

God:

Is Divine Existence Credible?

By Dr. Dallas Burdette

WEBSITE: freedominchrist.net

In residing, some years ago, at an American State University, one of the things that most impressed me was the prevalence, alike among the students and among members of the staff, of the view that belief in God is no longer possible for any really enlightened mind.¹

Moses (1526-1446 BC) began his book with “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth” (Genesis 1:1). As we examine the word *God* in this chapter on Christian apologetics, we call attention to the origin of the concept of God in the world of humanity. Is Divine existence credible? It is appropriate to begin this study with the question, where did the idea of God originate? In the nineteenth century (April, 1829), Alexander Campbell (1788-1866, early leader in the Second Great Awakening) addressed the thought of the existence of God in terms of where the idea of God originated. He presented this question to Robert Owen (1771-1858, founder of socialism in England and an American atheist) in his debate concerning the existence of God.²

GOD’S EXISTENCE REVEALED THROUGH SUPERNATURAL REVELATION

God’s initial revelation of Himself came through supernatural means, not through nature. Since everyone has a concept of God, the question is: where did this idea come from? Did the notion of God originate within one’s imagination or did the idea of God originate from a direct revelation from God Himself? Since humanity lives in a world of five worlds—**seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, and feeling**. The idea of God had to come outside our five worlds. Since human beings have an idea of God, where and when did the inspiration of an eternal First Cause

¹Norman Kemp Smith, *Is Divine Existence Credible?* (London: Humphrey Milford Amen House, E. C., 1931), 3. This essay was presented at the Annual Philosophical Lecture, Henriette Hertz Trust, British Academy, July 15, 1931. This paper is one of the best papers that I have read in defense of why one can believe that Divine existence is credible.

²Alexander Campbell and Robert Owen, *The Evidences of Christianity: A Debate between Robert Owen, of New Lanark, Scotland and Alexander Campbell, President of Bethany College, VA* (Nashville: McQuiddy Printing Company, 1957), 123.

who is uncaused enter into the world of the human race? Where did the idea of One who is outside of space and time originate? The Christian proposal of an Eternal First Cause uncaused is the only answer for human existence and the creation of the Universe.

The question that confronts everyone is: how did the impression of God come into existence. The answer: When God created Adam and Eve, He revealed Himself directly. **Since we are confronted with God's existence, we ask, again, the question, where did the impression of God come from?** The only answer is that God revealed Himself through supernatural revelation. Neither man nor woman could have invented the concept of God through imagination or reason. Even those who deny God's existence, we observe that all of these individuals have a concept of the God that they repudiate; otherwise, they could not write about God.

Why? Humanity lives, as stated earlier, in a world of five worlds—seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, and feeling. It is quite evident that human beings could not have initiated the brainstorm of God through the five senses. The thought of God had to come from outside the sphere of this world of time and space. On the other hand, it is through the five senses that we acquire our theories of the Universe; it is not through the senses that our thoughts, or perceptions, of God exists. Men and women could never, without the aid of Divine Revelation, have originated the idea of Deity.

God revealed Himself to Adam and Eve, and this revelation came to them through direct disclosure from God, not their five senses. God's existence had to come to both (Adam and Eve) through direct revelation, not through the five worlds of nature. Once the idea of God originated through divine revelation, then nature proves the existence of God. All nations have derived their idea of Deity from traditions handed down from Adam and Eve, not from the light of nature. Since humanity possesses only five senses, humankind could not have originated the idea of Deity. With no other guide but the light of nature, we know that men and women could never have invented or imagined Deity.

After God revealed Himself through direct interaction (supernatural revelation), we then see God in creation (natural revelation). The five senses, in and of themselves, do not reveal the existence of God by themselves. God had first to make Himself known through supernatural means. Today, all humanity has some belief about God's existence, which notion came through God disclosing Himself to Adam and Eve. Once God unveiled Himself, mankind is then able to see evidence of God's reality through His creation of the Universe with Planet Earth as unique in our Galaxy. Also, within the five senses of humanity, we discover design, which design suggests the idea of supreme intelligence. We witness the handiwork of God in the world of our five senses. For instance, without the sense of **smell**, life oftentimes would be destroyed. Second, next to that is **taste**. Through the world of taste, we are able to discriminate between that which is agreeable to our well-being and that which is disagreeable to our health.

The Author of nature (God) wisely ordered the locale, or geographical location, of the sense "taste." If this sense had been located somewhere else, this world of "taste" would be valueless to humankind. Within this world of taste, one is also cognizant that saliva is associated with the world of taste. This action enables the tongue to discriminate the qualities of the food, or substance, as pleasing or displeasing. **Feeling** is another world of humanity that exhibits design in creation. We, through this sense, are able to determine the roughness,

smoothness, hardness, softness, coolness, hotness, and so on, of objects, which ability is essential to our well-being. If we were born without these three avenues of intelligence, these three worlds would be closed and we would remain forever in ignorance. Without these three worlds, we could never originate the idea of material tangibility, that is to say, something that is sensible, touchable, verifiable, graspable, well-rounded, and so on.

The fourth world of the five senses is **hearing**. With this faculty, we are able to discriminate vibrations and motions of the air. Every impression made upon the outward ear reaches the middle ear. If one is born deaf, that person has no idea of the nature of sound; therefore, this one cannot learn the art of speaking. One who is deficient of this world of hearing cannot communicate his or her ideas to others. Finally, the fifth world is **seeing**. This world is one of the most perfect and delightful of all senses. This is the avenue of intelligence through which all our ideas of color, magnitude, and distance are derived. The impressions made upon this sense reach the sensorium, or brain, through the optic nerve. Our ideas of colors, sounds, odors, tastes, and touch are derived through these five senses.

This study of the five senses is important in answering the question: where did the idea of God come from? It is obvious that there is nothing in the five senses that could have revealed God without God first having revealed Himself through Divine Revelation. We could not acquire such knowledge without direct revelation from God, which revelation was passed on to the descendants of Adam and Eve. It would be just as rational to talk of seeing by the hand, or hearing by the tongue, as for us to talk of knowing God without a communication from God Himself. What is revelation? Revelation cannot be applied to anything done upon the earth.

Thomas Paine (1737-1809) wrote his *Age of Reason* as an attack against Christianity.³ In spite of his attack against Christianity and the Bible, he, nevertheless, correctly defined “revelation” in his assault against the Bible, which confrontation originated from his reaction to the clergy of his day as a pretentious power-seeking priesthood. He raised his cry against ecclesiasticism and Roman Catholicism that shackled the human mind with its thralldom of relentless systems of bondage. He failed to grasp that the religious climate of his day was not biblical Christianity. The following words on “revelation” by Paine add clarity to the concept of “where did the idea of God come from”:

As it is necessary to affix right ideas to words, I will, before I proceed further into the subject, offer some observations on the word *revelation*. Revelation, when applied to religion, means something communicated *immediately* from God to man.

No one will deny or dispute the power of the Almighty to make such a communication, if He pleases. But admitting, for the sake of a case, that something has been revealed to a certain person, and not revealed to any other person, it is revelation to that person only. When he tells it to a second person, a second to a third, a third to a fourth, and so on, it ceases to be a revelation to all those persons. It is revelation to the first person only, and *hearsay* to every other, and consequently they are not obliged to believe it.⁴

³For a refutation of Paine’s book, see Richard Watson, *Reply to Paine; or, An Apology for the Bible: in Letters to Thomas Paine* (New York: American Tract Society, 1796, 1825).

⁴Thomas Paine, *The Age of Reason* (New York: Citadel Press, Inc., reprint, 1948, 1974), 51-52. Paine was not an atheist, but he was a deist.

Revelation is a communication of something that the person to whom it is revealed did not know before. Revelation is supernatural. It means Divine communication concerning spiritual and eternal things—a knowledge that we could never have attained by the exercise of our own reason upon material, or sensible, objects. The human intellect has no creative powers. It can only rearrange in new images the data already received through the world of our five senses. The world of spirits is outside our world of five senses. Once more, the words of Paine are on target as he seeks to clarify the meaning of *Revelation*:

Revelation is a communication of something which the person to whom that thing is revealed did not know before. For if I have done a thing, or seen it done, it needs no revelation to tell me I have done it, or seen it done, or seen it, nor to enable me to tell it, or to write it.

Revelation, therefore, cannot be applied to anything done upon earth, of which man himself is the actor or the witness; and consequently all the historical and anecdotal parts of the Bible, which is almost the whole of it, is not within the meaning and compass of the word revelation, and, therefore, is not the Word of God.⁵

Paine is correct in his definition of the word *revelation*, but, at the same time, he fails to understand that the written Word of God does contain information concerning the coming of the Messiah that, of necessity, did take direct supernatural revelation from God, which understanding did not come through the world of our five senses. So, the Bible is still the Word of God, which revelation He revealed through supernatural means to make public His scheme of redemption through Christ. The following remarks by Alexander Campbell (1788-1866, an early leader in the Second Great Awakening of the religious movement known as the Stone/Campbell Movement), in his debate with Owen, are informative and, at the same time, uphold the integrity of the Old and New Testament writings, which writings, Paine denied as being the Word of God:

Mr. Campbell continues: Mr. Chairman—I have just now found on my desk a few questions from some unknown hand, which, I suppose, have been presented to me from my own invitations given during the discussion. As these questions bear upon our discussion, I beg leave to give a brief answer.

The first is. Are the books composing the Old and New Testaments the only books of divine authority in the world?

I answer positively, Yes. I have already said, that the books composing the two Testaments contain more than what is properly called a *Divine Revelation*. They contain much history which can with no propriety be called a Divine Revelation; for example, the history of the deluge—the confusion of human language—the dispersion of the human family—the biography of the patriarchal judges, and kings of Israel—the chronicles of Judea and Israel. All the things recorded in these sections were written, and therefore could not be REVELATIONS. But it was necessary that these important facts, because of their intimate connection with the people to whom Divine Revelations were made, should be recorded and divinely authenticated. Hence the Pentateuch, in addition to all the revelations which it contains, presents us with a historic record of the first ages of the world, divinely authenticated.⁶

⁵Ibid., 59.

