

## McDonald's Fifth Affirmative

I want to begin with Spencer's answers to my questions:

(1) "How could Christ have been naturally raised from the dead without defying or violating the laws of nature?"

Lo:

(1). I don't know. But the fact that *I* don't know how Jesus could have risen naturally doesn't mean advanced ETs wouldn't know, or that Jesus could not have risen naturally.

Comment: He claims that such is possible, but doesn't know how such could have happened. If a person is going to claim that something is possible then proof would be needed that such a thing is possible, otherwise it is just wishful thinking.

(2) "If Christ's resurrection defied or violated the laws of nature would this not mean that the laws of nature were being set aside?"

Lo:

(2). Yes, though it is unclear what you mean by "set aside."

Comment: If he says if Christ's resurrection defied or violated this would set aside the laws of nature, but he is unclear about what I mean by "set aside" means. Well, if he doesn't understand what I mean by "set aside" how does he know that the laws of nature would be set aside?

(3) "If you continue to contend that Christ was naturally raised from the dead, but admit that this would defy the laws of nature and that defying the laws of nature would be setting aside the laws of nature, wouldn't this be the same as saying that Christ was raised from the dead by natural means which set aside the laws of nature?"

Lo:

(3). You are confused: I never even entertained the possibility that Jesus could have risen naturally and this would "defy" or "violate" the laws of nature. If Jesus rose naturally, then he did *not* violate the laws of nature—a point I *repeated* multiple times.

Comment: You answered question # 1 which said "How could Christ have been naturally raised from the dead **without defying** or **violating** the laws of nature?" Your answer was: "I don't know. But the fact that I don't know how Jesus could have risen naturally doesn't mean advanced ETs wouldn't know, or that Jesus could not have risen naturally." You are arguing for a position that you have absolutely no idea how it is possible to happen. You argue that Christ could

have risen by natural means without violating natural law, but you aren't sure how that could be done. You are unclear on what is meant by "setting aside" of natural law, but you say that "Yes" it would defy or violate the laws of nature. You might want to reconsider who is confused here and who isn't. However, I believe you know full well what I mean by those words. You can't have a natural resurrection without the violation of and setting aside of the laws of nature, and I have a feeling that you know this too—which is why you tried the little word game of "though it is unclear what you mean by 'set aside.'" If it was unclear then you shouldn't have answered with a "Yes" answer. Your answer gave your position away.

(4) "Did the NRDA and RDA arguments not have anything to do with the MA (McDonald's Argument)?"

Lo

(4). (NRDA) has everything to do with MA. See premise (1) of MA.

Comment: I am glad you said that because in your third rebuttal you made the following statement:

My opponent also denies conceding the validity and soundness of Arg2, even though his statement "the argument is valid, and it is a sound argument" appears just three sentences after he quotes Arg2. He explains that by "the argument" *he was referring to McDonald's Argument—the logically valid argument I attributed to Jerry McDonald—and not to Arg2, despite never having mentioned MA anywhere in his second affirmative.* Perhaps, then, it is not I who "needs to read a little bit closer," but my opponent who needs to write a bit more clearly.

Now I hope that you understand why I wrote what I wrote under your RDA argument. I was not referring to the RDA, I was referring to my Constituent Element Argument (MA as you had labeled it) and I was saying that it was valid and sound. No, neither your NRDA nor your RDA are sound arguments, they are false arguments because they are based on the fallacy of logic call *Ad Ignorantiam*.

(5) "In 800,000 + years will it be possible to find that the earth aged billions of years in 10,000 natural years?"

Lo

(5). Yes, it is possible (which is not to say it is likely).

Comment: I am amazed at the lengths that my opponent would go to in order to hang on to this illogical position of natural resurrection. I mean come on "the earth aging *naturally* billions of actual years over a period of 10,000 *actual* years"! Are you serious? Yet, in order to hang on to the natural resurrection, that is the very position he would have to take, because if Jesus being raised naturally

is possible, then anything is possible. There are no impossibilities, there are only improbabilities. Is that what you want us to believe Spencer?

