherwise the whole central teaching of Christianity would collapse in ruins if we would allow contrary opinions the same level of importance.

Larry. It's sort of like, in a sense, eschatology. I don't really make a big deal with the premillennial dispensationalists as opposed to amillennialism or any of that. Just talk the different views and things like that but I'm not... About the only one I would fight with on that front would be these full preterists, you know? But outside of them, to me you can disagree with me on my eschatological views and I can still....

Rob. Right. You're old enough to remember back in the late '70s, early 80's when speaking in tongues was all the rage and I never could understand why that was such a huge deal in the body of Christ for two reasons. 1. It's the least of all the gifts. You really want to fight over this?

Larry. That's what the Scripture says.

Rob. And the second thing is Paul said, "I'd rather speak five words with my mind than 10,000 with a tongue." That puts it in its place. So those people who are trying to get other people to speak in tongues and they were pushing it so hard that it split churches, I would say that's a heretical idea to do that. Whether speaking in tongues is with us yet today or if it has ceased, that's not going to crush anybody.

Larry. Well, what's interesting about you bringing that issue up is that we have already done a seven part series, it's hours long, on the blasphemous Pentecostal and Charismatic mayhem, and it's getting a lot of views, by the way.

Rob. The implications....

Larry. A lot of that we talk about in that series, those are damnable heresies.

Rob. They are. They are.

Larry. And we get into all that, so anyone that wants to get more into that issue like Rob just brought up and the series that we've done, go to that series and you can see it on your screen, we're putting it on the screen so you could access it on YouTube and watch that whole seven part series. It's there.

Rob. And it's good to differentiate. So if I come to you and I say, "Larry, I speak in tongues," and you say to me, "Well, that's good, Rob. I hope that edifies the body of Christ." And I say to you, "Larry, if you don't speak in tongues, you can't be saved." Now we've crossed over. Now we've crossed into heresy.

Larry. And you know that because of Galatians 1 with the circumcision argument.

Rob. Exactly. Exactly. It becomes heresy when it's pressed into a doctrine that violates the central doctrines of Scripture.

Larry. Okay, now with all that said to kind of set the table, let me play William Lane Craig with his own voice. It's only about one minute worth of clips here but he says a lot in that one minute of clips. Now there's going to be a lot more clips of William Lane Craig coming up later in this show but for just to start the show, I want to hear, I want everybody to hear him out of his own mouth say a bunch of stuff and then I'm going to have you start to make comments on what you hear.

Rob. Okay.

Larry. So here we go.

[audio clip]

William Lane Craig. I encourage unbelievers not to think of the Bible as divinely inspired.

Over 50% of Evangelical pastors think that the world is less than 10,000 years old. Now when you think about that, Kevin, that is just hugely embarrassing.

We're not arguing for Christianity tonight. I don't present an argument on Christianity or even for the God of the Bible.

Over half of our ministers really believe that the universe is only around 10,000 years old. This is just scientifically, it's nonsense.

You ought to rejoice in my arguments and I can just say this, I'm going to be a theist but I'm not going to be a biblical theist.

We're not trying to disprove Allah's existence. We are arguing for a generic monotheism that is affirmed by Jews, Christians, Muslims, deists, and theists of any sort.

"Are you certain that God exists?" No. "Good." "Are you certain that God exists?" No. "Good." "Are you certain that God exists?" No. "Good."

"...he is a double-minded man, unstable in all his ways," James 1:8.

[end of clip]

Larry. Anyway, there's a little collage of different things that Dr. Craig said. You know, it's embarrassing to think the earth is young because that would, basically that would

correlate with what the Bible is talking about. But he's into, you know, long ages of earth, evolution, and things of that nature. He doesn't encourage anybody to believe in biblical inerrancy. He's not trying to show to anybody that the Bible is inspired. You know, all those things you just heard. So would you like to make some comments on any of what you just heard?

Rob. Well, normally when theologians or apologists begin to go down this road, they have read too much of the scientific data and not enough of the Scripture. Now Christians believe that the Bible is supernaturally given to us by God through the inspiration of authors over a long period of time and it contains truth, it doesn't contain error. So Christians are committed to the revelation of God as being truthful. Now if the Bible taught that the earth was a million years old or two million years old, and we were certain that it was that old from the word of God, then perhaps we could talk about an old earth but the Bible doesn't. The data from the Bible suggests a young earth. So when he says it's embarrassing to hold to a young earth model, he's tipping his hand because he thinks that science has proven it to be an old earth and that's not factual. But he's also tipped his hand in another way. He's saying that God is incapable of creating the world in a short period of time. He doesn't like that idea. Why doesn't he like that idea? Probably because scientific data is overwhelming, the simplicity of the scriptural account of Genesis and the creation of the universe.

But what struck me, Larry, in the things that he was saying was when he said we are not trying to prove the Christian God, we're trying to prove a generic God. Okay, now when Jim White, who is a friend of mine, talks about this sort of thing, I'm sure that he would jump all over this. There are two schools of thought when it comes to apologetics. The first school of thought is called the evidentialist school of thought. The idea is that you have to bring somebody along and get them to believe that there is a god before you ever have any hope of convincing them that there is the God, which would be the God of Scripture.

Larry. So a process of getting them to a place of salvation in increments.

Rob. Right. Getting them to a place because in their minds the unbelievers mind can be convinced that there is a god, and once you've got them to believe there is a god, then you're going to get them to believe that there is the God, the God of Scripture. Now the problem with that, of course, is all the evidence in the world will not be able to unearth this fine mind of the unbeliever. It's not a matter of mind, it's a matter of heart, soul, spirit. It's a matter of being dead to spiritual things. The Bible is very clear that the natural man, that is, the man that doesn't believe in the God of Scripture does not understand the things of the Spirit of God. He is unable to do so.

Larry. That's 1 Corinthians 2:14.

Rob. Right. He is unable to do so. So if you're going to pile evidence upon evidence upon evidence and he's still never going to understand. And as Jim White mentioned in his response tape...

Larry. By the way, I wanted to mention to the viewing audience that you really are a friend of his because you did a debate with him against two Roman Catholic apologists at Boston College.

Rob. We did.

Larry. And we're showing on the screen right now just the screen graphic of that, it's in two parts, that was a long debate...

Rob. Right, it was.

Larry. ...you and James White had. And so, viewers at home, if you want to check out Rob and James White's debate with these Roman Catholic apologists, I think Sungenis was one of them, Butler, I think was the other, y'all did a great job dealing with those guys. But anyway, I digress. Go back to your point.

Rob. Well, I'm sure James would agree with me on this whole idea that evidence can convince a person to believe in the God of the Bible. It's simply not true. You might be able to convince somebody that there is some sort of god out there but what have you done? You've done nothing.

Larry. Right, you're still going to go to hell.

Rob. You might be able to... and you don't have to convince a Muslim that there is a god out there. You don't have to convince a lot of these cult religions that there is a god out there, they already do. Try to get them to believe in the God of the Bible. You're not going to be able to do that unless God opens their eyes to see, gives them eyes to see and ears to hear. So this whole evidentialist camp is working under the assumption that if we give them more education, give them more terminology, kind of side with them a little bit on the theological data that we think they would appreciate and kind of be in the same camp with, then we can get them to God, and the Bible says that's nonsense. That's foolishness.

Larry. You know, I can almost prove that in a way. Back in 1985, I spent with a co-worker of this night job I have, out in the parking lot after work five hours I sat out there which was summertime, and I was sitting here and the sun is over on this side of the side of me. I'll never forget that because after five hours out in that Texas sun in a parking lot, I'm preaching myself until I'm blue in the face, answering all his atheistic questions, he was an atheist, and giving him a pile of information, you know, and when after it was over and I came home, I looked in the mirror and half my side, the side of my face that was facing the sun was sunburned.

Rob. Sunburned, right.

Larry. And I had almost kind of red and white looking at my face. But I spent five hours with this guy and at the end, in spite of all the evidence, answering all his questions and everything, it was still the same. He was no different than before. So from pure experience, apologist, and I was kind of back then I was more into the evidential side of it because of Josh McDowell, you know, "Evidence that demands a verdict," and all that kind of stuff.