⁶Alexander Campbell, *The Evidences of Christianity: A Debate Between Robert Owen, of New Lanark, Scotland and Alexander Campbell, President of Bethany college, VA*—Held in Cincinnati, Ohio, in April 1829—(reprinted—Nashville: McQuiddy Printing Co, 1957), 380-381.

We can state categorically that the name of God first entered the human family by revelation, not through the five senses. Over again, Campbell drives home the point of supernatural revelation in his famous debate on atheism. Listen to him as he explains:

The term revelation, in its strict acceptance among intelligent Christians, means nothing more or less than a Divine communication concerning spiritual and eternal things, a knowledge of which man could never have attained by the exercise of his reason upon material and sensible objects: for as Paul says, “Things which the eye has not seen, nor ear heard, neither has it entered into the heart of man to conceive, has God revealed to us apostles, and we declare them to you.” Now the corollary [outcome] is, that, to a man to whom this divine revelation has never been made, it is as impossible to acquire ideas of spiritual and eternal things, as for a blind man to admire the play of colors in a prism.⁷

Once more, the idea of supernatural “revelation” is extremely important in our discussion of our knowledge of God’s existence. Yet again, we call attention to Alexander Campbell, in his debate with Robert Owen in 1829, as he read from his *Christian Baptist* his remarks to Owen’s *New Harmony Gazette* newspaper concerning the question of where the idea of God originated. Owen’s band of unbelievers maintained that the idea of God did not originate through reason nor did the idea of God originate from the Bible. Since Owen’s paper represented “the official news organ of Owen’s experimental City of Mental Independence at New Harmony, Missouri,”⁸ he presented the following problem to this group of atheists:

A PROBLEM **To the Editors of the New Harmony Gazette**

You think that reason cannot originate the idea of an Eternal First Cause, or that no man could acquire such an idea by the employment of his senses and reason—and you think correctly. You think also that the Bible is not a supernatural revelation—not a revelation from a Deity in any sense. These things premised, gentlemen, I present my problem in the form of a query again.

The Christian idea of an Eternal First Cause uncaused, or of a God, is now in the world, and has been for ages immemorial. You say it could not enter into the world by reason, and it did not enter by revelation. Now, as you are philosophers and historians, and have all the means of knowing, how did it come into the world?⁹

Owen, upon listening to Campbell’s remarks, responded by saying that this concept of God originated through one’s imagination.¹⁰ Campbell replied by saying,

⁷Ibid., 152.

⁸Robert Frederick West, *Alexander Campbell and Natural Religion* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1948), 67. See also Richard J. Cherok, *Debating for God: Alexander Campbell’s Challenge to Skepticism in Antebellum America* (Abilene, Texas: Abilene Christian University Press, 2008), 41, for the beginning of *New Harmony Gazette*. He writes: “Owen initiated the publication of a weekly Newspaper, the *New Harmony Gazette*, on October 1, 1825.”

⁹Alexander Campbell, *The Evidences of Christianity: A Debate Between Robert Owen, of New Lanark, Scotland and Alexander Campbell, President of Bethany college, VA—Held in Cincinnati, Ohio, in April 1829—(reprinted—Nashville: McQuiddy Printing Co, 1957), 123.*

¹⁰Ibid.

Imagination, all writers agree, has not the power of creating any new idea. It has the power of analyzing, combining, compounding, and new-modifying all the different ideas presented to it; but imagination has no creative power.¹¹

In other words, Campbell is simply saying that from all the known principles of mental philosophy the “imagination” cannot create anything. It can only combine and rearrange in new forms the images already derived through the five senses—in other words, the “imagination has no creative power.” Campbell called upon Owen to disprove his remarks by calling upon him to imagine something in the sixth sense. Listen to Campbell as he comments upon the sixth sense:

Let us try the faculty of imagination, and prove, by our own experience, its creative power. We have but *five senses*: I would therefore ask Mr. Owen, and every one present, if you can, by any exertion of your faculties, imagine a *sixth sense*? What would it be? If you were to imagine any other sense, it must be analogous to those you already possess. You might imagine a being like a fabulous Argus [Gk. Myth. A hundred-eyed giant who was made guardian of Io and was later slain by Hermes.], with a hundred eyes; but fancy that you possessed an organ, like that of Fame, that would enable you to hear from a greater distance than the eye could reach to but could you have imagined this unless you had derived the simple idea of hearing from your organ of hearing. But a sixth sense, unlike those possessed, cannot be imagined. Now, Mr. Owen cannot, from his five senses, imagine a sixth, how can he assert that a savage or philosopher could imagine a God? But I call upon Mr. Owen to imagine and report to us a sixth sense.¹²

John Locke (1632-1704, British philosopher, Oxford academic and medical researcher) wrote a monumental essay (actually this essay is a book) “Concerning Human Understanding” in which he discusses the limits of human perception in respect to God. His comments reaffirm Campbell’s arguments concerning human comprehension and imagination. I cite his observations, even though lengthy, in order to drive home the importance of recognizing the five senses in our knowledge of the world in which we live:

2. *The mind can neither make nor destroy them.* These simple ideas, the materials of all our knowledge, are suggested and furnished to the mind only by those two ways above mentioned, viz. sensation and reflection. When the understanding is once stored with these simple ideas, it has the power to repeat, compare, and unite them, even to an almost infinite variety, and so can make at pleasure new complex ideas. But it is not in the power of the most exalted wit, or enlarged understanding, by quickness or variety of thought, to *invent* or *frame* one new simple idea in the mind, not taken in by the ways before mention: nor can any force of the understanding *destroy* those that are there.

The dominion of man, in this little world of his own understanding being much what the same as it is in the great world of visible things; wherein his power, however managed by art and skill, reaches no farther than to compound and divide the materials that are made to his hand; but can do nothing towards the making the least particle of new matter, or destroying one atom of what is already in being.

The same inability will every one find in himself, who shall go about to fashion in his understanding one simple idea, not received in by his senses from external objects, or by reflection

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Ibid., 125.

from the operations of his own mind about them. I would have any one try to fancy any taste which had never affected his palate; or frame the idea of scent he had never smelt: and when he can do this, I will also conclude that a blind man hath ideas of colours, and a deaf man true distinct notions of sound.¹³

Humanity is confronted with a search for the original concept of God. Where did the idea of God come from? The answer: God revealed Himself through supernatural revelation. Neither man nor woman could have originated the concept of God through imagination or reason. Why? Humanity lives in a world of five worlds—seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, and feeling. It is quite evident that human beings could not have invented the idea of God through the five senses. The idea of God had to come from outside the sphere of this world of time and space. In addition to the concept of God, we are also confronted with other things identified with God. For example, where did the idea of priest, altar, sacrifice, and so on, originate. Campbell related these spiritual concepts to an audience of approximately 1200 in order to illustrate his comments of supernatural revelation versus the world of the five senses. Owen did not refute Campbell's logic concerning the spiritual realm. Listen, once more, to Campbell as he presents another dilemma for unbelief:

I am apprehensive that it will be necessary for me to do one of two things—either to institute a regular argument demonstrative of this position, viz: “That it is impossible for man to originate any of those supernatural ideas which are developed in the Christian religion;” that is to say, I shall have to undertake to prove philosophically that man could not invent, or originate the idea of a God, a Spirit, a future state, or any of the positive institutions of religion; that he never could have invented or originated the ideas inseparably connected with the word *priest*, *altar*, *sacrifice*, etc., ergo [hence], that these ideas and the words used to express them, are derivable only from an immediate and direct revelation; man having no power, according to any philosophic analysis of his intellectual powers, to originate any such ideas.¹⁴

In Campbell's twelfth reply to Mr. Owen, he again spoke of five worlds within humanity:

[A] world of colors, cognizable by the eye; a world of sounds, cognizable by the ear; a world of odors, cognizable by the olfactory [relating to the sense of smell] sense; a world of savors, cognizable by the taste; and a world of tacts [something tangible], that is, of the tactile [proceeding from the sense of touch] properties of bodies, all the ideas belonging to which world are cognizable only by the sense of feeling....

But then there is the world of spirits, which no man could imagine, and of which these five worlds do not afford and archetype [model], or sensation, or perception. Of this world we have many ideas, thoughts, terms, and conversations, and the question is, How did we come by them? No window or door has been opened to us in the department of sense. Where are the organs, the senses, the media, through which we have derived these ideas? Not by the eye, the ear, nor the taste; for these are our

¹³John Locke, “An Essay Concerning Human Understanding,” in Robert Maynard Hutchins, Editor in Chief, *The Great Books of the Western World*, Volume 35 (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1937, 1971), 128. I divided this long paragraph into three paragraphs for ease of reading.

¹⁴Alexander Campbell, *The Evidences of Christianity: A Debate Between Robert Owen, of New Lanark, Scotland and Alexander Campbell, President of Bethany college, VA—Held in Cincinnati, Ohio, in April 1829—(reprinted—Nashville: McQuiddy Printing Co, 1957)*, 89.

corporeal [physical, bodily] senses, and cannot take cognizance of spiritual existences. For all our ideas of spiritual and eternal things we must, therefore, be indebted to some other power.¹⁵

It is through the five senses that we acquire our ideas of the Universe; it is not through the senses that our ideas, or concepts, of God exists. We could never, without the aid of Divine Revelation, have originated the concept of Deity, angels, spirits, altars, priests, and so forth. God revealed Himself to Adam and Eve, and this disclosure came to them through direct introduction from God, not Adam's and Eve's five senses. God's existence had to come to both through direct supernatural revelation, not through the five worlds of nature.¹⁶ Bill J. Humble summarizes Campbell's argument for the perception of God, which argument refuted "natural theology" that taught that nature revealed the existence of God. Humble writes:

One of the most interesting events in the first half of the debate occurred when Campbell, attempting to bring the skeptic into a clash of issues, asked Owen how the concept of God had originated. This question involved Campbell's belief, which he had expressed as early as 1826 in his letters to the young skeptic that man could not originate the concept of God by any faculties of the intellect, but once that concept had been revealed by the divinity, it could be confirmed by many evidences in nature. In taking this position Campbell was actually admitting one of the stock arguments of skeptics; for the natural theology of the period taught that nature revealed the existence of God. Skeptics denied this, and Campbell was convinced that they were right. This position furnished him with one of the most effective and original arguments which he could utilize against skepticism, and the unbelievers found one of their most powerful weapons turned against them.¹⁷

EVIDENTIARY THOUGHTS TO REFLECT UPON IN DEFENSE OF CHRISTIANITY

Since God revealed Himself to Adam and Eve, the world of nature bears ample testimony to humanity concerning the existence of God. The fine tuning of the Universe and the marvelous design of the human body testifies to a Designer for both the Universe and the human body. Paul, one whom Christ called directly to carry the message of redemption,¹⁸ wrote to believers in Rome about the evidence from nature to establish the credibility of believing in God's existence.