Let us look at some of these improbabilities:

1. You can make a ball that is black all over and white all over all at once at the same time. Impossible, or improbable?
2. You can make a four side triangle. Impossible or improbable?
3. If you jump off a 100ft cliff, without the aid of any kind of mechanical device or wings, you can make yourself fly. Impossible or improbable?

I say that all three of those things are impossible, but I wonder what Spencer will say! I mean, come on, he takes the position of natural resurrection, and the possibility of the earth naturally aging billions of actual years in 10,000 actual years. Why is a ball being two different colors at the same time going to be such a tough deal for him?

Now let's turn our attention to his fourth rebuttal. In his summary remarks he says:

McDonald complains that since I am taking the negative in this debate, I need to address the various arguments he has put forth for the affirmative position instead of making counter-arguments of my own. He is very confused: *my counter-arguments, if sound, would prevent him from being able to establish the affirmative position*, and therefore they constitute a real threat he needs to tackle. Moreover, he fails to realize that I *have* been addressing his argument for the affirmative—argument MA. As noted previously, McDonald's burden in this debate is to defend an affirmative answer to *two* questions (not just one): (i) Was Jesus raised from the dead?, and (ii) If Jesus was raised from the dead, would it have been God – or some supernatural process – who did the raising? How has McDonald attempted to defend an affirmative answer to (ii)? He hasn't, at all; and thus it was necessary to construct a logically valid argument *for* him—argument MA—and challenge McDonald to defend its soundness. Has he done so? No, he hasn't. Why not?

I want you to take a close look at what he has said here. Look at the words in italics: "*my counter-arguments, if sound, would prevent him from being able to establish the affirmative position.*" That has been his tactic all along, to keep me from establishing an affirmative position, that way he could justifiably walk away and say that I did not offer up any affirmative position for the resurrection. Well, it didn't work, Spencer, that one is one of the oldest in the books: If you are in the negative, put the affirmative in the negative and yourself in the affirmative—that way the audience doesn't see your inadequacies and the affirmative doesn't get to deliver his arguments. If you are in the affirmative, put the negative in the affirmative, and place yourself in the negative—that way the audience doesn't see that you don't have any affirmative material and it puts the burden of proof on

your opponent. Nice try, didn't work. I've had far too many debates to fall for that little trick.

He says he's been addressing my argument for the affirmative, but he's said nothing about the elements that I have given for that argument. That was his responsibility—not to run off making up negative arguments. He reminds me of Dr. Joe Barnhart in the *Warren-Barnhart Debate on Bentham's Utilitarian Ethics Vs. Christian Ethics* (Barnhart took Bentham's side and Warren took Christian side) in Denton, TX (1980). When Dr. Warren was in the affirmative, Dr. Barnhart would ignore Dr. Warren's arguments and just present his own material instead of answering Dr. Warren's. When Warren was in the negative he refused to make affirmative arguments and worked to put Warren in the affirmative. I was at that debate, and questioned Barnhart as to why he chose this tactic. He refused to answer, but then again, I was young and naïve back then I understand why now.

As I have stated previously, Spencer's NRDA and RDA arguments are no part of my position. In the first place they are based on the fallacy of logic *Ad Ignorantiam*. I have shown this in specific detail, and Spencer's simple denial of such will not negate the truth of the matter. However, the NRDA is also based on probabilities and possibilities. I dealt with the fact that Jesus was raised from the dead by the supernatural power of God. That was my very first element. Had Spencer bothered to deal with element number one he would have seen that. However, he chose to ignore my material on that and go with NRDA (an argument based on probability and possibility) and also based on a fallacy of logic which makes the argument false. I pointed out what "death" means and what "resurrection" means, but he refuses to deal with either one of those. Why? Because he would rather talk about little green men from the planet Mobeus than to talk about reality.

He wants to talk about the future when the proposition specifies "Historical." I didn't know that "historical" includes the future.

