### heresy CP

#### Public colleges and universities ought to censor people who criticize the Christian religion.

#### Heaven contains infinite good, while hell contains infinite bad. Thus, consequentialists have an obligation to maximize the chances of salvation.

Clarke 11 Steve “Coercion, Consequence and Salvation” April, 2011 Scientific Approaches to the Philosophy of Religion Part of the series Palgrave Frontiers in Philosophy of Religion pp 205-223 JW

Practically all of those who believe in salvation agree that salvation is supremely important. Salvation is typically understood as a precondition to entry into Heaven and the opportunity to enter Heaven is usually understood as an opportunity that only comes along once. On standard Christian and Muslim views entry into Heaven enables the experience of maximal happiness for eternity. And if that were not enough motivation to do what is necessary for salvation, Christian and Muslim theologians often add that some or all of those who are not saved will spend an eternity suffering in Hell. Salvation, if indeed it is available, is of overwhelming importance when compared to any other prudential or ‘self-regarding good’ (as distinct from ‘other-regarding goods’), or indeed all other prudential goods combined. Salvation is a necessary precondition to receiving eternal happiness. In the absence of salvation, our enjoyment of all other prudential goods is necessarily ephemeral. Salvific exclusivism has long been a prominent position amongst both Christians and Muslims. The Catholic Church officially advocated a fairly strict form of salvific exclusivism up until the time of Vatican II (1962-1965), holding that salvation is only available to practicing Catholics (Avalos, 2005, pp. 195-6). Nowadays its position is a salvific preferentialist one, according to which no one is excluded from the bare possibility of salvation, however, membership of the Catholic Church is said to make it much easier to attain salvation (Jones, 1967). The Southern Baptist Convention holds that only Christians can attain salvation, a form of salvific exclusivism that is common amongst conservative protestant groups. Muslim Salvific Exclusivists are often less exclusive than their Christian counterparts. An influential view in Islam is that Salvation is available to ‘people of the book’ – including Christians and Jews, but not to Hindus, Confucians and others. However, members of the Salafi branch of Sunni Islam are more exclusive than most Muslims, often holding that only very devout Muslims can be saved (Adraoui, 2008). Consequentialists, who view morality as being exhausted by the consideration of consequence, hold that we ought to do whatever can be done to ensure that the best possible consequences occur. So it seems that consequentialists who are salvific exclusivists should do everything they can to attempt to persuade all others to join the appropriate religious organisation, believe the required religious propositions and/or participate in the required religious practices, so that they may maximise their chances of attaining salvation – the one overwhelmingly significant consequence. The same claim can be made for those salvific exclusivists who are not consequentialists, but who accept that the consequences of salvation are important enough to trump whatever concerns, other than concerns of consequence, that they consider that morality requires. Such concerns might include deontological constraints that would override many considerations of consequence but are not considered to override consequences as significant as the attainment of salvation. What if the salvific exclusivist who is committed to maximising the chances that others are able to attain salvation is unable to persuade others to do what she believes that they need to do in order to attain salvation? Sometimes it may be within the power of consequentialist salvific exclusivists to coerce others to join religious organisations, to participate in religious practices, and, in so far as this is possible, to believe particular religious propositions. Should salvific exclusivists who are able to coerce others to do these things, in order to ensure that those others are eligible to receive salvation, do so? Many Kantians would object to the use of coercion, under such circumstances, on the grounds that it fails to respect individual autonomy. But consequentialists should have no such qualms, particularly when the stakes are as high as they are when the possibility of salvation hangs in the balance. Surely the consequentialist salvific exclusivist will consider that she has a moral obligation to employ coercive means to compel acceptance of the correct religion. Furthermore, it seems that the consequentialist salvific exclusivist has a moral obligation to ensure that rival religious doctrines are not promulagated, if there is some chance that these will be accepted by some people and that this acceptance will result in those people being denied salvation.

