

SPECIAL REPORT

THE CASE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD, WITHOUT A BIBLE OR ANY HOLY BOOK

Robert Fawcett

W R F Publishing Company
Suite 400
1400 16th Street
Denver, CO 80202

Website: www.MajorReligions.com
E-Mail address: Info@MajorReligions.com

This Special Report is included in the book
The Major Religions of the World
.....Revisited
The book is available on the website.

Copyright © 2011 by Robert Fawcett

PREFACE

A little Lesson on Faith,
and God versus Science

I know neither its origin nor the author of this piece, but it's pretty cute, and has its place in this discussion.

A college professor begins the school year with a lecture to the students.

“Let me explain the problem science has with religion.”
The atheist professor pauses before his class, and then asks one of his new students to stand.

“You’re a Christian, aren’t you, son?”

“Yes sir,” the student says.

“So, you believe in God?”

“Absolutely.”

“Is God good?”

“Sure! God’s good.”

“Is God all-powerful? Can God do anything?”

“Yes.”

“Are you good or evil?”

“The Bible says I’m evil.”

The professor grins knowingly. “Ah ha! The Bible!” He considers for a moment. “Here’s one for you. Let’s say there’s a sick person over here, and you can cure him. You can do it. Would you help him? Would you try?”

“Yes sir, I would.”

“So, you’re good...!”

“I wouldn’t say that.”

“But why not say that? You’d help a sick and maimed person if you could. Most of us would if we could. But God doesn’t.”

The student does not answer, so the professor continues. “He doesn’t, does he? My brother was a Christian who died of cancer, even though he prayed to Jesus to heal him. How is this Jesus good? Hmmm? Can you answer that one?”

The student remains silent.

“No, you can’t, can you?” the professor says. He takes a sip of water from a glass on his desk to give the student time to relax.

“Let’s start again, young fella. Is God good?”

“Er...yes,” the student replied.

“Is Satan good?”

The student doesn't hesitate on this one. “No.”

“Then where does Satan come from?”

The student falters. “From God.”

“That's right. God made Satan, didn't he? Tell me, son. Is there evil in this world?”

“Yes, sir.”

“Evil's everywhere, isn't it? And God did make everything, correct?”

“Yes.”

“So who created evil?” The professor continued, “If God created everything, then God created evil, since evil exists, and according to the principle that our works define who we are, then God is evil.”

Again, the student has no answer. “Is there sickness? Immorality? Hatred? Ugliness? All these terrible things, do they exist in the world?”

The student squirms on his feet. “Yes.”

“So, who created them?”

The student does not answer again, so the professor repeats the question. “Who created them?” There is still

no answer. Suddenly, the professor breaks away to pace in front of the classroom. The class is mesmerized.

“Tell me,” he continues onto another student. “Do you believe in Jesus Christ, son?”

The student’s voice betrays him, and cracks. “Yes, professor, I do.”

The old man stops pacing. “Science says you have five senses you use to identify, and observe the world around you. Have you ever seen Jesus?”

“No, sir. I’ve never seen Him.”

“Then tell us if you’ve ever heard your Jesus?”

“No, sir, I have not.”

“Have you ever felt your Jesus, tasted your Jesus, or smelt your Jesus? Have you ever had any sensory perception of Jesus Christ, or God for that matter?”

“No, sir, I’m afraid I haven’t.”

Yet, you still believe in Him?”

“Yes.”

“According to the rules of empirical, testable, demonstrable protocol, science says your God doesn’t exist. What do you say to that, son?”

“Nothing,” the student replies. “I only have my faith.”

“Yes, faith,” the professor repeats. “And that is the problem science has with God. There is no evidence, only faith.”

The student stands quietly for a moment, before asking a question of his own. “Professor, is there such a thing as heat?”

“Yes,” the professor replies. “There’s heat.”

“And, is there such as thing as cold?”

“Yes, son, there’s cold too.”

“No, sir, there isn’t.”

The professor turns to face the student, obviously interested. The room suddenly becomes very quiet. The student begins to explain. “You can have lots of heat, even more heat, super-heat, mega-heat, unlimited heat, white heat, a little heat or no heat, but we don’t anything called *cold*. We can hit up to 458 degrees below zero, which is no heat, but we can’t go any further after that. There is no such thing as cold; otherwise, we would be able to go colder than the lowest minus 458 degrees.”