Main Entry:

**his·tor·i·cal** 

Pronunciation:

\-i-kəl\

Function:

*adjective*

Date:

15th century

1 **a:** of, relating to, or having the character of **history** <*historical* data> **b:** based on **history** <*historical* novels> **c:** used in the past and reproduced in historical presentations 2: famous in **history** : **HISTORIC** a3 **a:** **SECONDARY** 1c **b:** **DIACHRONIC** <*historical* grammar>

— **his·tor·i·cal·ness**  \-i-kəl-nəs\ *noun*

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/historical>

Now maybe it's just me, but I don't see where the word "future" or anything related to "future" is there. "Future" is a totally different word with a totally different meaning.

Main Entry:

**'fu·ture** 

Pronunciation:

\□fyü-chər\  
□

Function:

*adjective*

Etymology:

Middle English, from Anglo-French & Latin; Anglo-French, from Latin *futurus* about to be — more at [BE](#)

Date:

14th century

1: that is to be ; *specifically* : existing after death 2: of, relating to, or constituting a verb tense expressive of time yet to come 3: existing or occurring at a later time <met his *future* wife>

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/future>

So the word "future" doesn't mean "historical" and "historical" doesn't mean "future." So the big question is why doesn't Spencer get the point that this debate is not about the future, but about the past?

He says that he has given us links that shows that there is evidence for extraterrestrials. Well, you know you can find just about anything on the internet. You know I can show that there is evidence that Elvis Presley is still alive. Notice:

<http://www.webspawner.com/users/elviselvis/>

<http://www.elvis-is-alive.com/>

<http://www.predictify.com/q/the-king-of-rock>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=glVGneYyJ44>

I can also show that Santa Claus is real. I mean even Norad tracks him each year.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dp7zWs8fHeE>

<http://www.noradsanta.org/>

<http://au.answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid=20071124122659AAxJcPq>

You see what you can prove by going to the internet? I mean, you can prove just about anything by going to the internet. So don't talk to me about internet evidence in favor of extraterrestrials.

In going back to the soundness of his argument 1, he states: "Moreover, even if I *had* argued fallaciously for (P1), it still would not follow that Arg1 is itself invalid —it would only follow that the argument I *used* in defense of (P1) is invalid." However, this statement is false because if the argument he used in defense of

(P1) was false it was false because it was based upon (P1). Let us look at this in syllogistic form:

**Major Premise:** If Lo defends (P1) and his defense of (P1) is false, and his defense of (P1) is based upon the truth or falsity of (P1) then (P1) is also false.

**Minor Premise:** Lo defends (P1) and his defense of (P1) is false, and his defense of (P1) is based upon the truth or falsity of (P1).

**Conclusion:** Therefore (P1) is also false.

He continues to claim that Arg 1 is not false and that it is not based on *Ad Ignorantiam*. Again, let us look at it.

(C2). Therefore, NRDA should not be presumed true until we have strong reasons to affirm NRDA. (from C1).

“The argument *ad ignorantiam* (from ignorance) is the mistake that is committed **when it is argued that a proposition ... is false because it has not been proved true**” (*Introduction to Logic*, p. 139).

Now C2 is saying that NRDA should not be presumed true until we have strong reasons to affirm NRDA or until it has been proven true. What is the difference between that and saying “it is false until it has been proven true”? There is no difference that I can see. So from what I can see NRDA is based upon the fallacy of *Ad Ignorantiam*. With that being the case, RDA is also based upon the very same fallacy because it is the opposite of NRDA.

(C2'). Therefore, RDA should be presumed true until we have strong reasons for abandoning this presumption.

“The argument *ad ignorantiam* (from ignorance) is the mistake that is committed **when it is argued that a proposition is true simply on the basis that it has not been proved false**” (*Introduction to Logic*, p. 139).