#### Any miniscule chance of a Christian God existing justifies attempted conversion.

Duncan 7 Craig Duncan (Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Philosophy and Religion at Ithaca College) “The Persecutor’s Wager” Philosophical Review, Vol. 116, No. 1, 2007 JW

Since S > 0, it follows that EV(EC) − EV(L) is greater than zero so long as pC ≠ 0 and Δc > 0. Thus, so long as there is some probability of an exclusivist Christian god existing, and so long as enforcement adds at least one person to the Christian ranks or retains within the fold one person who would otherwise slip away, enforcement has greater expected otherworldly value than liberty. But what about this-worldly expected value—that is, the expected amounts of well-being produced by each option in this world? Were we to include these in our calculations, we would end up with an equation of the following sort: EV(EC) − EV(L) = pC ⋅ S ⋅ Δc + A where A represents the difference between the this-worldly expected val- ues associated with enforcement and liberty. From this it follows that EV(EC) > EV(L) if and only if pC ⋅ S ⋅ Δc > −A With respect to choosing between options, then, the key question is whether the quantity pC⋅S⋅Δc is greater than the quantity −A. Since reli- gious enforcement undoubtedly causes great anguish to those subject to it, A is very likely to be a large negative number, making −A a large posi- tive number. Hence the quantity pC⋅S⋅Δc will have to be an even larger positive number in order for enforcement to have greater expected value than liberty. When will this happen? Borrowing a page from Pascal’s Pensées, a religious persecutor might answer “very often.” This is so, the persecutor can claim, because the well-being associated with salvation is infinite in scope—and when we set S equal to ∞, then so long as pC and Δc are both greater than zero, the quantity pC⋅S⋅Δc will likewise equal ∞. This will be in nitely greater than −A, a nite quantity, and thus enforcement will have infinitely greater expected value than liberty, no matter how much anguish the enforcement option will cause in this world.

#### Next: God must exist, three warrants.

Keller 8 Timothy J. Keller The Reason for God: Belief in an Age of Skepticism. New York: Dutton, 2008. Print.