The student continued. “Every body, or object, is susceptible to study when it either has or transmits energy. And heat is what makes a body, or matter, either have or transmit energy. Absolute zero (-458 F) is the total absence of heat. You see, sir, cold is only a word we use to describe the absence of heat. We cannot measure

cold. Heat we can measure in thermal units, because heat is energy. Cold is not the opposite of heat, sir, just the absence of it.”

Silence across the room. A pen drops somewhere in the classroom, sounding like a hammer.

The student continues. “What about darkness, professor. Is there such a thing as darkness?”

“Yes,” the professor replies without hesitation. “What is night if it isn’t darkness?”

You’re wrong again, sir. Darkness is not something -- it is the absence of something. You can have low light, normal light, bright light, flashing light, but if you have no light constantly, you have nothing and it’s called darkness, isn’t it? That’s the meaning we use to define the word.”

“In reality, darkness isn’t. If it were, you would be able to make darkness darker, wouldn’t you?”

The professor begins to smile at the student in front of him. This will be a good semester. “So, what point are you making, young man?”

“Yes, Professor. My point is that your philosophical premise is flawed to start with, and so your conclusion must also be flawed.”

The professor’s face cannot hide his surprise this time. “Flawed? Can you explain how?”

“You are working on the premise of duality,” the student explains. “You argue that there is life, and then there’s death – a good God and a bad God. You are viewing the concept of God as something finite, something we can measure. Sir, science can’t even explain a thought.”

“It uses electricity and magnetism, but has never seen, much less understood, either one. To view death as the opposite of life is to be ignorant of the fact that death cannot exist as a substantive thing. Death is not the opposite of life, just the absence of it.”

“Now tell me, professor. Do you teach your students that they evolved from a monkey?”

“If you are referring to the natural evolutionary process, young man, yes, of course, I do.”

“Have you ever observed evolution with your own eyes, sir?”

The professor begins to shake his head, still smiling, as he realizes where the argument is going. A very good semester, indeed.

“Since no one has ever observed the process of evolution at work and cannot even prove that this process is an ongoing endeavor, are you not teaching your opinion, sir? Are you now not a scientist, but a preacher?”

The class is in an uproar! The student remains silent until the commotion has subsided.

“To continue the point you were making earlier to the other student, let me give you an example of what I mean.”

The student looks around the room. “Is there anyone in the class who has ever seen the professor’s brain?” The class breaks into laughter.

“Is there anyone here who has ever heard the professor’s brain, felt the professor’s brain, touched or smelt the professor’s brain? No one appears to have done so. So, according to the established rules of empirical, demonstrable protocol, science says that you have no brain, ...with all due respect, sir.

So, if science says you have no brain, how can we trust your lectures, sir?”

Now the room is silent. The professor just stares at the student, his face unreadable. Finally, after what seems to be an eternity, the old man answers. “I guess you’ll have to take them on faith.”

“Now, you accept that there is faith, and, in fact, faith exists with life,” the student continues. “Now, sir, is there such a thing as evil?”

Now uncertain, the professor responds, “Of course, there is. We see it every day. It is in the daily example of man’s inhumanity to man. It is in the multitude of crime, and violence everywhere in the world. These manifestations are nothing else but evil.”

To this the student replied, “Evil does not exist, sir, or at least it does not exist unto itself. Evil is simply the absence of God. It is just like darkness and cold, a word that humankind has created to describe the absence of

God. God did not create evil. Evil is the result of what happens when humankind does not have God's love present in their heart. It's like cold that comes when there is no heat, or the darkness that comes when there is no light."

The professor sat down.

Faith requires reason, and the faculty of reasoning, in order to understand what is believed, and to articulate what is believed. Therefore, faith is complete trust, confidence, or reliance in the reasoning behind the belief.

Reason: the ability to analyze, to think logically, and to think-out systematically.

Moral evil: meaning, evil caused by humankind through rebellion against God and/or by our cruelty to others such as the innocent suffer many times because of hatred (war, rebellion, terrorism, or an individual act), or overindulgence (a drunk driver who kills, or injures, an innocent family), or greed (many starving to death while others hoard surpluses).