RDA should be presumed true until we have a strong reasons for abandoning this presumption, or when it is argued that a proposition is true simply on the basis that it has not been proven false. The only thing he has to hang on to either argument are the words “strong reasons” which mean nothing at all because “strong reasons” are meaningless. A person can give strong reasons to Spencer to abandon a position, but that does not mean Spencer will abandon it. I have given strong reasons why Spencer should abandon the “extraterrestrial” theory, but he says that I have to “prove that they don’t exist” before I can prove him wrong. So, at the end of the day his NRDA and his RDA are nothing more than fancy worded arguments based upon the *Ad Ignorantiam* fallacy of logic, thus making both

arguments invalid and unsound. And since argument five is based on RDA, it too is unsound. There are three out of his six that are down and out.

Arguments 3,4 & 6 are all that are left and they are nothing more than shells.

He gave up the ghost on argument 3 in answering my questions. He should know better than to answer questions without looking closely at them. I don't ask meaningless questions. When I ask a question there is a trap hidden somewhere there in.

In question # 1 I asked him how this could be, and his answer was: "I don't know. But the fact that I don't know how Jesus could have risen naturally doesn't mean advanced ETs wouldn't know, or that Jesus could not have risen naturally." Yet, he purports to tell us that it is possible. If it is possible then tell us how it is possible.

Main Entry:

**pos·si·ble** 

Pronunciation:

\ˈpɑ-sə-bəl\

Function:

*adjective*

Etymology:

Middle English, from Anglo-French, from Latin *possibilis*, from *posse* to be able, from *potis*, *pote* able + *esse* to be — more at [POTENT](#), [IS](#)

Date:

14th century

**1 a:** being within the limits of ability, capacity, or realization <a *possible* but difficult task> **b:** being what may be conceived, be done, or occur according to nature, custom, or manners <the best *possible* care> <the worst *possible* circumstance> **2 a:** being something that may or may not occur <a *possible* surprise visit> **b:** being something that may or may not be true or actual <*possible* explanation> **3:** having an indicated potential <a *possible* housing site>

**synonyms** [POSSIBLE](#), [PRACTICABLE](#), [FEASIBLE](#) mean capable of being realized. [POSSIBLE](#) implies that a thing may certainly exist or occur given the proper conditions <a *possible* route up the west face of the mountain>.

[PRACTICABLE](#) implies that something may be effected by available means or under current conditions <a solution that is not *practicable* in the time available>. [FEASIBLE](#) applies to what is likely to work or be useful in attaining the end desired <commercially *feasible* for mass production>.

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/possible>

Now this is what the word "possible" means. It doesn't mean far-fetched, it means something that is capable of being realized. In order to do this one would

have to know how this is going to be done. You cannot say it is possible if you don't know how to do it or how it can be done. You can't say "well, the ET's certainly knew how" because you haven't proven that any "ET's" existed or ever will exist. Do you think that the angels were extraterrestrials? Where did you get that, from the movie "*Knowing*"?

In my fourth affirmative I quoted the meaning of the word natural, and Spencer ignored it (just like he does everything else that nails him down):

**“Natural NATURAL**, a. [to be born or produced] 1. Pertaining to nature; produced or effected by nature, or by the laws of growth, formation or motion impressed on bodies or beings by divine power. Thus we speak of the natural growth of animals or plants; the natural motion of a gravitating body; natural strength or disposition; the natural heat of the body; natural color; natural beauty. In this sense, natural is opposed to artificial or acquired” (*Webster’s Dictionary, e-Sword*).

Main Entry:

**'nat·u·ral** 

Pronunciation:

\ˈnɑːtʃə-rəl, ˈnɑːtʃ-rəl\

Function:

*adjective*

Etymology:

Middle English, from Anglo-French *naturel*, from Latin *naturalis* of nature, from *natura* nature

8 a: occurring in conformity with the ordinary course of **nature** : not marvelous or supernatural <*natural* causes>

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/natural>

Now what both of these definitions tell us is that natural cannot be anything like what Spencer is arguing for. A resurrection from the dead would not go in the ordinary course of nature, as a matter of fact it would go opposite of the ordinary course of nature. It would defy the ordinary course of nature, so how could you have a natural resurrection?