¹⁵Ibid., 161.

¹⁶See Dinesh D'Souza, "The World beyond Our Senses: Kant and the Limits of Reason," in Dinesh D'Souza, *What's So Great about Christianity* (Carol Stream, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, 2007), 171-182. The arguments in this chapter are essentially the arguments sets forth by Alexander Campbell and John Locke, except D'Souza tackles this problem with Kant's terminology—noumenon (independent of the world of perception) versus phenomenon (something known through the senses rather than by thought or intuition. This is a powerful chapter that lends validity to our belief that God exist—not through our five senses, but rather through supernatural revelation.

¹⁷Bill J. Humble, *Campbell & Controversy: The Debates of Alexander Campbell* (Joplin, Mo.: College Press Publishing Co., Inc., 1986), 98.

¹⁸For a defense of Paul's conversion from Judaism to Christianity as a justification for the genuineness of his encounter with the Resurrected Christ, See Dallas Burdette, "Paul's Conversion: Apologetic for Christianity," in Dallas Burdette, *Biblical Preaching and Teaching: Jesus and Our Privileges*, Vol., 1 (Longwood: Fl: Xulon Press, 209), 92-120.

The wrath of God is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and wickedness of men who suppress the truth by their wickedness,¹⁹ since what may be known about God is plain to them, because God has made it plain to them.²⁰ For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse.²¹ For although they knew God, they neither glorified him as God nor gave thanks to him, but their thinking became futile and their foolish hearts were darkened.²² Although they claimed to be wise, they became fools²³ and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images made to look like mortal man and birds and animals and reptiles.²⁴ Therefore God gave them over in the sinful desires of their hearts to sexual impurity for the degrading of their bodies with one another.²⁵ They exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served created things rather than the Creator—who is forever praised. Amen.²⁶ Because of this, God gave them over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones.²⁷ In the same way the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their perversion.²⁸ Furthermore, since they did not think it worthwhile to retain the knowledge of God, he gave them over to a depraved mind, to do what ought not to be done.²⁹ They have become filled with every kind of wickedness, evil, greed and depravity. They are full of envy, murder, strife, deceit and malice. They are gossips,³⁰ slanderers, God-haters, insolent, arrogant and boastful; they invent ways of doing evil; they disobey their parents;³¹ they are senseless, faithless, heartless, ruthless.³² Although they know God's righteous decree that those who do such things deserve death, they not only continue to do these very things but also approve of those who practice them. (Romans 1:18-32)

Faculty of Speech

The faculty of speech is also evidence in nature for the existence of God. The ability to speak is proof of God's design in His creation that enables humanity to communicate intelligibly with one another. We very seldom reflect upon this gift. This ability to speak is a phenomenon that is evidence of design. As we contemplate on the credibility of God's existence, we examine an incredible endowment, or special capacity, of humanity, that is, the faculty of speech. Where did the ability to speak come from? No one has ever spoken who was not first spoken to. Language is purely an imitative thing. How do infants learn to speak?

Do they speak as naturally as they "see" or "smell"? The answer is no! Speech is the result of training; it is an imitative faculty of men and women. Without God, the Divine instructor, one could not have communicated to others. God first spoke to Adam and Eve, and this ability has been passed on to mankind through copying, or echoing, speech patterns. Speech, like faith, comes by the ear. Whatever comes by the ear is derived; therefore, human language is acquired. Human language is not natural.

As we reflect upon the faculty of speech, we are acquainted with the word *God*. **Where did this word come from?** There must be the existence of something before one can assign a name. In other words, the idea of anything must necessarily be prior to the invention of a name for it. Why is this concept important? All nations have had a mental impression of Deity before the word *God*, in their respective languages, could have been invented. For example, the word *steamboat* did not exist prior to steamboats. So it is in the spiritual realm. For example, names such as God, Spirit, altar, priest, and sacrifice are common names to mankind. How were these names derived to men and women? All these conceptions must have existed previously to

the invention of names to express them. Speech is as legitimately the subject of Divine Revelation as religion itself, both came from God.

Creation of Adam and Eve

The question that confronts everyone is: how did men and women come into existence. We know that men and women did not make themselves. If they did not make themselves, then we must ask ourselves, once more, the above question: how did men and women come into existence? The answer is: God created Adam and Eve. On Planet Earth, how do we account for both male and female in evolution? Did both evolve at the same time as infants or did they both evolve at the same time as full grown male and female?

Were both male and female produced as coordinates on “Planet Earth” as infants with no parents? If so, they could not have arrived to maturity. Do infants survive today without care? No! Experience teaches that the first pair must have been adults when they were first ushered into being. For us to deny the plain evidence concerning the survival of infants, we have to suppose, contrary to all experience, that the first pair (male and female) were not the same as the species known today, otherwise they would not have reached adulthood. If evolution is true, did “mindless chance” create the sexual reproductive systems of both male and female for the propagation of the human race?

The age-old question is still around: which came first the chicken or the egg? We know that the chicken had to exist before the egg. If not, where did the egg come from? Did the acorn, or seed, exist before the tree? In the vegetable kingdom, there had first to be the plant before a seed could fall to the earth. Even in the animal kingdom, there first had to be the male and female in its prime before there could be offspring. Nature cannot now produce a new genus, or classification, in the vegetable kingdom nor produce a new species, or variety, in the animal kingdom. By what rational evidence can it be shown or demonstrated that nature ever had such power? If the first male and female were infants, they could not have reached maturity; they would have perished. We can only conclude that both must have been adults who were created with reason, the ability to speak, and knowledge without experience (fully mature at the time of creation).

Ray Comfort (author of more than fifty books) examines the arguments of James D. Franz (a professing atheist and a believer in the theory of evolution) as set forth in his book (*Intelligent Design versus Evolution*). Comfort, in his response to Franze, sets forth two compelling statements that demonstrate that God has not left Himself without evidence that He exists. The evidence of God’s creation leads us to know that belief in God is credible. We should read and reflect carefully upon Ray’s first statement about God making plain to the world His existence through His creation of the animal world as well as the creation of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. Ray Comfort exposes the fallacies of evolution and, at the same time, testifies to the truthfulness of the Genesis account of the creation of Adam and Eve on the sixth day:

Evolution—the origin of sexes. Almost all forms of complex life have both male and female—horses, dogs, humans, moths, monkeys, fish, elephants, birds, etc. The male needs the female to reproduce, and the female needs the male to reproduce. One cannot carry on life without the other.

Which then came first according to the evolutionary theory? If a male came into being before a female, how did the male of each species reproduce without females? How is it possible that a male and a female each spontaneously came into being, yet they have complex, complementary reproductive systems if each sex was able to reproduce without the other, why (and how) would they have developed a reproductive system that requires both sexes in order for the species to survive?

“I myself am convinced that the theory of evolution, especially the extent to which it has been applied, will be one of the great jokes in the history books of the future. Posterity will marvel that so flimsy and dubious an hypothesis could be accepted with the incredible credulity that it has.”
Malcolm Muggeridge, British journalist and philosopher (From the Evidence Bible.)¹⁹

Yet again, Ray Comfort seeks to develop the male and female scenario to prove that evolution could not possibly be the way that male and female came into existence. Again, the following comments of his second statement proves the creation story as revealed by Moses in Genesis 1—3.

God made them male and female. If every creature “evolved” with no Creator, there are numerous problems. Take for instance the first bird. Was it male or female? Let’s say it was a male. How did it produce offspring without a mate? If a female evolved, why did it evolve with differing reproductive organs? Did it evolve by chance, or did it evolve because it knew that it was needed by the male of the species? How did it know what needed to be evolved if its brain hadn’t yet evolved? Did the bird breathe? Did it breathe before it evolved lungs? How did it do this? Why did it evolve lungs if it was happily surviving without them? Did the bird have a mouth? How did it eat before it had evolved a mouth? Where did the mouth send the food before a stomach evolved? How did the bird have energy if it didn’t eat (because it didn’t yet have a mouth)? How did the bird see what there was to eat before its eyes evolved? Evolution is an embarrassment. “Evolution is a fairy tale for grownups. This theory has helped nothing in the progress of science. It is useless.” Professor Louis Bounoure, Director of Research, National Center of Scientific Research. “Scientists who go about teaching that evolution is a fact of life are great conmen, and the story they are telling may be the greatest hoax ever. In explaining evolution, we do not have one iota of fact.” Dr. T. N. Tahmisian, Atomic Energy Commission (From the Evidence Bible).²⁰

CREATION OF THE UNIVERSE

As believers, we affirm that unbelief is demonstrably unreasonable. When we, as believers, read books by atheists who deny the creation account in the Book of Genesis, we cannot help but recall the words of Jesus to the religious leaders: “You blind guides! You strain out a gnat but swallow a camel” (Matthew 23:24). Many present-day scientists and teachers strain out a gnat, but, at the same time are willing to swallow a camel. Whatever the difficulties of Christian belief are, we are acutely aware that the difficulties of unbelief are still greater. If we reject Christianity because miracles seem incredible, we must stand in awe at the miracles that unbelief is compelled to assert, which miracles, according to their assertions, are far more incredible. Refusal to accept belief in God and His creation commits us to even greater

¹⁹Ray Comfort, *Intelligent Design VS Evolution: Letters to an Atheist* (Orlando, Florida: Bridge-Logos, 2006), 28.