The Mysterious Bang Those of a more rational mind-set have always been fascinated by the question, “[First] Why is there something rather than nothing?” This question has become even more interesting to people in the wake of the Big Bang theory. There’s evidence that the universe is expanding explosively and outwardly from a single point. Stephen Hawking wrote: “Almost everyone now believes that the universe, and time itself, had a beginning at the Big Bang.”2 Scientist Francis Collins puts this clue in layman’s language in his book The Language of God: We have this very solid conclusion that the universe had an origin, the Big Bang. Fifteen billion years ago, the universe began with an unimaginably bright flash of energy from an infinitesimally small point. That implies that before that, there was nothing. I can’t imagine how nature, in this case the universe, could have created itself. And the very fact that the universe had a beginning implies that someone was able to begin it. And it seems to me that had to be outside of nature.3 Everything we know in this world is “contingent,” has a cause outside of itself. Therefore the universe, which is just a huge pile of such contingent entities, would itself have to be dependent on some cause outside of itself. Something had to make the Big Bang happen—but what? What could that be but something outside of nature, a supernatural, noncontingent being that exists from itself. Sam Harris, in his review of Francis Collins’s book, makes the classic objection to this line of reasoning. “In any case,” he writes, “even if we accepted that our universe simply had to be created by an intelligent being, this would not suggest that this being is the God of the Bible.”4 That is perfectly right. If we are looking at this as an argument proving the existence of a personal God, it doesn’t get us all the way there. However, if we are looking for a clue—a clue that there is something besides the natural world—it is very provocative for many people. The Cosmic Welcome Mat [Second] For organic life to exist, the fundamental regularities and constants of physics—the speed of light, the gravitational constant, the strength of the weak and strong nuclear forces—must all have values that together fall into an extremely narrow range. The probability of this perfect calibration happening by chance is so tiny as to be statistically negligible.5 Again, Collins puts it well: When you look from the perspective of a scientist at the universe, it looks as if it knew we were coming. There are 15 constants—the gravitational constant, various constants about the strong and weak nuclear force, etc.—that have precise values. If any one of those constants was off by even one part in a million, or in some cases, by one part in a million million, the universe could not have actually come to the point where we see it. Matter would not have been able to coalesce, there would have been no galaxy, stars, planets or people.6 Some have said that it is as if there were a large number of dials that all had to be tuned to within extremely narrow limits—and they were. It seems extremely unlikely that this would happen by chance. Stephen Hawking concludes: “The odds against a universe like ours emerging out of something like the Big Bang are enormous. I think there are clearly religious implications.” Elsewhere he says, “It would be very difficult to explain why the universe would have begun in just this way except as the act of a God who intended to create beings like us.”7 This has been called the “Fine-Tuning Argument” or the “Anthropic Principle,” namely that the universe was prepared for human beings. As an argument it must be a pretty powerful one, because there are a lot of fierce rebuttals being published about it. The most common rejoinder, which Richard Dawkins makes in his book The God Delusion, is that there may be trillions of universes. Given the enormous number of universes existing over enormous amounts of time and space, it is inevitable that some of them are fine-tuned to sustain our kind of life. The one we are in is one, so here we are.8 Again, as a “proof,” the Fine-Tuning Argument is rationally avoidable. Though there’s not a shred of proof that there are many universes, there’s also no way to prove that there aren’t. However, as a clue, this line of thinking has force. Alvin Plantinga gives this illustration. He imagines a man dealing himself twenty straight hands of four aces in the same game of poker. As his companions reach for their six-shooters the poker player says, “I know it looks suspicious! But what if there is an infinite succession of universes, so that for any possible distribution of poker hands, there is one universe in which this possibility is realized? We just happen to find ourselves in one where I always deal myself four aces without cheating!”9 This argument will have no effect on the other poker players. It is technically possible that the man just happened to deal himself twenty straight hands of four aces. Though you could not prove he had cheated, it would be unreasonable to conclude that he hadn’t. The philosopher John Leslie poses a similar illustration. He imagines a [hu]man who is sentenced to be executed by a firing squad consisting of fifty expert marksmen.10 They all fire from six feet away and not one bullet hits him. Since it is possible that even expert marksmen could miss from close range it is technically possible that all fifty just happened to miss at the same moment. Though you could not prove they had conspired to miss, it would be unreasonable to draw the conclusion that they hadn’t. It is technically possible that we just happened to be in the one universe in which organic life occurred. Though you could not prove that the fine-tuning of the universe was due to some sort of design, it would be unreasonable to draw the conclusion that it wasn’t. Although organic life could have just happened without a Creator, does it make sense to live as if that infinitely remote chance is true? The Regularity of Nature [Third] There is something about nature that is much more striking and inexplicable than its design. All scientific, inductive reasoning is based on the assum[es]ption of the regularity (the “laws”) of nature, that water will boil tomorrow under the identical conditions of today. The method of induction requires generalizing from observed cases to all cases of the same kind. Without inductive reasoning we couldn’t learn from experience, we couldn’t use language, we couldn’t rely on our memories. Most people find that normal and untroubling. But not philosophers! David Hume and Bertrand Russell, as good secular men, were troubled by the fact that we haven’t got the slightest idea of why nature-regularity is happening now, and moreover we haven’t the slightest rational justification for assuming it will continue tomorrow. If someone would say, “Well the future has always been like the past in the past,” Hume and Russell reply that you are assuming the very thing you are trying to establish. To put it another way, science cannot prove the continued regularity of nature, it can only take it on faith. There have been many scholars in the last decades who have argued that modern science arose in its most sustained form out of Christian civilization because of its belief in a all-powerful, personal God who created and sustains an orderly universe.11 As a proof for the existence of God, the regularity of nature is escapable. You can always say, “We don’t know why things are as they are.” As a clue for God, however, it is helpful.