THE CASE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD, WITHOUT A BIBLE OR ANY HOLY BOOK

Pursue God, ...and you'll find happiness.

Pursue Happiness, ...and you'll find neither.

Professor C. S. Lewis
Mere Christianity

* * * * *

From the Apostle Paul, we have this:

For the truth about God is known instinctively. God has put this knowledge in their hearts. From the time the world was created, people have seen the earth and sky and all that God made. They can clearly see his invisible qualities – His eternal power and divine nature. So, they have no excuse whatsoever for not knowing God.

Romans 1:19 –20

* * * * *

We are created to worship God, and if we don't worship God, ...we will worship something else. Understanding this truth, and knowing that we are all so needy, has really helped Alex and me in our ministry to people.

Emily Large

* * * * *

All human beings – regardless of where they live or what religion they may have been raised under – have a natural longing for God. The Bible tells us that God's law is written on our hearts. The same thing that the Apostle Paul wrote about applies to us today:

Even when Gentiles (non-Jewish people), who do not have God's written law, instinctively follow what the law says, they show that in their hearts they know right from wrong. They demonstrate that God's law is written within them, for their own consciences either accuse them or tell them they are doing what is right.

Romans 2:14-15

* * * * *

To begin, I'll take a shot at addressing the question of atheism. As I continued to study, I needed to keep in mind that this is a discussion on its shortcomings in order to make the case for the

existence of God. So, the following is a modified version of the case made by John Maisel in his lecture booklet, *Is Jesus God?*

The person who holds an atheistic position really puts himself or herself in a very difficult position when you really think through the issues. Making the statement that “there is no God” is not a very rational position to assume. First of all, when that statement is made, it violates a basic philosophical presupposition that says that a finite person cannot draw an infinite, or absolute, conclusion.

If we gathered religious experts from all over the world, from different faiths and different backgrounds, and asked them, “Who is God?,” we would have many different opinions. Some would say God is personal; some would say God is impersonal. By sheer logic, we would have to conclude that God could not be both personal and impersonal at the same time.

When we examine the questions about God, “Who is He?” and “How can I know Him?,” we encounter the finite mind as it attempts to understand an infinite being, person, ...or God. Because of our limited and finite minds, humankind has developed many different opinions.

Further, when a person says there is no God, that person even violates a basic philosophical principle. They are a person with a finite understanding making an absolute statement about the nature of infinity. It would be like asking how much total knowledge humankind possesses. Albert Einstein, the Noble Prize Winner in Physics, has said that humankind grasps less than one percent (yes, less than 1%) of total knowledge. Therefore, if we only have less than one percent of total knowledge, would it not be possible for God to exist in the other 99+%?

One can see that it is impossible for a person with a finite mind to make an absolute statement that there is no God, because to do so one would need to possess total knowledge; therefore, it is very difficult for people to think about what God is really like, and be confident that their opinions are correct.

To help illustrate this point, a conversation being held between a professor of a university and a student who said he was an atheist:

PROFEESOR: “How can you say you are an atheist (meaning, there is absolutely no God) when you agree that you have less than one percent of total knowledge?”

STUDENT: “I guess I need to say I am an agnostic – I don’t know if there is a God.”

PROFESSOR: “Are you a hard agnostic, or a soft agnostic?”

STUDENT: “What do you mean?”

PROFESSOR: “A hard agnostic says, ‘You can’t know if there is a God’, and a soft agnostic says, ‘I don’t think there is a God.’”

STUDENT: “I guess you would have to say I am a hard agnostic.”

PROFESSOR: “Can you ever be sure that ...you can be sure that there is not a God? Or, do you know for sure that ...you can’t know anything for sure?”

STUDENT: “No. I can’t say for sure that I can be sure there is no God.”

PROFESSOR: “So, you’re really a soft agnostic.”

STUDENT: “Yes, I guess that’s true – I don’t know if there is a God.”

PROFESSOR: “You sound to me like a person who is saying, ‘I have never seen any evidence that there is a God, so I don’t know if there is.’”

STUDENT: “That’s right. I have never been exposed to any evidence about ...God ...life ...life after death ...or the ultimate meaning of life.”