²⁰Ibid., 29-30. See also Dallas Burdette, “Christianity Versus Skepticism, in Dallas Burdette, *Biblical Preaching and Teaching: Jesus and Our Privileges*, Vol. 1 (Longwood, FL: Xulon Press, 2009), 128-143, for an in-depth study of the fallacies in evolution.

difficulties. It goes almost without saying that the rejection of Christian truth becomes correspondingly more irrational, or illogical. For example, Jason Lisle (doctorate in astrophysics from the University of Colorado) zeros in on the so-called greater miracle of Atheists:

Yet, we have never seen life evolve from non-life, nor have we ever seen a living organism evolve into another kind with greater specified complexity. These “uphill” changes just aren’t observed; indeed, they seem to be impossible.²¹

Yet, many will reject the Virgin Birth of Jesus as preposterous, but, at the same time, will advance the notion that life came from non-life. Why should we snub the Incarnation brought about by miraculous Conception and the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead by God, and, at the same time, affirm the so-called miracle of the origin of the Universe from an atheist’s perspective—nothing created something? Should we throw out Christianity because the supernatural in Christianity is burdened with difficulties to the so-called scientific mind? When we take away the supernatural in Christianity, what is left behind is no longer Christianity.

If we advance the notion that the supernatural in Christianity is regarded as incredible, it is demonstrably more incredible without the supernatural intervention of Deity to account for the origin of the Universe along with the first male and female of the human race. Unbelief on the part of the atheist can only uphold its objections to Christian miracles by accepting an even greater and grosser miracle—nothing created something. Common sense teaches us that from nothing comes nothing.

As we contemplate this Universe, we are conscious that the present Universe had a start, or beginning, somewhere. Should we agree to the miracle of creation by a Creator or should we consent to the so-called greater and all-embracing miracle that nothing created something about the size of a dot (.) on a typewriter and that this “.” (dot) exploded and from that explosion came out over 100 billion galaxies with over 100 billion stars in each Galaxie. On the other hand, are we to believe that some primordial nebulous allowed a multitude of atoms with their inherent forces and energies to create life as it is known today?

In other words, if the primordial nebulous concept is allowed to stand, we wonder how atoms, which stood apart from one another and that were not evenly distributed, could rearrange themselves in such a way that they were able to change the shapeless into the shapely and the simple into the more and more complex until the highest complexity reached its full development of living matter. For us to find staggering difficulties with the biblical creation account and to accept that differentiated atoms created the world as is known today is truly to vault over a mountain and to fall headlong over a straw.

As stated above, many modern scientists and teachers strain out a gnat, but, at the same time, they are willing to swallow a camel. When we come to the Universe, we cannot but wonder which is the greater miracle—belief in God or belief that nothing created something. Yes, the greater miracle is to believe that matter made itself, that is to say, nothing created

²¹Jason Lisle, *Taking Back Astronomy: The Heavens Declare Creation and Science Confirms It* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2006), 42.

something out of nothing. For us to postulate that atoms—all being exactly alike—proceeded to make themselves into different things, which are entirely different from each other, is incredible.

How did atoms develop into Carbon, Hydrogen, Nitrogen, Oxygen, and so on? Did the atoms endow themselves with all these potentialities? We wonder how these original atoms self-differentiated themselves to move into other forms of atoms. Did the atoms rearrange, or revamp, themselves through the function of mindless or unintelligent or brainless chance? I am reminded of a speech that the late Fred Hoyle (1915-2001, British astrophysicist) made in which he referred to the thinking of many scientists as a “junkyard mentality.” He writes in his book *The Intelligent Universe*:

In a popular lecture I once unflatteringly described the thinking of these scientists as a “junkyard mentality”. Since this reference became widely and not quite accurately quoted I will repeat it here. A junkyard contains all the bits and pieces of a Boeing 747, dismembered and in disarray. A whirlwind happens to blow through the yard. What is the chance that after its passage a fully assembled 747, ready to fly, will be found standing there? So small as to be negligible, even if a tornado were to blow through enough junkyards to fill the whole Universe.²²

The “junkyard mentality” is still alive and well on Planet Earth. Instead of reflecting upon the Boeing 747 analogy, we turn our attention to the “junkyard mentality” concerning atoms. Since the world is made up of atoms, we cannot help but ask the question: did the atoms rework themselves by sheer force or energy through a self-created power, that is to say, through a mindless and senseless and aimless force? Did the unlike come out of the like? Did that which is shapely come out of the shapeless? Did the useful come out of the useless? Finally, did the living come out of the lifeless? Is this marvelous Universe with all its beauty and with all its forms of life simply a product of blind chance? When we speak of the differentiation of atoms, we observe the vegetable and animal kingdoms—set apart atoms in observation.

In this world, we perceive order in the arrangement of atoms. Was there no guidance in the arranging of atoms in the creation of the animal and the plant kingdom?²³ **Did the blind chance of atoms create men and women as well as all known living creatures on the face of the earth?** Can we truthfully postulate, or speculate, that cells separated themselves into the human, vegetable and animal kingdom without any outside guidance? For us to accept this philosophy of blind chance is to swallow a camel (evolution) after straining out a gnat (Christianity with its miracles). Hopefully, we can overlook repetition in this study. Repetition is one of the means whereby we can better understand an idea or concept.

The modern world concept of evolution is an unverifiable assumption of dogmatic beliefs. When we deny God and His creation, we indeed accept outrageous assumptions. In my

²²Fred Hoyle, *The Intelligent Universe: A New View of Creation and Evolution* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1983), 18-19.

²³See Jobe Martin, *The Evolution of a Creationist: A Layman’s Guide to the Conflict Between the Bible and Evolutionary Theory* (Rockwall, Texas: Biblical Discipleship Publishers, 1994, 2002, 2004), for the defense of the creation of animals by God rather than evolution. Martin, himself, started out as an evolutionist but changed to a creationist because of the evidence he discovered in the whole of creation. His treatise of the animal kingdom leaves no doubt as to special creation by Deity.

judgment, the atheistic background is so nonsensical that I find it difficult to see how anyone can put it into words. It is a greater miracle to believe that those haphazard collisions of mindless atoms through aeons of time created male and female, the plant kingdom, and the animal kingdom. For the evolutionist or atheist to cry out against biblical creation by Deity is to recall the words of Jesus: “You hypocrite, first take the plank out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to remove the speck from your brother’s eye” (Matthew 7:5).

Neither the atheist nor agnostic (deist) has answers as to the origin of *homo sapiens*, that is to say, human beings—male and female. Only the inspired Scriptures, given by the Holy Spirit, account for the beginning, or start, of humanity. A perusal of the literature of unbelievers reveals that they do not distinguish between the animal kingdom and the kingdom of humanity—all are one and the same. Evolution is the common name assigned to justify such absurdities. Yes, skeptics who deny the existence of God and His supernatural Revelation also disavow, or repudiate, that men and women are privileged beings in this world. There is a confessed ignorance of atheists as they seek to account for the source of matter, the principle of motion in matter, the specific origin of the Earth with its unique environment to sustain animal life, plant life, human life, and so on.

The unbeliever has to admit much ignorance and to believe more mysteries than believers. For the atheist, unbelief is a far greater miracle than belief in the biblical account of creation for the Christian. The miracle of unbelief is that “nothing” created “something.” This mindset of unbelief is to swallow a camel and strain out a gnat, that is, the belief that God created the heavens and the earth. Once again, the words of Jason Lisle are significant as he ponders in bewilderment the naiveté of many scientists who believe in evolution:

When I think of the majority of intelligent scientists who have studied God’s magnificent creation, but have nonetheless rejected that God and have instead chosen to believe in aliens and millions of years of evolution, I am reminded of the words of Scripture. Romans 1:18-25 reveals that a rejection of God in favor of naturalism [the belief that nothing exists outside of nature] is not a new practice. God’s invisible qualities (His eternal power and divine nature) are clearly revealed in the natural world so that there is no excuse for rejecting God (Romans 1:20) or suppressing the truth about God (Rom. 1:18). The thinking of man apart from God is nothing more than futile speculations (Rom. 1:21). Exchanging the truth of God (such as creation) for a lie (such as evolution), and turning to a mere creature (such as hypothetical aliens) for answers is strikingly similar to what is recorded in Romans 1:25.²⁴

How do we account for the idea of God that is so universally known among the various races of the world? How do we account for the motion of matter? How do we account for the Earth revolving around the Sun? What brought about this action? Some planets have more than one moon—some revolving clockwise (in the same direction as the rotating hands of a clock) and others in the reverse (retrograde: counterclockwise). How do we account for this phenomenon? What gives regularity to motion? Why do the planets choose to move in a uniform course, or order? How do we account for the size of our moon? How do we account for the regularity of the laws of nature? Once more, Robert Frederick West summarizes

²⁴Jason Lisle, *Taking Back Astronomy*, 99.

Campbell’s concept, as discussed above, of two worlds—the supernatural world of God and the world of nature:

Two worlds constantly impinge upon him and he can never escape the impact of either. His original ideas of the material world are derived through sense perception and natural reason, once he has acquired the use of speech and language through societal experience and tutoring. But his original ideas of the spiritual world are derived through direct revelation and are otherwise unattainable except through social traditions which already have been influenced by previous experience of revelation.

Campbell would have no commerce with natural religionists. To him they were traders in borrowed or stolen wares offered under the deceptive trademark of their own manufacture. All their basic spiritual ideas were derived from mines of revealed religion but they claim to have collected them from the free fields of nature as the common property of natural men.²⁵

REVELATION OF GOD IN NATURE

Anthropic Principle

As we reflect upon the revelation of God in nature, we are confronted with what is known in the scientific world as the Anthropic Principle. The **“Anthropic Principle” is the principle that our unique universe is designed to sustain life.** If this concept is true, and it is, we are confronted with the startling revelation that someone designed it that way, namely God. Dinesh D’Souza (b. 1961, a former White House domestic policy analyst and former Rishwain Research Fellow at the Hoover Institute) explains very clearly the essence of the Anthropic Principle:

Not only does the anthropic principle suggest a creator who is incomparably intelligent and resourceful, but it also suggests a creator who has special concern for us.²⁶

²⁵Robert Frederick West, *Alexander Campbell and Natural Religion* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1948), 90.