#### The bible is a historically accurate document and proves that Christianity is correct—four warrants.

Zukeran 14 Patrick (ounder and Executive Director of Evidence and Answers, a research and teaching ministry specializing in Christian apologetics, the defense of the Christian faith. He is the host of the radio show Evidence and Answers (www.evidenceandanswers.org). Pat is the author of several books including The Apologetics of Jesus co-authored with Norman Geisler; God, Eternity, and Spirituality (ed.); and Unless I See . . . Is There Enough Evidence to Believe? Pat is a popular conference speaker and he also serves as an adjunct faculty for several colleges and institutes worldwide. He earned a B.A. from Point Loma Nazarene University, a Master of Theology (Th.M.) from Dallas Theological Seminary, and a Doctorate of Ministry (D.Min.) in Apologetics from Southern Evangelical Seminary) “How I Know Christianity Is True – A Defense of the Gospel” Probe August 30, 2014 <https://www.probe.org/how-i-know-christianity-is-true/> JW

Among all the books written by man, none have the credentials that equal the Bible. The second evidence for Christianity is the Bible, which proves itself to be true and divinely inspired. [First,] The Bible proves itself to be true because it is a historically accurate document. Thousands of archaeological discoveries confirm its historical accuracy. Numerous civilizations, rulers, and events once thought legendary by the skeptics have been confirmed by archaeology. Even miraculous geographic events in Sodom and Gomorrah, Jericho, and Sennachareb’s defeat in the 7th century B.C. have passed the test of archaeological scrutiny. Another proof of the Bible’s truth is in historical records outside the Bible. Numerous historical records from ancient civilizations confirm the historicity of the biblical accounts. Dr. William Albright, who is still respected as probably the foremost authority in Middle Eastern archaeology, said this about the Bible: “There can be no doubt that archaeology has confirmed the substantial historicity of the Old Testament.”{3} The historical evidence upholds the premise that if an ancient historical work proves to be accurate again and again in its detail, we can be confident that it is accurate on the material we cannot confirm externally. The Bible’s divine inspiration is attested to in its unity. [Second,] Although the Bible is written over a 1500 year period, written by over forty different authors from different backgrounds, and covers a host of controversial subjects, it maintains a unified theme and it does not contradict itself in principle from beginning to end. This indicates that a divine author supervised the entire process and guided each writer. Second, [Third,] we have the remarkable record of prophecy. Hundreds of detailed prophecies are written years before the event takes place. For example the prophet Ezekiel in chapter 26 describes accurately how the city of Tyre will be destroyed years before it occurs. Daniel predicts the empires of Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome. Prophecy shows the divine hand of God because only an eternal being could have inspired the writers to leave such a legacy. Finally, [Fourth,] the Bible answers the major questions all belief systems must answer. Where did we come from? What is the nature of the divine? What is our relationship to the divine? What is the nature of man? How do we explain the human predicament? What is the answer to the human predicament? What happens after death? And how do we explain evil? Any system that does not answer these questions is an incomplete system. The Bible gives the most complete and accurate answers to the truly important questions of human existence. No other book ever written has these credentials. A book written by God would have the fingerprints of God all over it. The Bible alone has His fingerprints.{4}

### AT: Infinite Values Don’t Matter

#### Even if infinite values aren’t relevant under consequentialism, assign salvation an unimaginably high finite value, like 100 to the 100th to the 100th.

Duncan 7 Craig Duncan (Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Philosophy and Religion at Ithaca College) “The Persecutor’s Wager” Philosophical Review, Vol. 116, No. 1, 2007 JW

I suggest that the root intuition at work in this assignment of infinite value to salvation is the idea that the good found in salvation is incomparably better than the goods one finds in this world; its magnitude is such as to swamp into irrelevance any good we are familiar with in our temporal existence.20 That is to say, the same conclusion will follow from the wager so long as the good of salvation is so immense that by comparison the goods of this world utterly pale in significance. Regarding saved individuals as infinitely well-off turns out merely to be the most dramatic form this swamping effect can take, not the only form.21 For instance, in the Simple Case, we could interpret S, not as ∞, but rather as a tremendously large finite number. To see this, recall from section 3 that had I included this-worldly well-being in the Simple Case, a comparison of options EC and L would have yielded the follow-ng equation: EV(EC) − EV(L) = pC ⋅ S ⋅ Δc + A with A representing the difference in this-worldly expected value associated with options EC and L. Clearly, so long as pC > 0 and Δc > 0, we can always set S equal to a finite positive number (say, 100100100) large enough that the resulting quantity pC⋅S⋅Δc is itself large enough to “absorb” the negative number A with only a negligible difference in its size, proportionally speaking. In this case A could be said to be swamped into irrelevance.