

Arguments for the Existence of God

- **Cosmological Argument**
- **Teleological Argument**
- **Moral Argument**
- *Ontological Argument*

COSMOLOGICAL ARGUMENT

- Why is there something rather than nothing?
- Cosmos = “world” or “universe”
- The Cosmological Argument is the argument from the beginning of the universe. If the universe had a beginning, then the universe had a cause.

1. **Everything that had a beginning had a cause.**
2. **The universe had a beginning.**
3. **Therefore, the universe had a cause.**

Premise 1 - “Everything that had a beginning had a cause”

- Law of Causality - *The fundamental principle of science. Without the Law of Causality, science is impossible.*
- **“True knowledge is knowledge by causes.”** Francis Bacon (*the father of modern science*)

Philosophical Arguments

- The Unmoved/Immovable Mover (Aristotle)
- The Uncaused Causer (Thomas Aquinas)

Premise 2 - “The universe had a beginning.”

- Philosophical Argument



- Scientific Arguments
 - In examining the Cosmological Argument, we can see that there are at least 5 lines of scientific evidence leading to the conclusion that the universe did indeed have a beginning. They help disprove the idea that the universe always existed, something scientists believed for many years.
 - **Second Law of Thermodynamics**
 - **Universe is Expanding**
 - **Radiation from the Big Bang**
 - **Great Galaxy Seeds**
 - **Einstein’s Theory of General Relativity**

Second Law of Thermodynamics

- Thermodynamics is the study of matter and energy

- The Second law states that **the universe is running out of usable energy**. With each passing moment energy is being used up, just like gasoline in a car or batteries in a flashlight. Like a flashlight with only a finite amount of energy in its batteries, the universe runs on a finite amount of energy that isn't being replenished. If a flashlight were on from eternity, it would be out of energy by now. Likewise, due to the Second Law, if the universe were eternal, it would be out of energy by now. Since we still have usable energy right now, the universe must have had a beginning.
- Sometimes called the **Law of Entropy**, the Second Law of Thermodynamics also states that **the universe is moving toward disorder rather than order**. Entropy ensures that nature will eventually turn a building into a pile of bricks, but it will never turn a pile of bricks into a building.
 - The German scientist Rudolf Clausius laid the foundation for the second law of thermodynamics in 1850 by examining the relation between heat transfer and work. He is quoted as saying, "The energy of the universe is constant; the entropy of the universe tends to a maximum."
- Both of these aspects of the Second Law of Thermodynamics show that the universe had to have a beginning. Without a beginning, by now the universe would be in complete disarray with no usable energy remaining. But as the stars are still burning and the universe remains in motion, it must have had a beginning. And if the universe had a beginning, then it must also have had a beginner.

Universe is Expanding

- General Relativity predicted an expanding universe
- It wasn't until legendary astronomer **Edwin Hubble** looked through his telescope more than a decade later (1929) that scientists finally confirmed that the universe is expanding and that it's expanding from a single point.
- Red Shift
- He knew this because the light from the galaxies had shifted toward the red end of the spectrum. (A shift toward the blue would have indicated motion toward Earth, while a red-shift indicated movement away.)
- There was no matter before the "Big Bang." Time, space, and matter came into existence at the "Big Bang."

Radiation from the Big Bang

- Cosmic Background Radiation
 - Discovered by accident in 1965 when Arno Penzias and Robert Wilson detected strange radiation on their antenna at Bell Labs in Holmdel, New Jersey.
 - No matter where they turned their antenna, this mysterious radiation remained.
 - They even thought it could have been bird droppings, but once it was cleaned, the radiation was still there, and it was coming from all directions
 - What Penzias and Wilson had detected turned out to be one of the most incredible discoveries of the last century - one that would win them Nobel Prizes.
 - These two scientists had discovered the afterglow from the Big Bang fireball explosion.
 - This afterglow is actually light and heat from the initial explosion

- This light is no longer visible because its wavelength has been stretched by the expanding universe to wavelengths shorter than those of a microwave oven, but the heat can still be detected.
- As early as 1948, three scientists predicted that this radiation would be out there if the Big Bang really occurred.
- When this discovery was confirmed, it laid to rest any lingering suggestion that the universe is in an eternal steady state.