And, that is where we must start, with the question: *Is there sufficient evidence for me to conclude that there is a God, and that I can have a personal relationship with Him?*

Atheism, by definition, is a nothingbutisms, and nothingbutisms are always illogical. One cannot say “there is nothing but something” because there would be nothing to compare it to for identification. For an atheist to claim there is nothing but matter is meaningless. If that were so, they would be unable to identify as matter.

Let’s look in more detail at the difficulty that the atheists put themselves into by their position when trying to answer the question of the existence of the universe. In other words, the “if” proposition, about anything that really exists. Does this universe really exist? Does this building really exist? Do these chairs exist? If something exists – where did it come from? You really have only two conclusions to that question: Does anything really exist? Either something must be eternal, or something eternal came from nothing.

The atheist has only the following options:

1. That which is eternal is the universe.

But that is not true, because the second law of thermodynamics says that the universe is not eternal. The universe is like a giant clock that has been wound up, and it is now winding down. Cars don't get newer each year; they get older. Buildings don't get more beautiful each year; they get older and eventually fall down. The law of thermodynamics says the universe cannot be eternal, because, in time, it will wind down.

[For the sake of this discussion, think in terms of a closed system such as our solar system (the sun which our Earth and eight other planets orbit). This solar system fits inside our galaxy, the Milky Way. Our galaxy forms a unit within the universe.]

This is how the Second Law of Thermodynamics helps to prove the existence of something being eternal. This logic follows from one of the most fundamental laws of contemporary physics and engineering. The Second Law of Thermodynamics says that in a closed system, the available energy will become less and less until finally you have no available energy at all. This is called a growth in *entropy* that finally results in heat death. It is a generalized law of the universe.

[Entropy is a measure of the degree of disorder in a system bearing energy such as heat/temperature that has the ability, or capacity, to do work, or to produce change. Energy is never destroyed. Ice melting in a glass in a warm room is an example of increasing entropy – entropy

increases in a small universe, a thermodynamic system consisting of the “surroundings” (a warm room) and a “system” (glass, ice, cold water). Heat will flow from the hot body to the cold one. But once the two bodies have reached the same temperature, everything stops. No energy has been lost by the heat transfer, it’s just no longer useful; thus, an example of where the entropy of the system has increased.]

Now for the atheist, the universe has to be such a system because there is no God outside. The universe is all there is. It is such a closed system. But, according to the Second Law of Thermodynamics, it only takes a finite amount of time to reach heat death.

Think about it. For the atheist, the universe is all there is, so it has always been around. That’s been an infinite period of time. But, an infinite period of time will embrace any finite period; so, the universe would already have reached heat death if the atheist were right. Now, it evidently hasn’t, because there is still enough energy left to discuss the question.

So, we must conclude that atheists are wrong in their assumptions. One of two things must be the case, maybe both:

- a. The universe was created a finite amount of time ago, and has not yet had enough time to reach heat death.
- b. God created it. (And/or there is some cosmic gas station attendant out there somewhere feeding in energy. That is known as continuous creation by the theologians.)

But, you've got to have creation. The Second Law of Thermodynamics insists on it. Go to Gordon Van Wylen's textbook on *Thermodynamics* (published by Wylie & Son, Philadelphia, the scientific and technical publisher). Gordon Van Wylen was head of the Engineering Department at the University of Michigan. This is the most widely used text in Thermodynamics. Professor Van Wylen says, "*Many authors, and myself, must believe in God. We have no choice. The Second Law of Thermodynamics insists upon this.*"

2. The second choice the atheist has, if the first is not true, is to say that the universe is not eternal.

If they are being honest with the laws of physics, where did the universe come from? Their next position is that the universe created itself⁹, which is a logical absurdity.

For something to create itself without existing prior cannot be true. One of the basic laws of science is "nothing comes from nothing." The atheist must say the universe is not eternal, and if this non-eternal universe exists, they cannot conclude that it created itself from nothing. As we have said, nothing comes from nothing, so it didn't create itself.

3. The next perspective could be that everything must be an illusion. In other words, I'm not really here, but we know that cannot be true, because we can set specific times and make predictions with comets, with sunrise, and sunsets. Most atheists do not conclude that this is true.