²⁶Dinesh D’Souza, *What’s So Great about Christianity* (Carol Stream, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 2007), 135. This book is an excellent defense of Christianity. Unfortunately, D’Souza accepts the theory that the universe is “approximately fifteen billion years old and at least fifteen billion light years in size” (Ibid., 113). There is no evidence to substantiate that the Universe is “approximately fifteen billion years old,” yet, there is scientific evidence that our Milky Way Galaxie is “fifteen billion light years in size.” On the other hand, the assertion that the universe is “fifteen billion years old” is based on theory, not scientific evidence. Scientists who start with the theory of evolution then mold the so-called data to fit their presuppositions. His remarks about the Anthropic Principle are on target with the Scriptures. The Anthropic Principle is also the same statement made by John D. Barrow & Frank J. Tipler in *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986, 1996), 3.

Regrettably, many Christians hold to evolution as the means of bringing about humanity, not the special creation of the Universe and all that is contained within it as recorded by Moses in Genesis 1—11, especially, the creation of Adam and Eve on the sixth day of creation. The Anthropic Principle is correct, but the postulates of the age of the Earth and the theory of evolution are not correct. Unfortunately, D’Souza accepts the theory of evolution, but, at the same time, he rejects Darwinian evolution. I, in all good conscience, cannot adhere to this dogma. He writes:

The Anthropic Principle upholds the biblical account of Creation. I call attention to the comments of another outstanding scholar (D'Souza) concerning the significance of this principle as a defense for design in our Universe. He is on target when he writes: "We live in a meaningful and purposeful universe. The Anthropic Principle suggests that human beings are part of the intended handiwork of God."²⁷ Professor Robert Jastrow (1925-2008, an American astronomer, physicist, and cosmologist) wrote about the complexity of the Universe:

Thus, according to the physicist and the astronomer, it appears that the Universe was constructed within very narrow limits, in such a way that man could dwell in it. This result is called the *anthropic principle*. It is the most theistic result ever to come out of science, in my view.²⁸

In spite of the evidence for a fine-tuned Universe, nevertheless, many individuals have rejected the significance of humanity as well as the creation of the universe as set forth by Moses in the Book of Genesis. In my research, I discovered that this downward spiral of the importance of men and women began, as a whole, with the discovery of the heliocentric model of the Universe by Nicolaus Copernicus (1473-1543, mathematician and astronomer). Prior to Copernicus, the view of the Universe centered on the Earth as being the center and not the Sun.²⁹ As a result of this finding by Copernicus, humanity became less significant among many scientists. This new finding (Earth revolves around the Sun) resulted in an intellectual revolution, which modernization of ideas resulted in the belief that humankind did not occupy a distinctive or unique place in the Universe.

This mindset has persisted among numerous intellectuals today in the various scientific fields. D'Souza explains this frame of mind of certain so-called academics: "The Copernican revolution [Earth revolves around the Sun] can be understood as establishing the principle of mediocrity. This principle simply says that we human beings are nothing special."³⁰ This low-view of the Earth and the Universe is set forth by the late Carl Sagan (1934-1996, an American astronomer, astrophysicist, cosmologist, author, and science popularizer) in his book *Pale Blue*

It should be clear from all this that the problem is not with evolution. The problem is with Darwinism. Evolution is a scientific theory, Darwinism is a metaphysical stance and a political ideology. In fact, Darwinism is the atheist spin imposed on the theory of evolution. As a theory, evolution is not hostile to religion," Ibid., 157.

²⁷Ibid, 135.

²⁸See Robert Jastrow, "The Astronomer and God," in *The Intellectuals Speak Out About God: A Handbook for the Christian Student in a Secular Society*, Edited by Roy Abraham Varghese (Chicago, Illinois: Regnery Gateway, 1984), 22. Even though, as far as I know, Jastrow never accepted Christ as the Savior of the world. Yet, this article reveals that he was conscious of "supernatural forces" that was "outside the body of natural law" (Ibid., 19). He wrestled with evolution versus a supernatural power that was a "larger force," which force expressed "a larger purpose of direction in the Universe" (Ibid., 20).

²⁹The Greek astronomer Ptolemy (AD 90-168) postulated the "geocentric model," which model advanced the idea that the Sun and all the planets revolve around the Earth. Yet, Copernicus (AD 1473-1543) discovered the "heliocentric model," which model taught that all the planets (including the Earth) orbit around the Sun.

³⁰Dinesh D'Souza, *What's So Great About Christianity*, 132.

Dot. In this book, he expressed this skewed view of the place of the Earth and humankind in the Universe:

Our posturings, our imagined self-importance, the delusion that we have some privileged position in the Universe, are challenged by this point of pale light. Our planet is a lonely speck in the great enveloping cosmic dark. In our obscurity, in all this vastness, there is no hint that help will come from elsewhere to save us from ourselves.³¹

In spite of negative thoughts proposed by atheists and evolutionists, the scientific world appears to confirm the fundamental opinion of the Anthropic Principle of design within our solar system. Paul Davies (born 1946, English physicist, cosmologist, and astrobiologist) freely confesses that something is written in the laws of nature that indicates that the Earth is made for human habitation. He writes with conviction and sincerity as he seeks to explain life:

In the chapters that follow I shall present a completely different view of science. Far from exposing human beings as incidental products of blind physical forces, science suggests that the existence of conscious organism is a fundamental feature of the universe. We have been written into the laws of nature in a deep and, I believe, meaningful way.³²

Again, he speaks of the laws of nature as being rooted in God. Listen, once more, as he explains himself:

As long as the laws of nature were rooted in God, their existence was no more remarkable than that of matter, which God created. But if the divine underpinning of the laws is removed, their existence becomes a profound mystery. Where do they come from? Who “sent the message”? Who devised the code? Are the laws simply there—free-floating, so to speak—or should we abandon the very notion of laws of nature as an unnecessary hangover from a religious past?³³

Another scientist, Owen Gingerich (born 1930, Research Professor of Astronomy and of History of Science at Harvard University and a senior astronomer at the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory) also expresses his thoughts about a superintelligent Creator:

Atheists and theists alike may be disconcerted and challenged by the conclusion that the Copernican principle provides an opening to teleology [the study of evidences of design in nature]. I am personally persuaded that a superintelligent Creator exists beyond and within the cosmos, and that the rich context of geniality shown by our universe, permitting and encouraging the existence of self-conscious life, is part of the Creator’s design and purpose. Yet like many Christians steeped in a conservative ethos [guiding beliefs of a person, group, or institution] that human beings are central to God’s plan, my gut reaction is to disparage the possibility of the existence of intelligent life on other worlds. But I remind myself, Beware! Not only is such a view inconsistent with the notion that the

³¹Carl Sagan, *Pale Blue Dot: A Vision of the Human Future in Space* (New York: Random House, 1994), 7. For a refutation of this philosophic mindset, see, Dinesh D’Souza, “A Designer Planet: Man’s Special Place in Creation,” in his book, *What’s So Great About Christianity*, 131-141, for a detailed analysis of the Copernican Revolution within the scientific world.

³²Paul Davies, *The Mind of God: The Scientific Basis for a Rational World* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992), 21.

³³*Ibid.*, 81.

universe has been deliberately established as a potential home for self-conscious contemplation, but it sets unwarranted human limitations on God's creativity.³⁴

It is not uncommon for scientists who still believe that we emerged into this universe by chance to express their doubts about their statements as well as their true confessions about the mystery of life and the complexity of the Universe that sustains life. One such scholar is the world-renowned scientist and public intellectual Freeman Dyson (born 1923, British-born American theoretical physicist and mathematician). In his comments about Jacques Monod (1910-1976, French biologist and director of the Pasteur Institute in Paris), he admits that he, too, holds the view of Monod that we came into the Universe by chance.³⁵ Yet, in spite of his negative comments about chance, he, nevertheless, disagrees with Monod and acknowledges his puzzlement about the Universe:

I answer no. I believe in the covenant. It is true that we emerged in the universe by chance, but the idea of chance is itself only a cover for our ignorance. I do not feel like an alien in this universe. The more I examine the universe and study the details of its architecture, the more evidence I find that the universe in some sense must have known that we were coming.³⁶ (Emphasis mine)

Monod wrote a book, *Chance & Necessity*, which he concludes with the following comments about mankind, which philosophy, in part, Dyson rejects. Pay attention to the utter hopelessness of humanity in the words of Monod:

The ancient covenant is in pieces; man knows at last that he is alone in the universe's unfeeling immensity, out of which he emerged only by chance. His destiny is nowhere spelled out, nor is his duty. The kingdom above or the darkness below; it is for him to choose.³⁷ (Emphasis mine)

Design in the Universe: God's Activity

As we reflect upon the **Anthropic Principle**, we are conscious that our Universe is designed for life (humans, animals, and plants) by someone who designed its unique nature specifically for life within the three kingdoms (humans, animals, and plants). This One is God as revealed in Genesis 1:1. Yes, **this One who calculated the Universe for habitation is God.** As Christians, we approach our investigation of the world from the viewpoint that God created everything. On the other hand, the naturalists approach the study of the Universe without God. Jason Lisle (Ph. D. in Astrophysics [a branch of astronomy dealing esp. with the behavior, physical properties, and dynamic processes of celestial objects and phenomena] from the University of Colorado) explains the mindset of those who deny God's activity in the creation of the Universe as well as the mindset of those who accept God as the Creator:

³⁴Owen Gingerich, *God's Universe* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2006), 39.

³⁵Freeman Dyson, *Disturbing the Universe* (New York: Basic Books, 1979), 250.

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Jacques Monod, *Chance & Necessity: An Essay on the Natural Philosophy of Modern Biology*, translated from the French by Austryn Wainhouse (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971), 180.

The heart of the issue is whether we start from the foundation of the Bible, or the foundation of naturalism. Naturalism is the belief that there is nothing outside of “nature” — the world we see, with its matter and energy, is all that exists, so it must have created itself by its own processes and properties. There is no supernatural realm in this worldview. Many scientists today, even though they themselves might believe in God, seem to regard this as irrelevant to the way they think about the origin and history of the world. For all practical purposes, therefore, they are operating within a naturalistic framework, a belief system that rejects God.