Great Galaxy Seeds

- If the Big Bang actually occurred, scientists believed that we should see **slight variations (or ripples) in the temperature of the cosmic background radiation** that Penzias and Wilson had discovered.
- **These temperature ripples enabled matter to congregate by gravitational attraction into galaxies.**
 - In 1989, NASA sent the \$200 million satellite COBE to look for these ripples. COBE stands for Cosmic Background Explorer.
 - In 1992, when the project leader, astronomer George Smoot, announced COBE's findings, his shocking characterization was quoted in newspapers all over the world.
 - He said, "If you're religious, it's like looking at God."
 - Stephen Hawking called the findings "the most important discovery of the century, it not all of time."
 - What did COBE find?
 - It not only found ripples, but scientists were amazed at their precision. The ripples show that the explosion and expansion of the universe was precisely tweaked to cause just enough matter to congregate to allow galaxy formation, but not enough to cause the universe to collapse back on itself.
 - Any slight variation one way or the other, and none of us would exist.
 - The ripples are so exact (down to one part in one hundred thousand) that Smoot called them the "machining marks from the creation of the universe" and the "fingerprints of the maker."
 - COBE actually took infrared pictures of the ripples.
 - The pictures taken by COBE point to the existence of matter from the very early universe that would ultimately form into galaxies and clusters of galaxies.
 - **Smoot called this matter "seeds" of the galaxies as they exist today**
 - These seeds are the largest structures ever detected, with the biggest extending across $\frac{1}{3}$ of the known universe.
 - That's 10 billion light years, or 60 billion trillion (60 followed by 21 zeros) miles.

Einstein's Theory of General Relativity

- Einstein's Theory of General Relativity gives evidence that the universe had a beginning, and its discovery was the beginning of the end for the idea that the universe is eternal.

- The theory itself, which has been verified to five decimal places, demands an **absolute beginning for time, space, and matter.**
 - It shows that **time, space, and matter are co-relative.**
 - That is, they are interdependent. You can't have one without the others
 - From General Relativity, scientists predicted and then found the expanding universe, the radiation afterglow, and the great galaxy seeds that were precisely tweaked to allow the universe to form into its present state.

Who made God?

- Logically, something has to be eternal.
- **Either the universe has always existed, or something outside of the universe caused it to come into existence.**

Natural Theology

- Creation informs us about God.
- Psalm 19:1-2 - *The heavens declare the glory of God, and the sky above proclaims his handiwork. Day to day pours out speech, and night to night reveals knowledge.*
- Romans 1:18-20 - *For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who by their unrighteousness suppress the truth. For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. For his invisible attributes, namely, his eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly perceived, ever since the creation of the world, in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse.*

Attributes of the First Cause

- Self-existent, timeless, nonspatial, and immaterial (*since the First Cause created time, space, and matter, the First Cause must be outside of time, space, and matter*). In other words, it is without limits, or infinite;
- Unimaginably powerful, to create the entire universe out of nothing;
- Supremely intelligent, to design the universe with such incredible precision (*we'll see more of this next week*);
- Personal, in order to choose to convert a state of nothingness into the time-space-material universe (*an impersonal force has no ability to make choices.*)

These characteristics of the First Cause are exactly the characteristics theists ascribe to God.

Cosmological Argument

1. Everything that had a beginning had a cause.
2. The universe had a beginning.
3. Therefore, the universe had a cause.

TELEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT

- Why is there so much design to the universe/life?
 - *Telos* = “design”
1. **Every design has a designer.**
 2. **The universe/life has a highly complex design.**
 3. **Therefore, the universe/life has a Designer.**

Isaac Newton said,

“The most beautiful system of the sun, planets and comets, could only proceed from the counsel and dominion of an intelligent and powerful Being.”

Premise 1 - “Every design has a designer.”

