

This pamphlet considers 3 core areas of evidence for God. What do you think?

You might like to reply with your thoughts to

roland@hopeadmaston.org.uk

The debate regarding God's existence has gone on for 1000's of years from at least Greek philosophy to the present day. It cannot be proved either way in a mathematical sense, but evidence can be weighed. To prove that God does not exist would require all positive evidence to be defeated – likewise the reverse. We will continue to look at 3 core types of evidence.

Is there a God? 1 – The Finite Universe

Science can give us lots of information back to the microseconds after the start of the universe. But it can neither go before the universe, nor answer the big "Why?" question. Below are three related pieces of evidence to consider.

- 1) Mathematics and "the infinite" It is mathematically and scientifically impossible for the universe to have been around for an infinite amount of time. For example, if it had been around for an infinite amount of time it would be impossible to measure time¹. There had to be a beginning we call it the Big Bang. Anything that is actually infinite is beyond this universe.
- 2) Philosophy and "Cause and effect" For something to begin, it must have something to both will to start it and to actually start it. If this universe had a beginning, then there must be something that preceded it to start it off. This something must have had both the will and power, and is beyond this universe.
- 3) Science and "a Beginning" Scientific theory traces the universe back to a Big Bang because we observe an expanding universe. This confirms that the universe has a beginning and thereby logically shows that something existed before the universe which was both able to and wanted to form the universe. This something has to be something beyond the universe and which depended on nothing else for its cause.

What would we call this something that is:

- Beyond the universe,
- Had the will and power to bring the universe into being, and
- Is the uncaused cause of all things?

- 1) Universe Designed for life The universe at both a micro level (atoms and materials) and at a macro level (the cosmos) shows intelligent design behind it. Astrophysicist Hugh Ross lists 57 parameters² that are crucial to life: these range from the ratio of electron mass to proton mass for chemical bonding, to the distance of the earth from the sun for a stable water cycle. Is this unlikely chance, or evidence for a designer?
- 2) Intelligent Communication for life DNA is the information stored in life that defines what that life form is like. Did the carefully arranged code in the DNA come about by chance? In an extremely unlikely event, some information can be randomly ordered, but never with the intention of communicating something. DNA is clearly intended to communicate and so originates from an external communicator. We refer to Mother Nature. This is good evidence for an external intelligent communicator.
- 3) Irreducible Complexity Anything in our world has a certain irreducible complexity. For example, how much of a mouse trap can be removed before it can no longer catch mice? Take the most basic eye it has to allow light in, have receptors to receive the light, a communication channel to the brain and an agreed language with the brain. If anyone of these bits is lacking, it will not work in any functional capacity. It has to be all present in one go no animal is going to have an advantage by having a hole in the head without the rest being present. Many evolutionists talk of "big leaps" in the chain³, others simply step over this. The theory of evolution which relies on mutation and natural selection cannot produce an eye by random chance. All practical theories require intelligent design and manufacture to develop these areas of irreducible complexity.

What would we call this intelligent being that has:

- Designed the universe and matter,
- Established life-forming communication systems, and
- Developed items of irreducible complexity?

Is there a God? 3 - Right and Wrong

- Cultural relativism Cultural relativism is the idea that as different cultures
 have different morals, there must be no absolute moral standard. There is a
 simple logical flaw in this: a cultural relativist must accept as valid a culture
 that argues there is an absolute morality, but this defeats his own concept.
- 2) Conventionalism Conventionalism is the idea that right or wrong is defined by what a society decides. Working against that society's moral perspective is therefore immoral. But this makes all great reformers such as Gandhi, Wilberforce or Martin Luther King immoral people.
- 3) Personal Morality This is the idea that I decide what is right for myself: morality is a question of choice and preference. Someone who holds this view cannot speak against anyone else (e.g. Hitler or 9/11) as they were doing what they chose to be right. This cannot be right; there must be some objective morality which defines certain things as clearly wrong.
- 4) Objective Morality This is the idea that there is an absolute and objective morality which does not change and against which all else can be measured. This is evidenced by the fact that the above possibilities cannot stand. It is further evidenced by concepts of morality (e.g. loyalty) existing in all times and cultures. Morality is about how we ought to behave (prescriptions), not how we actually behave (descriptions); it consists of commands, not suggestions; it applies to all people at all times; it exists independent of our beliefs.
- 5) Presence of Evil To be able to call something evil is only possible because of the existence of good. In calling something evil, we are saying that it does not conform to what we would expect of something good. This implies the presence of an absolute standard of goodness.
- 6) **Presence of Guilt** When we break a moral code, we may feel guilty. That guilt is not just towards the person we have offended, but can be a vaguer sense of general guilt. This would suggest that we feel guilty because we have broken some transcendent morality.

The existence of an objective, transcendent, moral code is strong evidence for the existence of a transcendent person who prescribes that moral code. What would we call that person?

Of course, this evidence leads to many more questions...