Rob. Think about the nation of Israel. No one was more committed to monotheism, no one was more committed to the fact that there is a God and they still are. No one is more committed than they are to the God of Israel, Yahweh. No one is more committed to the idea of a God and yet you still cannot get them from their concept of God to the God of the rest of Scripture because they reject Jesus Christ as the Incarnate God.

Larry. Viewers that want to know more about that, see Rob and I's video that we did on the Jewish Talmud. And as you described the Talmud, it was enlightening to me just to see the layer upon layer upon layer upon layer, 12,000 pages, whatever, just obscure the actual word of God which came from Moses. Everything else is just from simple men and it obscures everything.

Rob. Right. And if Dr. Craig would be more careful with Scripture, he might become a presuppositionalist. This is the school of thought that says you can't believe unless God opens your heart.

Larry. But what we found about Dr. Craig over the decades is that he doesn't seem to be interested in doing any study on anything that opposes what he already believes. And that's been the problem. You see, if you don't, if you attack other people or say certain things without studying what they believe or without studying to find out why they believe it. You see, I never go into a debate, we're both debaters, we've been in all kinds of debates with people of other religions and so forth, I usually try to know more about their religion than they know themselves before I go into a debate. But Dr. Craig doesn't seem to be interested in it somehow. He knows all about atheism because all he's arguing for is a generic god...

Rob. Generic god, right.

Larry. So he's just trying to show that the atheist position is wrong but he's not proving the Christian God at all which is going back to your point that you started with. So it's worthless in the end.

Rob. Yeah. It's surprising to hear these comments made by Dr. Craig because you would think somebody who has a degree in theology and has studied the Scriptures evidently would come out with this sort of stuff. So somewhere along the way he got on another bus and that bus is headed nowhere.

Larry. That's exactly right. In fact, what you just said, Rob, there's a site I'd like everybody, people can see it on their screen right now. It's an excellent website called

"Monergism." And you can go to that site and I've got it cued up here for where I'd like you to go look in relation what Rob is talking about. We have here "Serious errors in Dr. William Lane Craig's positions on the Trinity and the Incarnation." And you can see a whole list here underneath. For the sake of time, y'all can see it there yourselves but you've got all these articles, you know, proving that Dr. William Lane Craig has not done his homework and so he's got serious errors on what the biblical doctrine of the Trinity is. He's got serious errors on what he thinks the Incarnation is. And you see, that's start getting into the idea of possibly affecting salvific doctrines that determine your eternal destiny. If you get the doctrine of God wrong, well, that's a damnable heresy. You can't be wrong about who God is. You can't be wrong about the Incarnation. Those are cardinal doctrines.

Rob. Right. Well, you've departed from Christianity at that point.

Larry. Exactly. So I want everybody at home to check those out. We don't have time to go into all that right now but that Monergism site has a lot of valuable information about that. Now what I'm going to do in this case with Rob here as my guest, is briefly because we only have a certain amount of time, explain the importance, what is the Trinity for new viewers and people that are watching and maybe they're not believers and just watching this video. What is the Trinity, what are its implications of not believing that, and also the Incarnation. How important are these?

Rob. Well, if you don't believe in the Trinity, then Jesus Christ is not the Son of God and he's not God Incarnate, and he's not a member of the Godhead. So it destroys the validity of the New Testament which claims all these things for Jesus Christ. "I and the Father are one."

Larry. The Trinity being the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

Rob. Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

Larry. The three eternal persons within a nature of the one true God.

Rob. That's right. The Trinity expressed simply is that there is a Triune God who exists in three person but one nature. The three persons are the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and in the order of redemptive purposes, they all have their role to play. So the Holy Spirit is given all of the essence, all of the authority, and all of the power of God the Father. God the Son is given all of the essence, all the authority and the power as God the Son. And you cannot have a God the Father without God the Son or God the Holy Spirit and have Christianity. The essence of Christianity is the worship of a Triune God and we can't fully explain the Trinity because it goes beyond the depth of our understanding, but the Bible automatically in its presentation to us of the essence of God, the purpose of God, and the revelation of God, drives us to a Triune God because it gives each person of the Trinity the exact same authority, power and essence. The only difference is their roles that they play.

So this is Trinity briefly. You get this wrong, you don't have Christianity. You get this wrong, you have to reduce Christianity down to nothing really because Jesus Christ would not be the Son of God Incarnate, the Holy Spirit would not even exist or he would be not a person, he would be an emanation from God, and you're right back to a single solitary god.

Larry. So for a Trinitarian, understanding when Jesus is talking or you see him in the Scripture, the gospels, you're really seeing God in the flesh, in human form right there, Philippians 2. So that's how important that doctrine is. Now what about the Incarnation?

Rob. Well, the Incarnation is interesting. We believe that God in his eternal wisdom provides a plan whereby he can save poor lost sinners, and his plan includes the sending of his only begotten Son. This is scriptural report. And that only begotten Son leaves his place in heaven, assumes the likeness of human flesh without sin, and sojourns through this world in his Incarnation and ultimately offers himself up as a sacrifice for the sins of God's church.

Now you can't get any aspect of the Incarnation wrong and I was just reading William Lane Craig's understanding. In the Incarnation, there are some things that Jesus Christ has set to the side to become Incarnate in the likeness of human flesh. In other words, Philippians 2 says that he sets aside to become this, and so is there a limitation on what he knows as the Incarnate Son of God? We would say yes. God has not revealed to him the time of his return. God has not revealed to him those whom he would be saving. Christ in his Incarnation, Jesus Christ is surprised at the hardness of some and at the belief of others. So there is this sense where God is either revealing it to him as he goes along in his life, or he says openly, "My Father in heaven has not revealed this to me." Okay? But to force limitations on Jesus Christ...

Larry.that aren't there scripturally.

Rob. ...that aren't there scripturally, to say that because he is God Incarnate hypostatically united with human nature and therefore because he has human nature that he doesn't know things or doesn't know what he's talking about, or he's unsure. And I guess this is the position of William Lane Craig. There's a quote here from this website that's quoting William Lane Craig, "When people ask me what unanswered questions I still have, I tell them I don't know what to do with those Old Testament stories about Noah and the ark and the tower of Babel, and so on." And what he's saying, he doesn't know what to do with them, he's saying, "I don't know if they're true or false." Well, wait a minute. Jesus Christ in his Incarnation gave full validity and veracity to these historical events. They really happened. They're really true.

Larry. Now when you're talking about like Noah's flood, Adam and Eve, Jesus verified all of this.

Rob. Right. The tower of Babel.

Larry. Yeah, he verified these things as actually happening, as being true, that actually took place in human history, and William Lane Craig is denying that, not just in this quote that you're giving but in multiple places. He's basically saying Jesus was wrong.

Rob. Right. Here's Craig, he says in response to the Christological implications of Jesus making a mistake about these things, Craig says, "That's a really good question which theologians need to explore. Did Jesus hold false beliefs in his human consciousness?"

Larry. See, he doesn't even want to give a straight answer. He's just asking, "Well, maybe he..."

Rob. "Maybe he did. Did he think the sun goes around the earth? Did he think the earth was at the center of the universe? Did he think that there were any stars beyond those we can see at night? I'm not going to try to answer these questions but I think they're worth asking. Did God stoop so low in condescending to become a man that he took on such cognitive limitations, that Jesus shared false beliefs typically held by other ordinary first century Jews?"

Larry. I found that William Lane Craig is a guy who talks out of both sides of his mouth at the same time. It really reminds me of C. S. Lewis or Hank Hanegraaf or Mike Licona or any of these other guys. They always leave themselves an out so they can deny what they just really are actually affirming.

Rob. Okay, so here's what Craig does. He says, "Since I have good reason to believe in his deity," he believes in Jesus' deity, "as explained above, I would sooner admit that Jesus could hold false beliefs that ultimately don't matter rather than deny his divinity." That's an oxymoron. If you say that he holds false beliefs and he doesn't understand what he's talking about, then he is leading people astray, he's not able to be truthful because he doesn't know the truth, and that denies his divinity. "I would sooner admit that Jesus could hold false beliefs rather than deny his divinity." To believe that he holds false beliefs is to deny his divinity. "Rather than impose on him our prior conceptions of what divinity implies, we need to be open to learning from the gospels what the Incarnation entailed." Well, you can learn from the gospels what the Incarnation entails just simply by reading them.