4. The only other option that the atheist has is that this non-eternal universe was created by something that is eternal. That something, that is eternal, is someone – God. That is the Christian view, and is a rational view.

To the Christian, that “who” is eternal, and is an infinite personal God who created this universe, and He created human beings. There are two key factors that we can appeal to:

- a. the arguments of cause and the effect;
- b. the idea that for every design, there must be a designer.

(a.) For every effect, there has to be an equal and a greater cause. As I look around at this natural universe, there is nothing to explain this effect of the universe from what I see. There is nothing in the universe that is of sufficient cause to cause this effect. And so, it is reasonable to assume that the ultimate cause must be outside the universe.

(b.) I look at design and assume a designer. Example, a wristwatch: you know this wristwatch just didn’t happen; you can’t take the pieces of this watch, put in a box, shake it up, and out comes this watch. There is a watchmaker that made this watch. I look at the effect of this building, and the wind didn’t create this building. There was design behind this building. All scientific investigation is based upon order, and design.

When the Russian cosmonaut went into space and said, “*I see no God here,*” that is like going into an art gallery, seeing a beautiful painting, and saying, “*I see no artist.*” The painting of Mona Lisa didn’t paint the Mona Lisa. There was a master artist, Leonardo Da Vinci, who painted it.

Let's assume that there is a God. And because I'm a human being, I think, I feel, I make choices, and I know that I am an effect. That it is reasonable to assume that this God is both infinite and personal, because I am finite and personal. He created me like He is, in His image -- with the ability to think, feel, and make choices. How can I know that this "absolute" we call God is personal? Well, is it more reasonable to think that the absolute is personal, or impersonal?

For one thing, notice that we have used our minds in reasoning to the absolute. Wouldn't it be strange if it required rational minds and personalities to engage in this argumentation, and when you finally arrived at God, He is non-rational? It would be more reasonable to assume that the reason we are able to get there rationally is that He is rational and a personal being Himself.

For another thing, in our experience, the impersonal does not give rise to the personal. You do not have birdhouses giving rise to birds. The personal gives rise to the impersonal. Human beings build bridges; bridges do not turn into people. So, it is more reasonable to assume that the Source of the universe is personal and rational than that the Source of the universe is impersonal; that is to say, irrational.

Life never evolved from non-life. If I'm an effect, then there has to be a cause that is greater from someone like I am.

The atheist has a big problem in understanding any type of moral values. Because, if they conclude that there is nothing eternal, then there are no absolutes; so, who determines what is right and what is wrong? It's like the Russian writer Fyodor Dostoyevsky

wrote in *The Brothers Karamazov*, “If there is no God, then everything is permitted.” And, it is true. If there is no absolute God in authority, then who determines the value of anything? Popular vote?

As Tom Wolfe (well known current author of *The Right Stuff* and *A Man In Full*, being his best known books), said at Brown University: “*Unless you believe in God in Heaven who points his finger at you and said ‘Thou shalt’ and ‘Thou shalt not’ you have no basis for values, and you have no way to get us out of the mess our culture is in.*”

The atheist has no answer for where did the laws of logic come. So, they can never defend their position from logic, because logic must have an ultimate source to appeal to.

Is it reasonable to eliminate the existence of God? The existence of God cannot be deemed impossible because the cause and effect cannot be invalidated.

Of course, God cannot be self-caused; however, there is another alternative than an unending line of causes – namely an eternal God. An eternal God could be a cause, ...yet need no cause.

Also, since the universe is not eternal and all causes are greater than their effects, the cause of the universe must be ultimately ...eternal.

Does life make sense without God? If there is no God, life is absurd.

Humankind’s values would be changing; hence, moral truth would be relative, but that is impossible.

Human utopia and education are also meaningless, because humankind faces death, and with it ...extinction.

The universe also faces death; so, life holds no ultimate significance.

The contributions of scientists to human knowledge, the advance of medicine, the efforts of the diplomats to secure peace in the world, the sacrifices of good people everywhere, all come to nothing.

Humanity is essentially nothing more than a swarm of flies, or a herd of pigs. Because humankind ends in nothing, we become nothing.