Then in question # 2 I asked about if Jesus' resurrection defied the laws of nature would that mean that the laws of nature were set aside, and you said "Yes," but then you said "though it is unclear about what you mean by 'set aside.'" When you said that you gave your entire position away, because either I was unclear on what I meant by "set aside" or Jesus' resurrection set aside the laws of nature. You can't have it both ways. If you don't understand what I meant by "set aside" you shouldn't have answered "Yes" because answering in the affirmative said that you understood what "set aside" meant. Do you just answer "Yes" to anything?

Then question # 3 is the clincher. I asked about your continued position on the natural resurrection and your affirmative answer to question 2. Your answer

was: “You are confused: I never even entertained the possibility that Jesus could have risen naturally and this would “defy” or “violate” the laws of nature. If Jesus rose naturally, then he did *not* violate the laws of nature—a point I *repeated* multiple times.” Oh, no, I am not confused—not in the least. You don’t even know what “set aside” means. Yet you say that if Christ’s death violated the laws of nature it would set aside the laws of nature, not even understanding what that meant. So how do you know that natural resurrection wouldn’t set aside the laws of nature? Since you aren’t clear on “setting aside” of the laws of nature, how do you know that natural resurrection does not involve the setting aside of the laws of nature—therefore violating and/or defying the laws of nature? So...who is confused and who isn’t? I understand very well what setting aside the laws of nature means, and I take a firm stand that if Christ rose naturally his natural resurrection would have naturally set aside the laws of nature—a logical contradiction. That is a problem you can’t escape which is why you have come up with this off the wall garbage about natural resurrection not having anything to do with violating the laws of nature. So down goes argument number three, and all that’s left is 4 & 6.

Question # 5 was asked for argument 4. “We cannot properly infer from the fact that, if the event of Jesus being raised from the dead were inconsistent with the physical laws as understood by current science (henceforth C), then that event will probably be inconsistent with the physical laws as understood by any possible future state of science (henceforth F). [premise]” Question 5 was: “In 800,000 + years will it be possible to find that the earth aged billions of years in 10,000 natural years?” Your answer was: “Yes, it is possible (which is not to say it is likely).” So what you are saying is that it is possible that the earth naturally aged billions of actual years in only 10,000 actual years? Great, my man Todd Greene (my opponent in my debate on the age of the earth) will be glad to hear that. Can I quote you? You may have just re-written the book on geology. Now, let’s see, which do you want for your platter? Gold or silver? But either way the blood will stain!...But hey when you have natural resurrection, who cares? As the little cartoon cylon said, after being resurrected, “hm...hm...hm...I’m back, I’m back, I’m back, O baby, it’s all about the resurrection ship, I’m back, I’m....” I won’t repeat the rest of what he said when he found out he came back as a raider with a centurion’s head.

In the future, we will find that gravity still works, that dead people still stay dead and that Jesus was still the Son of God, not an extraterrestrial. We will find that the laws of nature still work the same as they do today. 2,000 years ago Jesus raised Lazarus from the dead, but it wasn’t through any natural means. I have presented this argument before and Spencer has ignored it every time. Why? Because it goes to the very heart of arguments 4 and 6. If it is possible that Jesus was an extraterrestrial as argument six posits, and had powers to naturally raise people from the dead, why didn’t he touch Lazarus? From the account, he simply spoke to Lazarus and Lazarus came forth. Does that sound like any natural thing to you? Spencer won’t deal with the resurrection of Lazarus because he knows that the moment he does it will destroy his last two arguments. Argument 4

argues that resurrection would have to take place naturally, and argument 6 argues that either Jesus was an alien and/or aliens naturally raised him from the dead (maybe the angels were the aliens). Deal with the resurrection of Lazarus, Spencer. His refusal to do so shows the weakness of both arguments 4 & 6. Thus down go his last two arguments.