What Craig is saying is that he's comfortable with holding that Jesus could hold false beliefs but not comfortable in denying his divinity. Well, to say that Jesus could hold false beliefs is a denial of his divinity and all he has to do is read the rest of the New Testament and read especially the book of Colossians. My goodness gracious, anybody who's read Colossians 1 and Colossians 2 would realize that all things created were created by him, for him, through him, and nothing was created apart from him. His divinity is absolutely safeguarded but I think what Craig is getting at here is that in his Incarnation he may have just been as dumb as the regular people that he was talking to.

Larry. Right. It's terrible. It's absolute heresy.

Rob. I know. I know.

Larry. But he's still trying to cover his tracks by muddying up the waters by talking out of both sides of his mouth.

Rob. Oh, my goodness.

Larry. Now he also in other statements it says that he doesn't even believe Noah's flood happened, it was more like a local flood, something like...stuff like, any of these miracles that happened, you know, the miracles of Egypt and things like that, it's like he just can't buy it. It's supernatural. The only thing he really believes in is the resurrection. He believes that one, he can swallow that gnat and he eat the camel by denying everything else, right, but it's like the resurrection of Christ is a massive event and if God could do that besides create the world, why can't he do all these other things like Noah's flood, Tower of Babel, all the things you've already mentioned.

Rob. If Jesus Christ lends credence to the actuality of a historical event, who is William Lane Craig to say that Jesus was wrong? It's a low view of Jesus Christ but it's even a lower view of the revelation of God that Jesus Christ is trying to present to us. And besides, why not? I would ask these guys why not? What's your objection? Just as you have said, you believe in the resurrection of the dead. If God can raise somebody from the dead, could he not perform a universal flood over the entire earth? I think he could. If God could speak an instant creation, why would you...

Larry. The logic of it is overwhelming but he denies it.

Rob. What is he trying to say here? I mean, what's his position?

Larry. Well, the people at home and, of course, we don't have that much time for this production because you've got to catch an airplane and get out of town pretty soon, so what we're going to do with the rest of this article you've been reading from is put it on the screen. People can see it right now and you can freeze frame each page if you want to read this or go to that website that's putting this up which is, I believe, Answers in Genesis. But we'll have that there for you. You'll see it on the screen and so freeze frame each page if you want to read it straight off this YouTube video and then you can just continue from there because of our time limitations here.

But now I want to bring this back to another thing. He definitely says it's not important to believe in the virgin birth of Christ. He's made that statement over and over again. What do you say to the people out there that it's not important about the virgin birth of Christ.

Rob. Well, then the Scriptures have lied to us. We've been misinformed. That's his view of inspiration.

Larry. Yeah, but that's the number one Christian apologist in the world by a lot of people. I mean, the virgin birth doesn't matter so why would you want to go with the Scripture when you can go with the number one Christian apologist?

Rob. Well, that's the problem. Obviously if he says the virgin birth doesn't matter, I'm grasping for where he's going with this. Why doesn't it matter?

Larry. Because he's saying that in Christian apologetics, you cannot bring theology into it because you just use philosophy. Philosophy to get people to a generic god which you've already....

Rob. So the supernatural is unfathomable in our efforts to convince people that there is a God.

Larry. See, you referenced to some of this already in this video about the idea is not to get people to Christ through his resurrection, the idea is to get them to a generic god with evidentialism and evolution and all these things, you know, Charles Darwin and C. S. Lewis where you can be a Buddhist and still make it to heaven.

Rob. William Lane Craig's god is getting smaller and smaller and smaller and smaller.

Larry. Because he's into minimalism.

Rob. It is a man-made god.

Larry. You kind of mentioned it yourself a while ago, it's just a very low view.

Rob. The lowest common denominator.

Larry. And of course, when you do that just like Hank Hanegraaff of the Christian Research Institute and a lot of these other guys, when you go to the lowest common denominator which follows along Mere Christianity of C. S. Lewis, well, then you get more people to support your ministry. You get more people listening to you because you're not offending them. But as far as when I'm reading the Scripture, it's a rock of offense to most people, but if you leave that out, you have more people that will listen to you.

Rob. He needs to get out of Christianity and find a real job because...

Larry. Walter Martin used to say about false prophets, they need to get out of theology or this false ministry they've got and just start selling insurance.

Rob. Or herbal teas or something because if we depart from the word of God in such a fashion as to say what it plainly teaches is irrelevant, what are we saying about the word of God? It's irrelevant and I'll pick and choose and tell you what's relevant and what isn't

relevant, therefore that makes me the judge of Scripture rather than Scripture the judge of me and it is all man-centered.

Larry. Now you are an apologist. You are a Christian apologist. You've been one for, what, 30-40 years already about like me, and William Lane Craig is saying that you shouldn't be using any theology when you do apologetics, you should just use philosophy. Now what does the Bible say about philosophy? Didn't you just mention something?

Rob. It's worthless. It's worthless.

Larry. What does the Bible say about philosophy? Colossians 2:7-8, "Let your roots grow down into him and let your lives be built on him." That's talking about Christ. "Then your faith will grow strong in the truth you were taught and you will overflow with thankfulness. Don't let anyone capture you with empty philosophies and high-sounding nonsense that come from human thinking and from the spiritual powers of this world rather than from Christ.

2. 1 Timothy 6:20-21, "Timothy, guard what has been entrusted to you. Avoid the pointless discussions and contradictions of what is falsely called knowledge although some claim to have it and they have abandoned the faith. May grace be with all of you."

3. James 3:15, "Such wisdom does not come down from heaven but is earthly, unspiritual, demonic."

4. 1 Corinthians 2:13, "When we tell you these things, we do not use words that come from human wisdom, instead we speak words given to us by the Spirit using the Spirit's words to explain spiritual truths."

5. 1 Timothy 4:1, "The Spirit says clearly that in latter times some believers will desert the Christian faith. They will follow spirits that deceive and they will believe the teachings of demons."

6. 1 Corinthians 3:19, "For the wisdom of this age is foolishness with God. As it is written, he catches the wise in their craftiness."

God will shame the world.

7. 1 Corinthians 1:27, "Instead, God chose things the world considers foolish in order to shame those who think they are wise, and he chose things that are powerless to shame those who are powerful."

8. 1 Corinthians 1:21, "For after that in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God. It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe."

9. 1 Corinthians 1:25, "For the foolishness of God is wiser than human wisdom, and the weakness of God is stronger than human strength."

10. 1 Corinthians 1:20, "Where is the one who is wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the debater of this age? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world."

11. Jeremiah 8:9, "The wise will be put to shame. They will be dismayed and trapped. Since they have rejected the word of the Lord, what kind of wisdom do they have?"

Reminders.

12. 1 Corinthians 2:6, "We do, however, speak a message of wisdom among the mature but not the wisdom of this age or of the rulers of this age who are coming to nothing."

13. Titus 3:9-10, "But avoid foolish controversies, genealogies, quarrels, and fights about the law because they are useless and empty. Reject the device of a person after one or two warnings."

14. Psalm 49:12-13, "People despite their wealth do not endure. They are like the beasts that perish. This is the fate of those who trust in themselves and of their followers who approve their sayings."

15. 1 John 4:1, "Beloved, do not believe every spirit but test the spirits to see whether they are from God, for many false prophets have gone out into the world."

A bonus verse. Titus 1:12-16, "One of themselves, a prophet of their own, said, 'Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, lazy gluttons.' This testimony is true. For this reason reprove them severely so that they may be sound in the faith, not paying attention to Jewish myths and commandments of men who turn away from the truth. To the pure, all things are pure; but to those who are defiled and unbelieving, nothing is pure, but both their mind and their conscience are defiled. They profess to know God, but by their deeds they deny Him, being detestable and disobedient and worthless for any good deed."