Many critics have suggested that we should not start from the Bible — that this is unscientific. However, if the Bible really is absolutely true, if it really is accurate history, wouldn't it be unscientific to ignore this information? Is it logical to deny recorded history, and choose to rely instead on guesswork? Since all scientific evidence must be interpreted in light of some worldview, it seems very reasonable to base our world view on the infallible Word of the Creator. I have found that the Bible is a sure foundation for a world view that is logical, moral, self-consistent, and consistent with the evidence.³⁸

As we seek answers for a fine-tuned Universe, we must be conscious that the Book of Genesis is not a text book for science today. The thirty-nine books called the Old Testament do not contradict science. Yet, many scientists refuse to accept the biblical account of creation, especially the literal seven days recorded in Genesis One. The purpose of the Book of Moses (Genesis through Deuteronomy—written originally as one book) was to set forth the announcement of the coming redeemer to redeem lost humanity, namely, Jesus the Messiah. In fact, the entirety of the Hebrew Scriptures develops this theme. Throughout the Torah (the Law), the Prophets, and the Writings (which writings began with the Book of Psalms), we do find references to natural history. For instance, God is revealed in nature as set forth in the Hebrew Scriptures. For example, David, King of Israel (reigned: 1010-970 BC), declares that the heavens exhibit God's glory and His handiwork:

The heavens declare the glory of God; the skies proclaim the work of his hands. ²Day after day they pour forth speech; night after night they display knowledge. (Psalm 19:1-2)

The heavens announce God's glory to every nation or culture. Men and women are without excuse for denying God and His truth as revealed in nature. God has made known to humanity His existence with irrefutable evidence. It is in this vein, as mentioned earlier, that Paul could write:

Since what may be known about God is plain to them, because God has made it plain to them. ²⁰ For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse. (Romans 1:19-20)

The design of the Universe with Planet Earth testifies to the unique blueprint of our planet—without which essential conditions on planet Earth, life could not exist. It is in this vein that Mark Whorton (holds a Ph.D in aerospace engineering from Georgia Tech and works on guidance, navigation, and control systems for spacecraft at the NASA Marshall Space Flight

³⁸Jason Lisle, *Taking Back Astronomy: The Heavens Declare Creation and Science Confirms It* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2009), 8-10.

Center) and Hill Roberts (holds a Master's degree in physics and serves as chief scientist for an aerospace research company) call attention to the exceptional plan of the Universe: "Atheistic views of the universe cannot account for the world as we know it."³⁹ Just a brief examination of Planet Earth reveals that Whorton and Hill are correct in their analysis.

It is also in this vein that Carl Sagan (1934-1996 [died at age 62], American astronomer, astrophysicist, cosmologist, author, science popularizer, science communicator in the space and natural sciences, and promoted the Search for Extra-Terrestrial Intelligence [SETI]), candidly admits that "The Earth is the only world known so far as to harbor life."⁴⁰ In his Introduction to this well-known book, he again frankly acknowledges that "Life is a comparative rarity. You can survey dozens of worlds and find that on only one of them does life arise and evolve and persist."⁴¹

He also calls attention to the fact that since "1962, our machines have flown by, orbited, or landed on more than seventy worlds."⁴² What did they discover about life on other planets? THERE IS NO LIFE! Again, he openly confesses that "We have found nothing on dozens of worlds so clear and striking as the signs of life found by the *Galileo* spacecraft in its passages by the Earth."⁴³ John C. Whitcomb's (born 1924, Professor of Theology and Old Testament at Grace Theological Seminary [1951-1990] and young Earth creationist) comments are on target concerning extra-terrestrial life outside of Planet Earth:

It seems biblically certain, however, that this door is tightly shut, because God has created life on this planet and nowhere else.... In other words, the only extra-terrestrial intelligence men need to be deeply concerned about is the intelligence of God Himself, as revealed in His Word.⁴⁴

As far back as 1983, **Fred Hoyle addressed his readers with the Anthropic Principle which sets forth the idea that "our planet seems to be ideally suited to our needs. It must be so."**⁴⁵ Again, he states the very crux of the problem in the scientific world among many scientists:

The same nihilistic [a doctrine that denies any objective ground of truth and especially of moral truths] belief that no aspect of the Universe can be thought of as a consequence of purpose underlies

³⁹Mark Whorton & Hill Roberts, *Holman Quick Source: Guide to Understanding Creation* (Nashville, Tennessee: B & H Publishing Group, 2008), 83.

⁴⁰Carl Sagan, *Pale Blue Dot: A Vision of the Human Future in Space* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1994), 7. He rejected Christianity and denied the biblical account of creation and accepted the theory of evolution.

⁴¹*Ibid.*, xix.

⁴²*Ibid.*, xviii.

⁴³*Ibid.*, 121. When Sagan leaves scientific data and travels into his theories about evolution, we witness a change in his terminology: "If I had to guess," *ibid.*, 29; "may exist," *ibid.*, 34; "if they exist," *ibid.*, 35; "perhaps" and "very likely," *ibid.*, 84; "perhaps," *ibid.*, 112; "seems to have," *Ibid.*, 161. Just a casual reading of this book reveals that these phrases are peppered throughout this book.

⁴⁴John C. Whitcomb, *The Bible and Astronomy* (Winona. Lake, IN: BMH Books, 1984), 27. A careful reading of the account of creation in the Book of Genesis reveals that God created life on this planet and nowhere else. The findings of Sagan only confirm what Moses recorded about Creation in his writings.

⁴⁵Fred Hoyle, *The Intelligent Universe: A New View of Creation and Evolution* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1983), 217.

both Darwinism and the anthropic principle. Every remarkable state of affairs is supposedly due to chance, and so one dismisses all further thought on the problem from one's mind, just as mention of the magical word "God" causes the theologian to desist from further enquiry.⁴⁶

THE SOLAR SYSTEM: DESIGN OR ACCIDENT?

In 1944, Abraham Cressy Morrison (1864-1951, Former President of the New York Academy of Sciences) wrote a book in response to Julian Huxley's (1887-1975, an English evolutionary biologist, and humanist) book *Man Stands Alone*. Morrison wrote his book *Man Does Not Stand Alone* as a refutation of Huxley's philosophy. Morrison's book, to some extent, is an enigma. He correctly points out that this Universe is expressly designed for life, which could not possibly have come about through chance. Nevertheless, he was a theist evolutionist.⁴⁷ Having said this, the first part of his book is on target because he is dealing with facts, not theory.

As we seek to briefly examine a few of Morrison's remarks about our unique world within our Solar System, I wish to call attention to a statement by Harry Rimmer (1890-1952, D.D., ScD., American creationist, itinerant evangelist, and a writer of anti-evolution books): "The plain and unvarnished facts of nature all testify to the reality and presence of God in His creation."⁴⁸ In 1936, Rimmer called attention to Robert Andrews Millikan (1868-1953, American experimental physicist and winner of the 1923 Nobel Prize for Physics), a famous scientist, for his comments about scientists and faith:

Call the roll of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and among the fifteen thousand members you can scarce find a man who will confess himself an atheist. A company of the most eminent of them, headed by Dr. Millikan, who attained fame long before he isolated the atom, recently, sent forth a signed statement to the press, declaring in no uncertain terms their faith and belief in God the Creator. It is a mistake to think that science is essentially atheistic; it is radically the opposite.⁴⁹

⁴⁶Ibid., 220.

⁴⁷See Cressy Morrison, *Man Does Not Stand Alone* (Westwood, New Jersey, 1944), 45 and 46, where he writes about one view of man's existence:

One view is that man came up through a process of evolution from the original spark of life. This is the basis on which the whole concept of evolution rest.... Man as such has been traced back with sufficient evidence to satisfy scientists for about one million years, but this is already an established minimum. Before that, his evolution, from whatever animal he may have developed, goes back to an antiquity beyond all human calculation.

The distinction between Carl Sagan and Cressy Morrison is that Morrison believes that God had a hand in evolution, but Sagan denied God's part. As long as Morrison deals with scientific data based upon facts, he is right on target, but when he writes about theories concerning evolution, he goes out of the realm of science. This trend to accept theistic Evolution is wide-spread among many evangelicals.

⁴⁸Harry Rimmer, *The Harmony of Science and Scripture* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1936, 1966), 43.

⁴⁹Ibid., 44.

Humans Live in a Unique World

The first chapter of Morrison's book in response to Julian's Huxley's book *Man Stands Alone* refutes this mindset. In order to illustrate that our Universe is a unique world, he begins with an illustration of ten pennies that are marked from 1 to 10. He then suggests that an individual put these ten coins into his or her pocket and draw the coins in the proper sequence of 1 to 10. He explains the probability of drawing this sequence:

Your chance of drawing No. 1 is 1 to 10. Your chance of drawing 1 and 2 in succession would be 1 in 100. Your chance of drawing 1, 2, and 3 in succession would be one in a thousand. Your chance of drawing 1, 2, 3, and 4 in succession would be one in 10,000 and so on, until your chance of drawing from No. 1 to No. 10 in succession would reach the unbelievable figure of one chance in 10 billion.⁵⁰

Morrison uses this illustration to demonstrate the utter futility of espousing the notion that the conditions of Planet Earth for life originated through blind chance. The atheist Carl Sagan bemoaned the idea that our universe is "custom-made for us."⁵¹ He then attributes this mindset to "self-esteem" to humanity.⁵² In spite of the evidence, he cannot bring himself to accept special design of our Earth by God in order to sustain life. He admits that life on other planets is totally absent. On December 8, 1990, NASA designed a spacecraft "to explore the planet Jupiter, its moons, and its rings."⁵³ After receiving the data from the spacecraft named *Galileo*, he pens the following admission:

Our success in detecting life on Earth with *Galileo*, without any assumptions beforehand about what kind of life it must be, increases our confidence that when we failed to find life on other planets, that negative result is meaningful.⁵⁴

This failure to find life on other planets led him to admit that life on Planet Earth is unique: "This examination of the third planet [Earth] strengthens our tentative conclusion that of all the worlds in the Solar System, only ours is graced by life."⁵⁵ Why is this admission correct—"only ours is graced by life"? Is it not that our Earth is "custom-made for us."⁵⁶ This self-evidence of uniqueness is the genesis of Morrison's first chapter in his informative book. In order for life to exist on Earth, there are certain factors that must be in place, which conditions do not exist on other planets (Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, and Neptune).⁵⁷

⁵⁰A. Cressy Morrison, *Man Does Not Stand Alone*, 13.

⁵¹Carl Sagan, *Pale Blue Dot*, 44.

⁵²*Ibid.*

⁵³*Ibid.*, 66.

⁵⁴*Ibid.*, 67.