- William Paley
 - **The Watch and the Watchmaker**
- As complex as a Rolex is, the universe is infinitely more complex. It is specifically tweaked to enable life on earth - a planet with scores of improbable and interdependent life-supporting conditions that make it a tiny oasis in a vast and hostile universe.
 - These highly precise and interdependent environmental conditions (which are called “anthropic constants”) make up what is known as the Anthropic Principle.
 - Anthropic comes from the Greek word *Anthropos* that means “human” or “mankind.”
 - The Anthropic Principle is just a fancy title for the mounting evidence that has many scientists believing that the universe is extremely fine-tuned (designed) to support human life here on earth. Any small variation in any of a number of factors could alter the delicate balance and cause the end of life on our planet.
 - It’s as if there is a control room somewhere with hundreds of dials, all of which are adjusted to exactly the right settings for life within our universe to exist. In fact, many of these factors are interdependent. In other words, if just one of these universal constants was even slightly different, the change would affect the other constants and life and our universe would not exist.
 - Some of these physical factors are so precise (we call them constants) that they defy any “chance” explanation.
 - By the way, “chance” explanation is Darwinian evolution. The Teleological Argument speaks directly in contrast with Darwinism. One is chance. One is intelligent design.

Premise 2 - “The universe has a highly complex design.”

- Anthropic Principle
- **The universe is extremely fine-tuned (*designed*) to support human life on earth. Any small variation in any of a number of factors could alter the delicate balance and cause the end of life on our planet.**

Anthropic Constants

large number: 1 with 22 zeros following it), his answer was shocking: one chance in 10^{138} - That's one chance in one with 138 zeros after it! There are only 10^{70} atoms in the entire universe. In effect, there is zero chance that any planet in the universe would have the life-supporting conditions we have, unless there is an intelligent Designer behind it all.

- C.S. Lewis, in his classic book *The Screwtape Letters*, provides a great insight into this tendency we have to take for granted the amazing world all around us. The senior demon, Screwtape, writes some advice to his junior demon, Wormwood, on how to keep people from becoming Christians. Screwtape writes, “*Keep pressing home on him the ordinariness of all things. Above all, do not attempt to use science (I mean, the real sciences) as a defense against Christianity. They will positively encourage him to think about realities he can't touch and see. There have been sad cases among modern physicists.*” The “sad cases” are, of course, physicists who have been honest with the evidence they've seen and have become Christians.
- Lewis hit on a tendency many of us have. In our fast-paced lives, we rarely stop and observe the world around us and, therefore, tend to consider every amazing fact of this beautiful universe as ordinary. But as we have seen, it is anything but ordinary. Now science is showing us like at no other time in history that this is a universe of incredible design and complexity. It's giving us a new perspective on a world that we too often take for granted.

The Design of Life

- Why is it important to understand the origin of life?
 - Your belief about the origin of life affects how you view your own life. If everything that exists is the result of a cosmic accident and humans evolved from primordial goo, then life has no ultimate meaning. If humanity is nothing but a cosmic accident, then you are nothing but a highly evolved collection of cells whose ultimate fate is to return to dust. But if we were created, then you and everyone you know are endowed with rights, meaning, and purpose. What you believe matters.
- When it comes to the origin of life, there are really only two possibilities: Either life is the product of intelligence or it is not.
- Either some kind of intelligence created life or it came together by natural forces. While many atheists admit there is no good naturalistic explanation for the origin of life, they still insist that spontaneous generation must have occurred at some point, possibly in a warm pond millions of years ago.
- They insist on this view despite its lack of evidence because they have ruled out intelligent design in advance and therefore refuse to consider it as a real possibility.
- This is a philosophical presupposition that guarantees a naturalistic conclusion, and one that requires an unreasonable amount of faith to follow.

Evolution – Darwin

- The supreme problem for Darwinists is not explaining how all life forms are related (which IS a huge problem). The supreme problem for Darwinists is explaining the origin

of the *first* life. For unguided, naturalistic macroevolution to be true, the first life must have generated spontaneously from nonliving chemicals.

- The first life - so-called “simple” life - that of a one-celled animal known as an amoeba
 - According to the theory of evolution, all life has sprung from a first simple life, which came about by spontaneous generation (without intelligent intervention) in a warm little pond somewhere on the very early earth. This is called macroevolution.
- Unfortunately, for Darwinists, the first life - indeed any form of life - is by no means “simple.”