Rob. I'd like to go back to something that we were talking about earlier in Dr. Craig's use of Scripture. Here's a direct citation from Dr. Craig's understanding of Scripture. He says, "So your only example of any force is Luke 17:26 where Jesus says, 'Just as it was in the days of Noah, so too it will be in the days of the Son of Man. They were eating and drinking and marrying and being given in marriage until the day Noah entered the ark and the flood came and destroyed all of them.' But this reference, like Jesus' reference to Jonah, is compatible with citing a story just to make one's point. For instance, I might say to someone, 'Just as Robinson Crusoe had his man Friday to assist him, so I have my wife Jan to help me,' without thinking to commit myself to the historicity of Robinson Crusoe."

What William Lane Craig is saying here is that Jesus uses the story of Noah to present something that's going to happen in the future but it never happened in the past. It's an

Aesop, it's a fable, it is something that is used as a reference point as a story but the historical facts we don't have to commit ourselves to. And the problem with that is Jesus committed himself to these historical facts and the reality....

Larry. He said that they came from the very words of God, from the Scripture. He was always arguing with the Pharisees.

Rob. Yes. And when you go back to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, it is a historical fact. How on earth can you compare Robinson Crusoe with the Noahic flood and him building the ark, a true and real story as given in the Old Testament, and as reinforced by Jesus Christ? But this kind of treatment of the Bible gives us an idea of his low view both of Jesus Christ and of Scripture.

Larry. Well, he's shooting for a generic god so it doesn't really matter about all his theology and what the Bible says. So you've got to respect that since he's the number one Christian apologist.

Rob. If you're listening to us carefully out there, I ask you the question, we ask the question: how did Jesus treat the Old Testament? Fables? Stories? Events that did not occur? Make-believe just to prove a point moving forward? How would you ever trust somebody who does that in light of the fact that you can go back to these very historical incidents and read it for yourself. It's just absolutely dumbfounding, is that a word, dumbfounding?

Larry. Yes.

Rob. It's confounding.

Larry. You're in good shape there. I want to mention right now since you brought that up, to our viewers at home, we've got some videos on the authority of the word of God that can be found in the biblical canon and you're seeing them on your screen right now, the YouTube videos we produced on the inspiration of Scripture and how Jesus basically said if you don't believe the word of God, you are condemned by God. That kind of makes me think of Luke 16 where you've got the rich man and Lazarus. Remember, the rich man in Hades and saying, "Well, send Lazarus back." And then father Abraham says, "Well, you know, he won't do it again to send someone back from the dead. They've got Moses and the prophets, let them hear them." I mean, that's what counts.

Rob. Right. They don't believe them and they're not going to believe this guy sent back either.

Larry. See, and William Lane Craig falls into that category of, "Well, you know, what does it matter about all these Aesop fables in the Bible?"

Rob. I thought of something ironic, okay? I think this could be clearly ironic. William Lane Craig is an evidentialist apologist trying to get to a generic god, and all of the evidence points against him being an evidentialist.

Larry. The evidence is against the evidentialist.

Rob. The evidence is against the evidentialist and he refuses to take it.

Larry. Yeah, that is a good point. I like that.

Rob. So what is he? Is his foundation a presuppositional foundation of evidentialism? We got him.

Larry. William Lane Craig when asked about false teachers, I mean, you've got the paperwork right there, he's sitting with an atheist, a man named Hitchin, who's asking Craig whether he believed any of the world religions could be considered false, and Craig identified Islam as an example of a world religion that's untrue in its central assertions.

Rob. Well, he's asked by this atheist if there were any Christian denominations that Craig regards as false, and Craig replied, "Certainly." Hitchin asked him to identify one. Craig replied, "Um, well, I'm not a Calvinist. I think certain tenets of Reformed theology are incorrect." He then said these were intramural differences.

Larry. The rest of that is from James White.

Rob. The point is which is made from Dr. White is why would you leave out Roman Catholicism and go to an intramural squabble and reduce Calvinists to those who might be morally culpable for teaching what is false?

Larry. Now here's an excellent situation and I'm going to have you, remember we only have so many minutes left so don't take too long but I know you could talk for an hour on this but tell people the difference between what a Calvinist would believe and what Roman Catholic would believe, and how does that play into the nature of the sovereignty of God.

Rob. All Calvinists believe that man is held captive by a nature that is fallen completely and the correct description of it is total depravity. That's the beginning of Calvinism.

Larry. Found in Ephesians 2:1, I believe.

Rob. Man is totally depraved and his will is in bondage to his nature which is totally depraved.

Larry. Which is sin.

Rob. Which is sin.

Larry. Because he hates God. Because he loves the sin more than a holy God. He doesn't like, if you're a sinner you don't like the holiness.

Rob. He's absolutely incapable of loving God. Absolutely. His will is bound by his nature and his nature is utterly depraved and so the Calvinist would say the only way for a person to be able to come to Christ and believe in Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of his sins and for his eternal security and for the righteousness of Christ, is if he is born from above, John 3. You must be born again, born of the Spirit. It is a supernatural work of God that frees the will to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ.

Larry. Yeah, but Dr. William Lane Craig does not like supernatural acts of God.

Rob. No, and he does not believe in the bondage of the will.

Larry. How dare [unintelligible] teach that.

Rob. He doesn't believe in the bondage of the will. Roman Catholic theologians do not believe in the bondage of the will either. In fact, William Lane Craig would have to nudge his way in and ask all the Roman Catholic theologians, "Just move over a little bit. I've come to join you on my knees worshiping at the altar of free will," because his theology is absolutely free will theology. All is up to man.

Larry. That leads us into the next point.

Rob. That's why he thinks Calvinism is a serious error.

Larry. Now briefly tell us about Roman Catholicism from what you know about it. Is that a Christian religion?

Rob. Roman Catholicism is not a Christian religion. They have a different God, a different Jesus Christ, a different way of salvation, a different heaven if you include their damnable doctrine of purgatory, they have a different understanding of grace, a different understanding of faith, they have a different understanding of eternal punishment. All Roman Catholic theologians use biblical terms with different definitions and we've got how many videos on the Roman Catholic religion?

Larry. Right now, in fact our viewers at home can see our YouTube channel where we have 19 playlists. One of the playlists that we have is on Roman Catholicism. Currently we have 177 videos on Roman Catholicism showing that it's nothing but a pagan-type religion using terminology that looks Christian but in actual fact it's paganism cloaked in a cover of Christian terminology to hide the fact that it's really pagan.

Rob. Right. From baptismal regeneration to the final act of the Roman Catholic priest granting absolution in final rites, the Roman Catholic religion is rotten to the core through and through.

Larry. Well, it's not just one damnable heresy, it's a multitude of damnable heresies wrapped into one religion. So there's so many ways to get damned to hell in that religion, it's unbelievable. But anyway, we're getting short on time and you segued nicely to where we can go to the other thing. You were talking about human autonomy, free will, and let's get to this last point here before we run out of time. William Lane Craig's big idea comes from a Jesuit priest back in around the 1500s who taught, a Jesuit priest named Molina which has fostered this phony, even the Roman Catholics don't buy it. But William Lane Craig buys it and it's called Molinism. Can you tell us something about Molinism?

Rob. I can't tell you much about it because I haven't been introduced to it very long, but a quick comment and what I've listened to with Dr. White on this whole theory is that God knows what a person will do given any set of circumstances that that person is in. So there are multitudes of circumstances that a person can be in and God only knows that if he chooses this, this second thing will happen, or if he chooses this, this second thing will happen.

Larry. In other words, there are vast numbers of permutations to whatever takes place according to the free will of the man.

Rob. Permutations, permutations, permutations. Right. The whole thing, well, I should have said that at the beginning. The entire thesis is that man's will is autonomous. It's totally free. His choices are totally free so now God only knows what will happen if he makes a choice for this, a choice for that, a choice for this, a choice for that. He doesn't know if the person will make a choice for this or a choice for that or a choice for anything, he only knows that if he does, this, this and this will happen.

Larry. And he tries to do it where the best probability of him getting saved might take place. It's sort of like a computer printing out probabilities from permutations.