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, 67, 68.

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, 44.

⁵⁷I highly recommend Jason Lisle, *Taking Back Astronomy* (Green Forest, AR, 2009) for an excellent overview of astronomy. See also pages 88-91 for a study on "Science Confirms a Unique Earth."

Earth's Temperature and Its Rotation

He begins his analysis with the size of the Earth. The Earth is 8,000 miles in diameter. Its distance from the Sun is 92, 752 million miles. Its orbital period around the Sun is 365 days. Also, an extremely important factor is the surface temperature of the Earth, which is 59°F.⁵⁸ He points out that the “earth rotates on its axis in twenty-four hours or at the rate of about one thousand miles an hour.”⁵⁹ Does this exact speed make a difference in life upon earth? Morrison goes on to comment upon why this speed is necessary for life to exist on Planet Earth:

Suppose it turned at the rate of a hundred miles an hour. Why not? Our days and nights would then be ten times as long as now. The hot sun of summer would then burn up our vegetation each long day and every sprout would freeze in such a night.⁶⁰

In my research, I discovered a website known as “From Ask the Astronomer” by Dr. Sten Odenwald. When Odenwald deals with scientific data his comments are extremely informative, but, on the other hand, when he leaves science and deals with theories, we must be cautious. His comments on the rotation of the earth on its axis are revealing.

Currently, the Earth is spinning about 1000 miles per hour at the equator. A LOT less towards the poles. An appreciable change in rotation direction would produce winds with speeds of thousands of miles per hour EVERYWHERE. Anything not anchored to bedrock would be torn out of the soil and mixed with a world-enveloping hurricane of activity. The Earth would remain engulfed in thick clouds of dirt, dust and debris for decades. I cannot imagine anything surviving such a catastrophe, because the solid Earth would be wracked by earthquakes the likes of which have never been experienced by living organisms in over 3 billion years or more. There would be no spot on the Earth not affected by 100 – 500 mile per hour winds and earthquakes of magnitude + 7 and MUCH HIGHER.⁶¹

Earth's Distance from the Sun

The distance of the Sun from the Earth is also another major factor in sustaining life upon Earth. The Sun is 869,000 miles from the Earth. Also, the Sun has a temperature of 10,000°F⁶² (mean surface temperature—the mean core temperature is 27 million°F).⁶³ Once more, Morrison calls attention to the distance and the temperature (10,000 to 12,000 degrees Fahrenheit) and its effect for life upon Earth:

⁵⁸See Clare Gibson, *The Handbook of Astronomy* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 2006), 74. I have taken the liberty to round off the odd numbers listed by Gibson. For the exact dimension, see page 74.

⁵⁹Cressy Morrison, *Man Does Not Stand Alone*, 16.

⁶⁰Ibid.

⁶¹See Sten Odenwald, “What Would Happen If the Rotation Axis of the Earth Changed?” (ONLINE). Available from <http://planet-x.150m.com/changeaxis.html> (accessed 27 May 1011). Odenwald is not a young Earth creationist. As far as I can tell from his website, he does not attribute these essential happenings to God, but rather to nature.

⁶²Clare Gibson, *The Handbook of Astronomy*, 57.

⁶³Ibid.

The sun, the source of all life, has a surface temperature of 12,000 degrees Fahrenheit, and our earth is just far enough away so that this “eternal fire” warms us just enough and not too much.... If the temperature on earth had changed so much as fifty degrees on the average for a single year, all vegetation would be dead and man with it, roasted or frozen.⁶⁴

It is in this same vein that Antony Flew (1923-2010 [died at age 87], British philosopher and ex-atheist who stunned and dismayed the so-called unbelieving faithful when he announced in 2004 that God exists), wrote

That vacation scenario is a clumsy, limited parallel to the so-called fine-tuning argument. The recent popularity of this argument has highlighted a new dimension of the laws of nature. “The more I examine the universe and study the details of its architecture,” writes physicist Freeman Dyson [born 1923], “the more evidence I find that the universe in some sense knew we were coming.” In other words, the laws of nature seem to have been crafted so as to move the universe toward the emergence and sustenance of life. This is the anthropic principle, popularized by such thinkers as Martin Rees, John Barrow, and John Leslie.⁶⁵ (Emphasis mine)

What does 93 million miles mean to us? How long would it take to travel from Earth to the Sun? Ariel A. Roth (born 1927, holds a doctorate in zoology from the University of Michigan and was director of the Geoscience Research Institute from 1980 to 1994 as well as an active participant in the evolution-creation controversy), in his book *Science Discovers God*, explains the “The Extreme Immensity of the Universe”:

From our tiny earth it is not easy to comprehend how far away other parts of the universe are. Our sun many seem to be just a little way out there, but it is nearly 93 million miles (150 million kilometers) away. We have trouble conceptualizing such figures. It may help if you realize that if you should journey from the earth to the sun at the speed of a commercial jetliner, it would take you 19 years of continuous travel to get there. A voyage to Pluto at jetliner speed would require 741 years.⁶⁶

Earth’s Speed around the Sun and Its Tilt

Again, Morrison calls attention to the rate of speed of the Earth around the Sun—“eighteen miles each second,”⁶⁷ which is equivalent to 70,000 miles per hour. He continues to explain what would happen if the speed was decreased or increased:

If the rate of revolution had been, say, six miles or forty miles each second, we would be too far from or too close to the sun for our form of life to exist.⁶⁸

⁶⁴Cressy Morrison, *Man Does Not Stand Alone*, 16.

⁶⁵Antony Flew, *There Is a God: How the World’s Most Notorious Atheist Changed His Mind* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2007), 114. The citation from Freeman Dyson is found in Freeman Dyson, *Disturbing the Universe* (New York: Basic Books, 1979), 250.

⁶⁶Ariel A. Roth, *Science Discovers God: Seven Convincing Lines of Evidence for His Existence* (Hagerstown, MD: Autumn House, 2008), 39/

⁶⁷Cressy Morrison, *Man Does Not Stand Alone*, 16.

⁶⁸Ibid.

As we reexamine our Universe with its fine-tuning, we have to say that “the universe in some sense knew we were coming.” Another phenomenon that causes us to stagger, as it were, in awe is the tilting of our Earth. The Earth turns on its axis at an angle of 23.5° from the vertical. What does this feature mean to us on Planet Earth? We should pay attention to Morrison as he explains the “why” of this maneuver by God:

The earth is tilted at an angle of twenty-three degrees. This gives us our seasons. If it had not been tilted, the poles would be in eternal twilight. The water vapor from the ocean would move north and south, piling up continents of ice and leaving possibly a desert between the equator and the ice. Glacial rivers would erode and roar through canyons into the salt-covered bed of the ocean to form temporary pools of brine [water saturated or strongly impregnated with common salt]. The weight of the unbelievably vast mass of ice would depress the poles, causing our equator to bulge or erupt or at least show the need of a new waistline belt. The lowering of the ocean would expose vast new land areas and diminish the rainfall in all parts of the world.⁶⁹

Once more, Sten Odenwald’s comments are informative as to the negative effects of a change in the “rotation axis of the Earth.” His comments on the rotation of the Earth on its axis are revealing.

A change in the rotation axis of the Earth, or its spin rate would be catastrophic. The number of the seasons would change and their duration. If the rotation axis became parallel to the orbital plane, as for Uranus, we could have winter in the Northern hemisphere for 6 months followed by summer. The Sun would set on the entire Northern hemisphere and not rise again for 6 Months. Less extreme axial tilts would produce a different pattern of seasons at each earth latitude.⁷⁰

The Moon and Its Distance from Earth

Once more, we see God’s handiwork in the distance of the Moon from the Earth (240,000 miles).⁷¹ Again, this distance demonstrates design. Morrison draws attention to God’s purpose in placing the Moon at the distance it presently is from the Earth. His remarks remind us once more of God’s handiwork in His creation:

The moon is 240,000 miles away, and the tides twice a day are usually a gentle reminder of its presence. Tides of the ocean run as high as sixty feet in some places [equivalent to six stories in height], and even the crust of the earth is twice a day bent outward several inches by the moon’s attraction. All seems so regular that we do not grasp to any degree the vast power that lifts the whole area of the ocean several feet and bends the crust of the earth, seemingly so solid. Mars has a moon—a little one—only six thousand miles away from it [Phobos, which has a diameter of 16 miles, takes just over seven hours to orbit the Red Planet at a distance of 5,592 miles⁷²]. If our moon was, say, fifty thousand miles away instead of its present respectable distance, our tides would be so enormous that twice a day all the lowland of all the continents would be submerged by a rush of water so enormous that even the mountains would soon be eroded away, and probably no continent could have

⁶⁹Ibid., 17.

⁷⁰ See Sten Odenwald, “What Would Happen If the Rotation Axis of the Earth Change?” (ONLINE). Available from <http://planet-x.150m.com/changeaxis.html> (accessed 27 May 1011).

⁷¹Clare Gibson, *The Handbook on Astronomy*, 76.

⁷²See Clare Gibson, *The Handbook of Astronomy*, 89. The planet Mars has two moons (Phobos and Deimos). “Deimos, whose diameter is nearly 10 miles, has an orbital period of a little over 30 hours and lies 14,292 miles from Mars,” Ibid..

risen from the depths fast enough to exist today. The earth would crack with the turmoil and the tides in the air would create daily hurricanes.⁷³

As we reflect upon the evidence for the origin of the Universe by God, we stand in amazement with the comments of Carl Sagan, especially his comments that follow his negative thoughts about the so-called “pale light.” He writes:

Our posturings, our imagined self-importance, the delusion that we have some privileged position in the Universe, are challenged by this point of pale light. Our planet is a lonely speck in the great enveloping cosmic dark. In our obscurity, in all this vastness, there is no hint that help will come from elsewhere to save us from ourselves.⁷⁴

Following his negative thoughts about the uniqueness of our Earth in our Solar System, he states, “The Earth is the only world known so far to harbor life.”⁷⁵ Toward the end of his book, he pens the following words: “We must surrender our skepticism only in the face of rock-solid evidence.”⁷⁶ Unfortunately, he did not follow his own advice in examining the evidence for a Universe designed by God. When we reflect upon the speed of light (186,000 miles per second), we stand in awe when we realize that light can travel around the earth seven times every second.