DNA

- This became abundantly clear in 1953 when James Watson and Francis Crick discovered DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid), the chemical that encodes instructions for building and replicating all living things.
- The incredible complexity of life becomes obvious when one considers the message found in the DNA of a one-celled amoeba (a creature so small that several hundred could be lined up in an inch).
- Staunch Darwinist Richard Dawkins, professor of zoology at Oxford University admits that the message found in just the cell nucleus of a tiny amoeba is more than all thirty volumes of the Encyclopedia Britannica combined, and the entire amoeba has as much information in its DNA as 1,000 complete sets of the Encyclopedia Britannica!
- In other words, if you were to spell out all of the A, T, C, and Gs of the nucleotides in the “unjustly called primitive amoeba” (as Dawkins describes it), the letters would fill 1,000 complete sets of an encyclopedia.
- Now we must emphasize that these 1,000 encyclopedias do not consist of random letters but of letters in a very specific order - just like real encyclopedias.
 - So the question arises: if simple messages such as “take out the trash” or “Mary loves Scott” require an intelligent being, then why doesn’t a message 1,000 encyclopedias long require one?

Atheists cannot answer the question, “If there is no God, why is there something rather than nothing?” They seek to use evolution as their answer.

Microevolution vs. Macroevolution

- Darwinists make no distinction between microevolution and macroevolution, and thus use the evidence for micro to prove macro.
 - Macroevolution cannot account for the first life, but even if it could, it can’t be true
 - Why can’t natural selection do the job? Here are five reasons it can’t:
 - Genetic Limits
 - Cyclical Change
 - Irreducible Complexity
 - Nonviability of Transitional Forms
 - Molecular Isolation

MORAL ARGUMENT

- Why is there right and wrong?
 - **Do you agree with the statement that there is nothing objectively wrong with murder, rape, torture, or child abuse?**
 - What must exist in order for those statements to be objectively wrong?
 - An objective Moral Law
1. Every law has a law-giver.
 2. There is an objective Moral Law.
 3. **Therefore, there is a Moral Law-Giver.**

When I say that the Moral Law exists, it means that all people are impressed with a fundamental sense of right and wrong.

How do we know the Moral Law exists?

1. The Moral Law is undeniable.
 - Relativists usually make two primary truth claims: one, there is no absolute truth, and two, there are no absolute moral values.
 - For the person who denies all values, values his right to deny them. Further, he wants everyone to value him as a person, even while he denies that there are values for all persons.
 - Even those who deny all values nevertheless value their right to make the denial. Moral values are practically undeniable.
2. We know the Moral Law exists by our reactions.
 - There are absolute morals. If you really want to get a relativist to admit it, all you need to do is treat them unfairly. Their reactions will reveal the Moral Law written on their hearts and minds.
 - Relativism is ultimately unlivable.
 - The Moral Law is not always apparent from our actions...but it is brightly revealed in our reactions.
 - The Moral Law is not always the standard by which we treat others, but it is nearly always the standard by which we expect others to treat us.
3. Without the Moral Law, there would be no human rights.
 - “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.” - The Declaration of Independence
 - Why is murder wrong?
 - If Morals are relative, why did the Allied forces prosecute Nazi war criminals after the war?
 - They were violating basic human rights.

4. Without the Moral Law, we couldn't know justice or injustice.
 - We can only detect injustice because there is an unchanging standard of justice written on our hearts.
 - You can't know what is evil unless you know what is good.
 - You can't know what is good unless there is an unchanging standard of good outside of yourself.
 - Without that objective standard, any objection to evil is nothing but your personal opinion.

5. Without the Moral Law, there would be no way to measure moral differences.
 - Maps of Scotland
 - If the Moral Law doesn't exist, then there's no moral difference between the behavior of Mother Teresa and that of Adolf Hitler.
 - "My argument against God was that the universe seemed so cruel and unjust. But how had I got this idea of just and unjust? A man does not call a line crooked unless he has some idea of a straight line. What was I comparing this universe with when I called it unjust?" –C. S. Lewis*

6. Without the Moral Law, you couldn't know what was right or wrong.
 - Without the Moral Law, there is no differentiating between right and wrong. It is all just a matter of opinion.

7. Without the Moral Law, there are no moral grounds for political or social dissent.
 - Without the Moral Law, atheists have no moral ground to argue for their political causes.

8. If there were no Moral Law, then we wouldn't make excuses for violating it.
 - People make excuses for immoral behavior.
 - That itself is an admission that the Moral Law exists.

Speeding Example

- **Just because you don't follow the law,**
- **don't believe in the law,**
- **aren't aware of the law,**
- **disagree with the law,**
- **or everybody breaks the law,**
- **doesn't mean the law does not exist.**

Arguments for the Existence of God

- Cosmological Argument
- Teleological Argument
- Moral Argument
- Ontological Argument*