Rob. Yeah, it's difficult to understand because we're committed to the scriptural account that God doesn't do this. He simply doesn't.

Larry. Or do you mean to say that what William Lane Craig is teaching about Molinism isn't found in the Bible?

Rob. No, it's not found in the Bible whatsoever. It's a philosophical construct trying to enable the free will of man determine whether or not he will be saved or not. God will have nothing to do with it. God just puts out possibilities and all he knows is that if this guy goes this way, not going to end up too well for him. Or if he goes this way and this guy goes this way and that guy goes this way, then there would be salvation. And William Craig has actually said that's the only way that God can save people in light of free will, and he actually says that there must be evil in the world because evil people doing different things enable people who do other things to ultimately find their way to salvation and God hopes that more of them will find their way to salvation in virtue of the fact that evil people are doing it. It's like a giant game of checkers and all God can do is

watch what happens. It really is. As I'm framing this in my mind that God sets out a bunch of possibilities but God doesn't know what's going on.

Larry. Well, he's on top of the computer tabulations with a little print sheet, but it's just middle knowledge. It's not real permanent determinism knowledge, it's he's just trying to put possibilities. And this is why William Lane Craig says that God is so great because what a massive intellect he must have to be able to do all these permutations and calculations which are in the trillions and billions and whatever sextillions...

Rob. Because this is the only way he could possibly save anybody.

Larry. Right, and at the same time it's because of the free will factor that he's trying to force into what the Bible doesn't teach. It eliminates the specific love of God for specific individuals.

Rob. No, that would be arbitrary of God if he loved one person more than the other and Craig doesn't believe God would do that. He'd be immoral to do that.

Larry. So God is not allowed to have his own choice at all, but now William Lane Craig and all the sinners on the planet, they get to have autonomy and control over God's will because it's not right for God to have a free will, it's only the sinners that get to have a free will and they can determine what's right or wrong because they look at arguments philosophically for a generic god according to his Gospel.

Rob. Right, I would agree with that, but the whole scheme is absolutely dust and heretical. I mean, I don't know about you, Larry, but the Scriptures tell me that God works out all things after the counsel of his own will, not my will.

Larry. There you go. You're getting that straight from the Bible but that's more, are you sure that's not Aesop's fable?

Rob. That's the part we're not supposed to use, right?

Larry. Remember, you don't use theology in apologetics, you just use philosophical arguments and read "Mere Christianity" by C. S. Lewis.

Rob. If you start all of your theological reasonings and philosophical buttressing reasonings with the one presupposition that man has a free will and God will never violate it, it will lead to a big game of checkers with God being the controller of a giant computer that permeates and computates and hopes that by all of this some good decisions will be made, and you'll also limit who's going to be saved, not by God but by man's choice.

Larry. That's right. Exactly. You take the power of that from God and give it to the sinners, the evil-loving sinners who despise holiness. Now I do have one objection to what you said.

Rob. What's that?

Larry. When I was a student at the University of Texas, I was on the University of Texas Chess Team and I think you get a lot more permutations and outcomes with a chess game over a checker game.

Rob. And that would give man a lot more intelligence too, so let's go with that example because it takes a lot more intelligence to play chess than checkers. But then again, in looking at humanity in our day and age, I'm not sure they rise to the level of chess.

[video clip]

James White. This is a William Lane Craig video. William Lane Craig isn't in it, it's a reasonable faith video. Now this is the weirdness of Molinism is that Molinism has absolutely specific providence, meticulous providence because God determines everything that's going to happen, but he does so based on middle knowledge. So it's not to his glory, it's not his free will, it's not his autonomous will, it is based upon the cards he's been dealt, middle knowledge, I run the worlds and, bingo, this is the best I can do.

Speaker. What immediately came up in my mind when I saw that is, "Oh, wait a minute, does God really, is he really the one that decides?"

James. Well, at the end it's all...

Speaker. Or he just simply picked the best world.

James Yes.

Speaker. He didn't really, he's not really the one that decided this, it's just how it's spun out.

James. No. He decided, well, the only freedom left to God at least [unintelligible] as far as I can understand it, is do you do, does he decide to save the maximum number of people or bring the maximum amount of good because the two may not be the same thing. So he gets to decide what his overarching parameters are for examining possible worlds. That's where his freedom is, but then which world he ends up creating is dependent upon that decision and then everything that happens within it is freely done by us but not freely done by us because middle knowledge says exactly what we're going to do.

Speaker. Which turns him into a great big cosmic statistician.

James. Yes. Oh, big time. Oh, big time. Yeah. Oh, yeah.

Narrator. So it's possible that God has so ordered the world that anyone who...

James. You know it's a William Lane Craig video when you hear, "It's possible. It's possible that maybe it could have been this way," and that's what you're getting here. I need to roll this back so you can get it.

Narrator. So it's possible that God has so ordered the world that anyone who would believe in Christ if he heard about him is created at a time and a place in history where he does hear about him. Thus no one is lost through historical or geographical accident.

James. So you go from "it's possible" to a statement of fact, "no one is lost." How do you go from possible to that? "It's possible that maybe God did it this way, therefore no one..." If you're just going to give a possibility, you can't then give an absolute, "Hey, this is the way it has to be as a result of that." That's just not going to work. But this is this idea that, well, God knows who would have believed had they heard and so maybe he actuates a world where all those who would do hear, but that's not what the inclusivistic thing beforehand about general revelation and conscience was saying. So it's almost like let's cover all of our possible bases, every possible base that affirms, what? Human autonomy. That's what all this is about. Have you heard anything about God's sovereign will in any of this? No. No. You have God decrees where we're going to be born, based on what? In Molinism it's based upon the parameters provided by middle knowledge that does not come from God's decree.

Narrator. Anyone who wants or even would want to be saved will be saved. Our eternal destiny truly lies in our own hands. So how about you? God made every nation of men that they should inhabit the whole earth and he marked out their appointed times in history and the boundaries of their lands. God did this so that they would seek him and perhaps reach out for him and find him though he is not far from any one of us.

James. So, again, Acts 17 dealing with idolaters, dealing with people from all over the Greek and Roman Empire who have all of their gods and they're worshipping all of their gods and what does Paul do? He uses what they have and then proclaims them the resurrection at which point they shut him down, but some people believed. That's where the quotation is derived from here in Acts 17.

Well, where did the....okay, I missed it. There it is. I'm sorry.

Narrator. Our eternal destiny truly lies in our own hands.

James. There you go. Is this not up? Yeah, you've got to put that up so people can see it. Yeah. Our eternal destiny truly lies in our own hands. What do you say? I'm awful glad that my eternal destiny lies in the hands of Christ and the Father, John 6, John 10. My sheep hear my voice. My hand, God's hand, can't be lost, etc. etc. But man-centeredness, that's what you get.

The last thing a true believer wants to be is autonomous. That's the last thing that a true believer wants to be. We want our will to be in full harmony with God's, not the other way around. But in Molinism, God may take into consideration the prayers that may be

said based upon middle knowledge in determining whether to bring a world into existence. Now I never heard anybody, I'll be honest with you, I've never heard anybody in any situation pray, "God, bring the world where I'm standing into existence, this Molinistically. In case you're looking down through the corridors of time as you are playing with your light bright set and seeing which world to actuate, I want to pray that you make this world where I exist and I'm a believer come into existence so I can be saved." I've heard some interesting prayers, that's not one of them I have ever heard, I will confess. [unintelligible] You hear that, Rich hears that in a Monty Python voice. A little bit like the hand-grenade of Antioch, yes. Thanks a lot, Rich. Appreciate that. I'm glad you didn't turn the camera on for that because that would have been used against you in a court of law.

So we continue on. But then oddly, you turn around and ask if it doesn't matter because God's creation decree already established salvation and damnation but, Mike, you already said that God's creation decree factored in those prayers so obviously it does matter. So the creation decree for William Lane Craig is secondary to human action. No question about it. I mean, it's stated right there. It's stated right there.