As humans, we live on Earth (a subdivision) in our Milky Way Galaxie. Our Galaxie is so large that our scientists measure distances in “light years,” which is the distance that light travels in a year (5.88 trillion miles). Our Galaxie is measured as 100,000 light years across. If we could travel at the speed of light, it would take 100,000 years to cross (It takes light a year to travel a light-year). It takes light eight minutes to travel from Earth to the Sun (93,000,000 miles).⁷⁷

Within our Galaxie, we have an estimated 100 billion (100,000,000,000) stars. If we could count the stars in our Galaxie every second, it would take 2,500 years to count. Sagan cannot escape the apparent design of our Solar System. Even though, he ultimately denies design; nevertheless, his admissions are startling:

How lucky for us that the Sun, the Moon, the planets, and the stars are part of some elegantly configured cosmic clockwork! It seemed to be no accident. They were put here for a purpose, for our benefit. Who else makes use of them? What else are they good for? ... The Universe seems designed for human beings.⁷⁸

⁷³Cressy Morrison, *Man Does Not Stand Alone*, 18. I highly recommend this book. I have just touched the hem-of-the-garment, so to speak, as to the design of our Earth in order to sustain life. My objective in this chapter has been to establish that belief in God is credible.

⁷⁴Carl Sagan, *Pale Blue Dot: A Vision of the Human Future in Space*, 7.

⁷⁵Ibid.

⁷⁶Ibid., 301.

⁷⁷For one of the most informative studies about the Universe is by Louie Giglio, *Indescribable* (A DVD Series by Louie Giglio). This DVD is available through AMAZON (DVD Running Time: 43 Minutes).

⁷⁸Carl Sagan, *Pale Blue Dot*, 11.

Sagan refused to accept the evidence of design for the Universe by a Designer (God) because of his presuppositional stance against Christianity and his belief about evolution. He negates his comments, as cited above, with another startling admission about design and then denies the implications of what he had just written:

There is in this Universe much of what seems to be design. Every time we come upon it, we breathe a sigh of relief. We are forever hoping to find, or at least safely deduce, a Designer. But instead, we repeatedly discover that natural processes—collisional selection of worlds, say, or natural selection of gene pools, or even the convection pattern in a pot of boiling water—can extract order out of chaos, and deceive us into deducing purpose where there is none.⁷⁹ (Emphasis mine)

If one is a philosophical atheist (a belief that material and natural reality is all that exists), he or she would have to accept the philosophy that there is not a supernatural being called God in spite of the evidence for His existence. This mindset leaves no room for any other alternative—God is out period! He cannot and must not be in the equation. With the acceptance of Darwin’s theory of evolution, the idea of God is discarded. An example of this frame of mind is Steven Pinker (born 1954, Canadian-American experimental psychologist, cognitive scientist, linguist, and author of popular science writings) who refuses to entertain a notion of God in his thinking.

We should pay attention to his logic as he sets forth his reason for rejecting the concept of a supernatural being: “Because there are no alternatives, we would almost have to accept natural selection as the explanation of life on this planet even if there were no evidence for it.”⁸⁰ He assumes there is evidence for evolution, yet he candidly admits that “even if there were no evidence for it,” he would not accept the alternative. Another scholar, Lee Smolin (born 1955, Astronomer, American theoretical physicist, and on the faculty of Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics) discards God out of his accepted wisdom or judgment because this would open the door for religion. He expresses his fears this way:

There is thus a danger that the need for such a theory of initial conditions leaves the door open for a return of religion. Not the mysticism of the mathematical I have been speaking about, but the idea that there is a god who by conscious decision and choice made the world.⁸¹ (Emphasis mine)

We see the horror or revulsion in his writings about even the possibility of returning to religion as a means of trying to arrive at a rational view of the origin of the Universe. For him, God is a no, no! God cannot enter into the equation. Again, he writes about his objection in crediting the Creation of the Universe to God:

It seems to me that the only possible name for such an observer is God, and that the theory is to be criticized as being unlikely, on these grounds. I say this not because I have something against God, but because I suspect that a theory that asserts that only such an outside observer could know the

⁷⁹Ibid., 54.

⁸⁰Steven Pinker, *How the Mind Works* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company 1997, 2009), 162.

⁸¹Lee Smolin, *The Life of the Cosmos* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 183.

objective reality of the universe must lack the kind of logical coherence that we would like a theory of the whole universe to have.⁸²

As we read the writings of scientists who reject God, we are conscious that these men see only through their own lenses, which glasses are strongly colored to substantiate their preconceived views of the world. Do their subjective biases invalidate all their writings? No! We must read their writings with objectivity. We can determine true scientific investigation of objective data concerning their findings about the Universe, but, at the same time, we can also identify their subjective opinions with various key words—perhaps, it may be, very likely, I would guess, must have been, and, seems to have occurred. Jason Lisle’s comments about scientific statements versus evolutionary assumptions are informative and correct:

The distant starlight question has caused some people to question cosmic distances. “Do we really know that galaxies are so far away? Perhaps they are much closer, so the light really doesn’t travel very far.” However, the techniques that astronomers use to measure cosmic distances are generally logical and scientifically sound. They do not rely on evolutionary assumptions about the past. Moreover, they are a part of *observational* science (as opposed to historical/origins science); they are testable and repeatable in the present. You could repeat the experiment to determine the distance to a star or galaxy, and you would get approximately the same answer. So we have good reason to believe that space really is very big. In fact, the amazing size of the universe brings glory to God (Psalm 19:1).⁸³

Many scientists start with the conclusion that there can be no God since that would go against their theory of evolution as well as to open the doors for religion. They reject evidence for God because they do not like the conclusion that may support a belief in God. As we reflect upon the above mentioned atheists, we are reminded that their presuppositions about the origin of the Universe also require faith. For us to believe and adore their interpretation of the system of nature, we stand in disbelief at the gullibility of these men and women—nothing created something. As long as a belief system is not in the Bible, many scientists will jump on the bandwagon with “out of the ordinary views,” that is to say, wacky, fantastic, strange, weird, way out, and so on. Carl Sagan’s comments explain the crazy world of many scientists:

As I’ve tried to stress, at the heart of science is an essential balance between two seemingly contradictory attitudes—an openness to new ideas, no matter how bizarre or counterintuitive, and the most ruthlessly skeptical scrutiny of all ideas, old or new.⁸⁴

There is a distinction between scientific observations and evolutionary assumptions. The Bible is the only book in the world that gives us the origin of the Universe and humanity. Atheism is full of mysteries—the origin of matter, the origin of humanity, the principle of the regularity of motion within our Solar System as well as the specific origin of the Earth, which is

⁸²Ibid., 264.

⁸³Jason Lisle, “Does Distant Starlight Prove the Universe Is Old?”, in *A Pocket Guide to Astronomy: What Is the Biblical Perspective?* (Petersburg, Kentucky: Answers in Genesis, 2010), 51-52.

⁸⁴Carl Sagan, *The Demon-Haunted World: Science As A Candle in the Dark* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1996), 304.

a unique subdivision within our Solar System. As Christians, we maintain that the Universe is the result of the intentional design of God, not a cosmic explosion in which we witness the haphazard collection of atoms resulting in the splendor and beauty of our Universe with all its galaxies and nebulae. Fred Hoyle (1915-2001) sums it up nicely when he writes: “‘God’ is a forbidden word in science.”⁸⁵ For one to introduce God into the scientific world is rejected by many scientists. Their objections arise more from dogmatic presuppositions than from scientific data.

CONCLUSION

The Christian idea of an Eternal uncaused Being is the only answer for human existence. The question, “Who made God” is nonsensical. No one made God! If we ask, “Who created God?” this question too is irrational or senseless. God was not created. God is outside of time. Only things created have a creator. In the finite world, everything has a cause. There has never been a time in which God did not exist. If we consent to the question, “Who created God?” we would have infinite gods with no end in sight. If one god created another god, we would still ask who created that God.

We began this study with the question: where did the idea of God originate? We demonstrated that the concept of God entered into the world through supernatural revelation—a revelation directly from God Himself. We also established that we live in a world of five worlds (five senses: **seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, and feeling**). The world of our five senses cannot reveal to us the concept of God, priest, altar, angels, and so forth. Thus, our knowledge of these things has come to us through special revelation, not natural revelation.

This in-depth study of God’s existence rejects theistic evolution and advances the belief that God created this Universe in six literal days as recorded by Moses in the Book of Genesis. Based upon the writings of Moses, we have also rejected extra-terrestrial life on other planets. Life is only found on Planet Earth. The Earth was created on day one, and the Sun, Moon, and Stars were created on day four. The Sun, Moon, and Stars were created for the purpose of illumination, time regulators, and signs—not for habitation. Moses writes about God’s rationale for these celestial bodies:

And God said, “Let there be lights in the expanse of the sky to separate the day from the night, and let them serve as signs to mark seasons and days and years,¹⁵ and let them be lights in the expanse of the sky to give light on the earth.” And it was so. (Genesis 1:14-15)

As we reflect upon Holy Scripture, we are reminded, once more, of the conciseness of Moses words as he epitomizes what he had just written in Genesis 1:14-15. Listen to him as he explains: “God made two great lights—the greater light to govern the day [Sun] and the lesser light [Moon] to govern the night. He also made the stars” (1:16). We cannot read the first two chapters of Genesis and arrive at the theory of evolution—either Darwinian evolution or theistic evolution. The first chapter of Genesis speaks of sudden appearances, not gradual development as set forth by evolutionists—non-believers (Darwinian Evolution) or believers

⁸⁵Fred Hoyle, *The Intelligent Universe*, 248.

(Theistic Evolution). The biblical account reads: “And God said, ‘Let there be light,’ and there was light” (1:3). In other words, there was a moment when there was no light in the Universe; yet, the next moment light appeared instantaneously at the command of God.

The Stars antedated Adam and Eve by the space of only two days. Moses writes about the creation of the Sun, Moon, and Stars appearing on the fourth day: “And there was evening, and there was morning—the fourth day” (1:19). Following the creation of these heavenly bodies, Moses lets us know that Adam and Eve appeared on the sixth day: “God saw all that he had made, and it was very good. And there was evening, and there was morning—the sixth day” (1:31).