His arguments are down and out. Now there is something I intended to deal with in my 4<sup>th</sup> affirmative, but I forgot to deal with it. Spencer brought up William Lane Craig's quotation "Jesus rose to eternal life in a radically transformed body that can be described as immortal, glorious, powerful, and supernatural" (*Knowing the Truth About the Resurrection*, p 15). Now here is the problem the body that Christ had required food to sustain it, something a "radically transformed body that can be described as immortal, glorious, powerful and supernatural" would not need.

*"And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known of them in breaking of bread. And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet. And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, **Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb. And he took it, and did eat before them**" (Luk 24:35-43)*

The truth of the matter is that Christ did not get his glorified body until he ascended into heaven after he gave the great commission to his apostles. It was then, that, that he received his immortal body. His resurrected body was merely the body that had died that had been resurrected. Nothing special happened to the body except that life had been restored to it. However, when he ascended into heaven that fleshly body became a spiritual body because flesh and blood cannot enter heaven. Until that point, Christ's body was a flesh and blood body and his being able to eat is evident of that fact.

He wants to know why I accept A3, that God worked, not only behind the scenes, but through miracles. I accept it because the Bible tells me that he did. I accept the Bible because I have tested it in debate for the last 20 years against atheists and have found it to stand up against the strongest arguments they have thrown at it. I accept the Bible because in studying it I have found reasonable explanations for each and every so-called contradiction in the Bible. I have found reasonable explanations for every other alleged problem that has been brought up to me in the Bible. I have a long dissertation on the inspiration of the Bible giving affirmative arguments in favor of it at

<http://www.challenge2.org/inspirationofthebible.pdf>

Q1. Do you wish to retract your previous claim that you do *not* have strong reasons for supposing (NRDA) to be true? If so, please list what you believe are strong reasons for supposing (NRDA) to be true.

My answer is “No, I do not wish to retract my previous claim about your NRDA argument.”

Q2. Do you wish to contest the soundness of arguments Arg1-Arg6? If so, please indicate in your next affirmative the premises you dispute and your reasons for disputing them.

My answer is: “I have already contested the soundness of Arg1-Arg 6 and given my reasons for disputing them. My reasons aren’t going to change simply because you keep bringing the arguments up and asking me if I wish to contest them.

#### CLOSING REMARKS

This is my final affirmative and I have done my best to present affirmative material and defend that material. I have made one argument in favor of my proposition:

**Major Premise:** All total situations, the constituent elements of which are factual are total situations which are true.

**Minor Premise:** The total situation described by my proposition is a total situation the constituent elements of which are factual.

**Conclusion:** Therefore, the total situation described by my proposition is a total situation which is true.

In addition to that argument I have given five elements to prove that argument.

Element number one was “Only By The Supernatural Power Of God Could Jesus Christ Have Been Raised From The Dead.”

Element number 2 was “Secular History Includes Evidence For The Resurrection Of Jesus Christ.”

Element number three was “Biblical History Gives Information About God Raising Jesus From The Dead.”

Element number four was “Extra-Biblical History Reports Evidence of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.”

Element number five was “Biblical Arguments For The Resurrection.”

These five elements when put together make up the whole of my argument, and prove my minor premise, and therefore the conclusion of my argument. Therefore my proposition is proven. I have tried to get Mr. Lo to take these arguments and deal with them, instead his tactics were to present negative arguments in an attempt to keep me out of the affirmative; by his own admission. Mr. Lo pines because he has granted that Jesus rose from the dead and I am not reciprocating and allowing the possibility that his resurrection was a natural one. Well, I can't allow that which goes against the course of nature to be natural. The only way I can grant it is to argue for a supernatural resurrection, and that's what I have been doing during the course of this debate. I can't make Spencer answer my arguments, all I can do is make them and hope he will deal with them.

In Christ Jesus  
Jerry McDonald

[Lo's Fifth Rebuttal](#)

[Home](#)