Well, anyway, it goes on from there. Like I said, if you want to see the rest of it, it's question 326. You can go and take a look at it. But it's always good to remind ourselves of why Molinism is a really really really bad choice. I can't tell you how many people I have encountered who have said, "Oh, I think the best way around it, I think Molinism." And then you start pressing just a little bit and, "Well, you know, I haven't read much about it but I, you know, it seems to just sort of answer all the questions." And it's like, no, it doesn't really answer any questions, actually. It leaves the big questions out there. [end of video clip]

Larry. Alright, our viewers out there in YouTube land can see the following pages and to read the entire article on Molinism. Just pause each page on your screen and you can read it in detail and move on to the next page and do the same thing until you get a complete review of the entire article.

But here on page 1, Molinism named after the 16th century Roman Catholic Jesuit theologian Luis de Molina, who concocted this theory, is a religious doctrine which attempts to reconcile the providence of God with human free will. William Lane Craig and Alvin Plantinga, despite not being practicing Roman Catholics themselves, are some of the best known advocates of this Jesuit doctrine today. So we have William Lane Craig, for instance, promoting a Roman Catholic Jesuit priest's idea of how God operates which is totally anti-biblical, yet William Lane Craig accepts this Jesuit doctrine with no biblical background for it.

You go from page to page here, page 2, information about that pertaining to philosophy. Page 3, you have the question, "What is Molinism and is it biblical?" You have information about that. You go to page 4, you have natural knowledge, middle knowledge, free knowledge defined for you there. Next page is the question again, "Is Molinism biblical?" And you have more information about that there. Then the next page

you see things like "Molinism is not the best way to think about God's sovereignty and human free will." The Bible teaches that God is sovereign over all things. Proverbs 16:33, Matthew 10:29, Romans 11:36, Ephesians 1:1. Even human decisions. Proverbs 20:24, 21:1. Although God does not stir men to sin, James 1:13, he is still working everything from individuals to nations to the end that he has willed. Isaiah 46:10-11. God's purposes do not depend upon man, Acts 17:24-26, nor does God discover or learn, 1 John 3:20, Job 34:21-22 and so forth. And of course, the last page here.

Let this be a lesson to those who follow William Lane Craig, that his theology and soteriology is so deficient and fallacious that he has to go to a Roman Catholic Jesuit to get his theory rather than just going with what the Bible says. He cannot be trusted in theological terms at all.

Larry. Wrap this whole thing up now in a final conclusion in three minutes or less. Go ahead.

Rob. Alright, I think that I would agree with Dr. James White and many other theologians who are intimately acquainted with what the Scripture reveals to us that if you start with the presupposition that man is totally free and all of his decisions are free and that the one big decision that determines his eternal destiny is free, then you're going to have to have a scheme whereby you limit the sovereignty of God and the Bible simply does not allow for this. The Bible speaks clearly, cogently, straightforwardly, any way you want to define it with a bunch of adverbs, that God is sovereign and he's sovereign over the universe that he has created. Over and over again the Bible teaches us that God will have mercy upon whom he will have mercy. He'll harden whom he'll harden. It is not the man who wills or the man who runs but God has mercy.

When it comes to this whole idea of becoming a Christian, it is not in the hands of an angry sinner, it's in the hands of God who has mercy. Jesus Christ told Nicodemus, "You must be born again." Literally the Greek word there is anothēn, the better translation is you must be born from above. What does that mean? Jesus goes on to explain that it means you must be born of the Spirit. He goes on to explain that the Spirit is free in bringing about this regenerative new birth. But it's magnificent. So when God brings home all those for whom Christ died and the Bible is clear all those that the Father gives to Christ will come and no one can come unless the Father gives him to him. It is a miracle and it's an absolute act of 100% total grace of God that he would save one poor lost sinner who has no hope due to his sinful nature, his sinfulness, and his rebellion against God. That's the real truth of the Scripture and we don't need to hide from this and we don't need to try to protect God's reputation by saying if he were too sovereign it would hurt poor little man's free will.

This is what William Lane Craig has done, he has constructed a philosophy that has no theology other than his own personal biases and prejudices and I'm sorry for this man and I'm sorry that he is so close to Roman Catholic Molina.

Larry. But you say he preaches a different gospel.

Rob. I've never heard him preach. I never have. There are men who believe this nonsense and then they stand up and find themselves having to preach something that's directly in front of them from the Bible, and they might even preach the truth but they don't believe it. I remember when Dr. Johnson, one of my mentors who has since gone, I'll tell you, since gone to the Lord, he said he went to Scotland and he heard one of the best sermons on the sovereignty of God from a pastor, and he went up to congratulate him afterwards and the man said, "Well, thank you very much, but I don't actually believe this to be true. It's my job here is to preach the Bible and that's what I do, but I don't actually believe this." Wow.

Larry. It's unfortunate. Very unfortunate, but from my perspective as we close and sign off this show, I think William Lane Craig is a false prophet, heretical, he's teaching heresies that...

Rob. Oh, he is to be sure.

Larry. Damnable heresies is what I believe. Now Dr. James White, who I have immense respect for and he also plays chess but anyway....

Rob. Not as good as some.

Larry. But anyway, he would disagree with me on this because Dr. James White has this perspective I just disagree a little bit because Jesus said in Matthew 7, "You will know them by their fruits," when he's talking about false prophets, and I've seen so much fruit here, especially in this presentation about Dr. William Lane Craig that that fruit doesn't look any good to me at all.

Rob. I agree with you.

Larry. And so I would put Dr. William Lane Craig in the category of the cults, false prophet teaching a false gospel, and he likes Roman Catholicism, by the way.

Rob. I'm sure he does.

Larry. And C. S. Lewis.

Rob. I'm sure he does.

Larry. So I would disagree with my favorite apologist, James White, because he's not going to go that far, you know, but I will because I'm somebody different and I think I've got Scripture.

Rob. Well, there is one who judges righteously.

Larry. God in the end.

Rob. In the end of the day, God will deal with it.

Larry. But I think Dr. William Lane Craig and those who follow him are on very very dangerous ground.

Rob. Oh, they are. And they're leading others astray, so we could correct that all day long.

Larry. That's right.

[video clip]

James White. Well, here's the danger. I think Cameron represents a lot of young zealous apologists in the William Lane Craig sphere who have heard him. He was at a conference a number of years ago, oh, man, I wonder how long this was? I'll have to ask my friend who told me about this. But this friend of mine was standing nearby William Lane Craig when he was asked a question about theology and apologetics, theology and philosophy, and his statement to the young man was, "You do not need to read books on theology, you need to read books on philosophy. You need to have, philosophy is the key issue, not theological resources." And very plainly that has been his emphasis. The result of that is people like Cameron get into apologetics but they don't have the solid theological foundation either in Scripture, original languages, exegesis, or church history to know what the Reformation was about. And so you run into all these philosophically-minded Roman Catholics and they end up, I can't tell you how many of these young men have ended up Roman Catholics because they didn't have the theology. So they weren't on the far side of the Tiber River calling for people to come out, they're paddling around the middle and they run into other people paddling around the middle who actually live in Rome and say, "Come over. Let me tell you about some stuff." And since they don't know, then it can be very very attractive. Very very attractive indeed. And there's just a huge number, a huge number over the years that I've seen that happen to.

Of course, when I talk to them and ask them, "So back when you claimed you were a Protestant, you claimed that your true source of peace was the imputed righteousness of Christ, therefore having been justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, so you understood that the reason that the wrath of God has no place in you is not because of anything you've done, it's not because of your sacramental cleanness, not because of your current state of sanctification, experiential sanctification, but you actually believed and lived in light of the reality that if Jesus' death was not sufficient for you, you would not be saved, that his righteousness is your whole plea before a holy God. So you claimed when you were a Protestant that Christ was enough but now you go to a priest who grants you sacramental forgiveness but you still have temporal punishments on your soul that you need to then he has, he gives you penances and by saying a certain number of Hail Marys or climbing stairs on your knees or this type or other thing, you somehow are removing the temporal punishments of sins, that the righteousness of Christ does not remove from you, and you believe that when you die you're going to have to go to a place called purgatory where you undergo sodus postio(ph), the suffering of

atonement to remove the temporal punishments of those sins and if you receive indulgences while you're in purgatory, they're made up of the righteousness of Jesus, Mary and the saints, a mixed righteousness, what caused you to all of a sudden change that?" They never have an answer to that. They never have an answer to that. All they want to do is, "Well, I just, I just came to realize you can't, you can't substantiate Sola Scriptura so my entire claimed relationship to God turned into something completely different. I discovered there was great evidence for the papacy, or I discovered this, that or the other thing." But you look them in the eye and they're not going to look back.