* * * * *

A 20-STEP PROOF FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

An adequate case for the existence of God can be made without reference to any Bible, or holy book.

Simple observation and logical thinking can construct a case for God.

This is a twenty-step proof for the existence of God:

1. Every effect has a cause, which is greater (that is, more complex) than itself.
2. The universe is an effect, which must have a cause, which is greater (more complex) than itself.
3. The universe exists. Pantheism is wrong.
Pantheism: from the Greek, meaning it is the view that “God is everything” and “everything is God;” or, that the universe, or nature, and God are equivalent.

Therefore,

4. The cause of the universe exists.
5. The universe contains the personal and the moral. (We humans are personal and moral.)

Therefore,

6. A (at least) personal moral cause for the universe exists. So, the cause can now be called “He,” not “It.”
7. The universe does not create something from nothing (by observation), yet it is something. (See #3 above.)
8. Therefore, the universe had to be created from nothing (or from something that was ultimately created from nothing.)

Therefore,

9. The personal moral existing cause for the universe can create; that is to say, a personal moral Creator exists.

10. If the Creator-Cause were finite, then He would have another Creator-Cause who would in turn have a Creator-Cause and so forth.

This leads to an infinite regress of causes.

...CN--...C3--...C2--...C1--...U

11. But that would mean that at least one finite Creator-Cause would be either (a) self-caused or (b) uncaused.

That is impossible because:

- a. A being cannot precede itself to cause itself.
- b. Nothing finite is uncaused (by observation).

Therefore,

12. All the causes cannot be finite (non-ultimate) causes.

Therefore,

13. The personal moral existing Creator-Cause is infinite; that is to say, ultimate.
14. The infinite cause must be eternal because eternity is infinity applied to time (and no meaningful statement can be made about space without reference to time).
15. An infinite eternal Cause could not change (since anything He would change into, He would already be).

Therefore,

16. The Creator-Cause must be all-knowing, all-powerful, and all-perfect; otherwise, He could change.

Therefore,

17. A personal, moral, infinite, eternal, immutable (unchanging), all-knowing, all-powerful, all-perfect Creator-Cause exists.

18. Such a Being is worthy of worship.

19. A Being worthy of worship can be called God.

Therefore,

20. GOD EXISTS.

CONCLUSION

Atheism must be rejected as an unreasonable worldview.

Note: The foregoing is a modified excerpt from the lecture booklet *Is Jesus God?* (Maisel, John. Is Jesus God?. East-West Ministries, International; 4450 Sojourn Drive; Addison, TX 75001. © 2002 East-West Ministries, Int'l.)

* * * * *

My observation is that the most common discussion put forward by atheists is, in reality, the overhanging argument for *choice*; that is to say, “It is my right to choose whether or not I believe in some higher power, a deity who can be called God.”

Once you sift through all the clutter, the essence of their argument is that it doesn’t make any difference: they simply do not want to believe in, or accept, God! The agnostics are in the same camp, too.

So, it boils down to people choosing their own beliefs simply because they do not want to be obligated to any system that makes ultimate demands on them – such as:

- the Jewish teaching On Our Creator, The Lord Our God saying (see website Table of Contents: Judaism, The Ten Commandments), “*I am the Lord, your God. Do not worship any other.....*” and the next Commandment, “*Do not make any idols of any kind, whether...,*”
- or the Summary Of The Law (see website Table of Contents: Christianity, The New Covenant) where it says, “*You shall love the Lord your God with...*” and “*You shall love your neighbor...,*”
- or the Christian teaching On Reconciliation With God saying “*Reconciling with God, or put another way, becoming a Christian, is a decision that each man and woman must make by myself...,*” and then lining out the steps,
- or ultimately having to humble themselves before an Almighty Supreme Being, ... God.

* * * * *

It is written, in the Book of Psalms that *Reverence for the Lord is the foundation of true wisdom.*

Psalm 111:10

Note: Wisdom: the quality of being wise: having and showing good judgment, having the power of discerning correctly and judging correctly, discriminating between what is true and what is false, or between what is proper and what is improper.

Notice that the definition doesn't have anything to do with formal education. By way of example, there are many poor uneducated people who are considered to be wise. Muhammad, as a further example, was considered to be wise, yet he could neither read nor write.