And I'm thinking of one guy that actually came to this office, sat 15 feet in that direction from where I am right now, and I knew he was going to Rome, ordained Presbyterian minister. I knew he was going to Rome and he wanted to do all this fancy-shmancy stuff about, "Well, how could you do a Sola Scriptura about year 110 and dat, dat, dat, dat, and all the rest of that type of stuff?" And I just told him straight, we talked for hours but I told him straight, I told him straight, "You know what you're doing and you know there is no way to have peace in the system you're talking about entering into. You know that. Don't play games. You know it's true."

Speaker. Is Andy Stanley saying, in a way, "Hey, even if," and I'm not saying that there is, "but even if there were some error found in the Bible, is that going to destroy Christianity?" And he would say, "No." He's definitely saying that. He's saying to be a Christian you don't have to believe.

James. Now listen, folks, okay, listen carefully. Are you ready? Are you sitting down? If you're driving right now, I'm not sure this is good. I'm giving you a warning right now. I hope you're not high speed or in bad traffic or whatever. Just get a deep seat.

William Lane Craig. And six day creationism or in the flood of Noah, or frankly even in things like the virgin birth or that the Bible is inerrant.

James. Some of you may be going, "No, play that again." Okay, let me, let me play that again.

WLC. You don't have to believe in six day creationism or in the flood of Noah, or frankly even in things like the virgin birth or that the Bible is inerrant. The fundamental historical credibility of the claims and resurrection of Christ can be established historically without making a commitment to those other sorts of things. That can be decided later once you have made a commitment to Christ.

James. That can be decided later, on whose authority? How many times have I said it, what you win them with is what you win them to. And so when you have this kind of presentation, "Well, you know, ah, Mr. Rebel Sinner Man, you get to decide whether God exists and then you get to decide whether it's the God of Jesus, and then you get to decide whether Jesus is God, and you get to decide all this stuff, and you get to analyze all this historical stuff, and you get to do all of these things, and then all this stuff in the Bible, hey, you get to decide whether you're really into the virgin birth or whether you're really

into this inerrancy and inspiration thing, or whether you're really into... I know Jesus talked about the flood and Noah and he used it as an example, but you know, he was just a man of his age and, you know, his audience would have enjoyed that. He was just communicating. It's all up to you." What you win them with is what you win them to.

I was, I heard that and I'm like, "Really? Wow." Look, we all know that William Lane Craig simply plays lipservice to inerrancy. He's told some people that it's disastrous for evangelicalism and apologetics, and we know that N. T. Wright describes it as that silly American doctrine. We're in the minority. I admit I'm in the minority in believing in the doctrine of inerrancy. I've said to Dr. Liconas, "Stop pretending. Just go ahead and come straight out and say, 'Hey, this is all just, you know, once you've got your ticket punched, then you can think these things through and, hey, whatever you decide. Whatever you decide.'"

WLC. And he's quite right about that. We do have these credible historical sources for the life and teachings, death and resurrection of Jesus which are not dependent upon a doctrine of biblical inspiration or inerrancy, and I don't think that Al Mohler understands this. Again, let me...

James. And I don't think Al Mohler said this. Okay, you just made a bunch of people sit up and finally take notice about really how far out you are theologically. Why do you have to keep making yourself look really foolish by saying, "And I don't think Dr. Mohler understands this." It almost makes people wonder, "What's your real motivation for doing this program anyways? Is there something going on behind the scenes that, you know, we don't really know about?" It makes you wonder just a little bit. You really think, I mean, Dr. Craig, Dr. Mohler has read probably 50 times the number of books you have, probably more. The most voracious reader I've ever encountered. You really don't think he understands this?

I mean, I'm just left stuttering at something like that. You know, this whole, "I'm so much smarter than anybody else," when I debated John Dominic Crossan, before we ever debated I was telling folks in my church, I've told folks on the air probably, this guy is one of the most intelligent people I've ever read. He's brilliant. I mean, he is so widely read and he's so intelligent. His IQ is so far beyond my own that if debating was just a matter of an IQ contest, then it would have been stupid. But you can have the highest IQ in the world, if the reasoning, the worldview you have is based upon falsehood, your conclusions are going to be wrong. And so this, "I just don't think Mohler understands this stuff." It really really detracted from everything else which needed to be detracted from us both.

WLC. From his editorial, he says in the strangest turn noted in Stanley's presentations before his message, he argues that if we can somehow believe in the fact of Christ's resurrection on the authority of prior historical sources and then we find that Jesus presumably as revealed in the four gospels respects the inspiration of the Old Testament, we should conclude that if one who rose from the dead affirmed the inspiration of the Old Testament, then we should as well. That's a very plausible argument.

James. Why is it a plausible argument? Why is that a plausible argument? There are so many things he's presupposing there. He is presupposing the meaning of that resurrection. He's ignoring the relationship of that resurrection to the atonement aspect of it, but leave that off to the side. How do you determine Jesus' view of the inspiration of the Old Testament? If you know anything about liberalism, you know, I know how the liberals respond to that. I know how the liberals, every liberal laughs at what you just said, Dr. Craig. They really do because when I say, "Well, look at Jesus' view of Scripture," they go, "We don't have any idea of what Jesus' view of Scripture was and even if we did, it would just simply be whatever was popular in his day." Well, what about this? "Well, that's Matthew putting that in Jesus' mouth. John, well, please. Mark? Still it's decades later. It's the later church's understanding. We don't know what Jesus' view of Scripture was. So even if he rose from the dead, we don't know what his view of Scripture is." The argument collapses. It blows up. But that's a great argument. Oh, wow.

WLC. Regarding the inspiration as a reliable word of God, namely Jesus claimed to be the Son of God, the absolute revelation of God the Father. This radical claim was vindicated by his resurrection from the dead and therefore we should believe in what Jesus teaches us about God and about theology, and Jesus teaches us that the Old Testament was the word of God. And so as his disciples, then we accept his teaching with respect to biblical authority. This is not at all strange or convoluted. Now again, this isn't the way you do systematic theology but we're talking here apologetics of how one might convince an unbeliever to accept...

James. Catch that again? This is how we do apologetics. Apologetics isn't theology. You're trying to convince the rebel. You see, they won't call him a rebel, he's just the unbeliever. He's just this neutral, might even be friendly toward God, just needs more facts. Theology matters. Theology determines apologetic.

WLC.most believe in Christ and then on the basis of Christ's teaching, the inspiration of the Scriptures.

Kevin. Okay, I'm sure that ears perked up when you said the virgin birth, Bill. I mean, you mentioned the flood, whether the flood was local or global. Well, okay, we can worry about that later, let's look at the claims of Christ. But would some people be alarmed that you would say that you could not worry about the virgin birth? Wouldn't that be a fundamental or an essential.

James. Now listen, listen, how do you respond to that because Kevin's exactly right. Kevin's exactly right. Now we're talking about chucking elements out from the gospel here, from what the New Testament writers thought was relevant, was clearly a part of the tradition of the early church, those very early primitive traditions we were just talking about. Why can we do that? Because...

Kevin. Can you just say...

WLC. Well, it may be fundamental to theology but we're not doing theology, we're doing apologetics, Kevin, and the historical credibility...

James. There, there, that is absolutely, I'm marking that one because we've got to keep that one marked, and it's almost condescendingly said.

Kevin. Can you just say...

WLC. Well, it may be fundamental to theology but we're not doing theology, we're doing apologetics, Kevin, and the historical credibility...

James. "We're doing apologetics, Kevin. We're not doing theology." Dr. Craig, if you're not doing theology, you're not doing Christian apologetics. I don't know what you're doing but it's a game. It's a game.

Yes, sir, quickly.

Speaker. I listen to that and I just, I hear somebody saying apologetics boils down to a good sales pitch. Look, we may be selling lemons but we're not worrying about the lemon juice right now, we're just trying to sell the thing, okay?

WLC. Of the crucifixion narrative, the empty tomb narrative, the burial narrative, the appearance stories, those don't depend in any way on the historical credibility of the virgin birth story. These are independent accounts...

James. Well, Christian truth can be fragmented and, you know, it's all up to you to determine how to put all these things back together again. If you don't want that element, you don't have to have that element. It's a disaster. It's an abject disaster but this is the Craig, Licona, Habermas, minimal, "Mere Christianity," this is why we keep saying, "You know, there's a problem here, folks. You might want to be careful and recognize that if you reason back from this, the theology you're left with is going to be a mess because they're not deriving their apologetic from a meaningful theological basis."

WLC. ...and they each need to be assessed in their own right.

Kevin. And Andy Stanley is saying that very thing. He's saying, "Look, I say things like I don't blame you for thinking that way about the Bible. I don't blame you for having your doubts about Satan, the virgin birth, or a global flood or things like that, but let's talk." He says quoting here, Andy Stanley says, "For listeners accustomed to preachers taking every opportunity to correct, chastise and reprimand unbelievers, my approach is confusing." In other words, he's saying, "I'm not going to chastise you, I'm not going to correct you, I'm not going to jump on you because you're having doubts and you're having trouble believing this biblical teaching here or something like that, but we can still talk and there's some information I think you need."

WLC. Yes, it's a more invitational approach.

James. In other words, it does not take seriously man's rebellion against God and the fact that as, well, as John says, he abides under the wrath of God. That sort of determines things too.

WLC. To invite the non-believer to look at the evidence, to look at the New Testament documents not as inspired...

James. No, no, no, not inspired.

WLC. ...authoritative....

James. No, not authoritative.

WLC. ...words of God....

James Just whatever you want to make them. Just a good nice post-modern feely thing.

WLC. ...but look at them as simply first century documents in Greek handed down to us, telling this remarkable story about this man, Jesus of Nazareth, and the question is how credible are these documents? And Stanley's argument is that when you assess these documents by the standards in which ancient historical accounts are normally assessed, the gospels and the New Testament letters come out looking very credible...

James Very credible. That's why the result of all this is that the preponderance of the evidence points to the higher probability of the existence of a god, but it's all up to you. It's all up to you. And that's what the apostles taught, just read Acts 17. It's highly probably Jesus rose from the dead but it's up to you.

WLC. ...as sources for the life and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth. And I must say, Kevin, I tend to wonder how confident Al Mohler really is in the historical reliability and credibility of the New Testament documents because he says in his article that on Stanley's approach...

James. You know, I think, I just get the real feeling this was much more Craig's defending this movement against Mohler than it was his trying to prop up Andy Stanley because this type of commentary is unnecessary and, in fact, distracts from the flow of the argument that he's making. So what's going on there? Inquiring minds want to know.

WLC. We would be dependent upon historians, among others, to tell us what parts of both Testaments still believe, those parts will inevitably grow fewer and fewer and that is simply not the case.

James. What do you mean simply not the case? Dr. Craig, I'm starting to wonder how much you know about liberalism. I mean, that's not the case? Then why are you

constantly contracting, contracting, contracting what you'll defend? Of course it's the case. Wow.

WLC. Historically since the time of Friedrich Schleiermacher, the beginning of the 19th century, the confidence of New Testament scholarship and the historical credibility of the gospels has grown and grown and grown.

James. Amongst whom? Amongst whom? You have to define. You're talking about people like Daniel Kirk? I don't think so.

WLC. At the end of the 19th century in the heyday of liberal theology, a person like Bruno Bauer, a German theologian, could doubt that the historical Jesus ever really existed. Today nobody except these nutty internet mythicists would attend, propound such a view.

James. By the way, which is why I just saw on twitter the day before yesterday or yesterday a picture of Bart Ehrman debating Dr. Price on the existence of Jesus because they're just nutty internet people and that's why Ehrman wrote a whole book on the subject because he just writes books against nutty internet people.

WLC. Even during the mid 20th century, a scholar like ?? could say that all that we can know about the historical Jesus could be written on a 4 x 6 index card. By contrast to today in the 21st century, the gospels are widely regarded by New Testament historians as fundamentally credible historical accounts of the life and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth.

James. Fundamentally credible. [unintelligible] but fundamentally.

WLC. And as I've emphasized in my published work, Kevin, this includes not only Jesus' death by Roman crucifixion under Pontius Pilate but his burial in a tomb by Joseph of Arimathea. We actually know the name of the man who buried Jesus.

James. There are many many many many scholars that would reject the inclusion of any type of name at that point. This is just sort of wishful thinking on his point.

WLC. The discovery of that tomb empty by a group of women followers on Sunday morning including Mary Magdalene, by name. Thirdly, that they're after...

James. This is the minimal facts argument. Again, we've heard 47,000 times.

WLC. ...various individuals in groups of people, including Peter, experienced appearances of Jesus alive after his death, and finally that the very origin of the Christian faith depends upon the belief of these earliest disciples that God had raised Jesus from the dead, a belief to which they sincerely and suddenly claimed despite every predisposition to the contrary. These facts are part and parcel of the portrait of the historical Jesus that has been established by the sort of historical criticism that Andy Stanley is talking about. Now when we do...

James. And the meaning of all those things utterly disconnected from the New Testament? No. Presupposes the New Testament.

WLC. ...systematic theology we don't base our doctrine upon historical studies, we base it upon the Bible. But when we do apologetics and you're asking why should we believe what the Bible says or even more fundamentally why should we believe that Jesus Christ is anybody special or that he rose from the dead, then we do appeal to the work of these historians which contrary to Al Mohler has increasingly established the historical credibility of the New Testament documents.

Kevin. Yeah, we shouldn't fear historical inquiry and research. We've got to keep that away from the Bible or it might destroy the Bible.

James. Which is nowhere near what Dr. Mohler was saying. Come on, guys, get serious. This is condescendingly insulting at this point. It really is. You've got something going on here and you're trying to do something about Dr. Mohler. That's obvious. This is getting bad. Shame on you.

Kevin. How much confidence is that?

WLC. Yeah.

Kevin. Well, Andy Stanley wraps it up with this quote and we'll wrap it up with this as well, Bill. He says, "But to recap, yes, I believe the Bible is without error in everything that it affirms..."

James. In everything that it affirms. That's exactly what Roman Catholics say. Whenever you hear someone add that caveat, "in whatever it affirms." If it's not affirming historical things, it can be wrong in history. If it's not affirming scientific things, it can be wrong in scientific things. That's the weasel word. Believe me, I've taught in the context where I hear weasel words all the time.

Kevin. "...yes, my approach to preaching is not traditional. Yes, my approach at times leaves those outside our local congregations wondering if I'm still an evangelical. So in light of all that, allow me the fact that here I am once again having to explain myself, shouldn't I consider changing my approach? No, actually I would like you to consider changing yours. Here's why," he says, "the world has changed."

WLC. That's right, a culture that is more skeptical and more secular and wants to hear credible non faith-based reasons to believe.

James. Did you catch that? Did you catch that? Non faith-based reasons to have faith. That's what this kind of philosophy leads you to. Wow. I couldn't have made it up if I had tried, folks. Could not have made it up if I had tried.
[end of video clip]

Larry. Okay, with that, brother, we've got to sign off. I hope you catch your plane. We're running late.

Rob. We've got to go.

Larry. God bless to everybody out there. Thank you for joining us. I'm Larry Wessels with Rob Zins for Christian Answers Presents. Join us again next time for another episode and remember John 14:6, Jesus said, "I am the way, the truth and the life; no man comes to the Father but by me." And you've got to believe what Jesus said. You can't just think he's teaching you Aesop fables. He said that's the word of God and you'd better believe it. God bless you now. Thank you so much. Thank you, Rob.

Rob. What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and loses his soul.

Larry. Amen. Amen.