

25. The Book of Psalms 19:1-4

Is God Real? (Part 2)

a message by Pastor Phil Ballmaier
(11-9-25)

Find this week's sermon audio and video message [HERE](#).

This morning we find ourselves in Psalm 19 which we're using to launch us into a series I'm calling—**"Is God Real?"** Psalm 19 is one of the greatest passages in the Bible to answer that question—or to put it another way—*"How do we know God exists?"*

As we said last time, since God is a supernatural Being (He can't be perceived by our human senses) the only way for us to know anything about Him (starting with His very existence) is if He *condescends* to reveal Himself to man—and that is exactly what God did.

A revelation is something that is made known to us by God—it is something that would be impossible for us to know through human logic or intelligence or our normal 5-sense capabilities—it is knowledge that comes through divine input.

When we talk about revelations from God to us there are 2 kinds: 1) Natural; and 2) Special.

- **Natural revelation** is God's revelation of Himself in creation (Psalm 19:1-6).
- **Special revelation** is God's revelation of Himself in Scripture. (Psalm 19:7-14)

Natural revelation gives us knowledge about God in general (He exists, He is powerful, He loves beauty and color etc.). Yet there are many things about God that *natural* revelation (things found in creation/nature) can't tell us about Him—and that is why God also gave us **special revelation**.

Special revelation is where God got 'up-close and personal' with us by introducing Himself to us, telling us His name, what He loves, what He hates, and how we can know Him personally, etc.).

➤ *So, once again, how can we know God exists?*

Well, if the invisible God created the visible universe and everything in it—then the visible universe would be the empirical proof for the existence of the invisible God.

The Bible itself gives two main proofs for the existence of God from **natural revelation**— **The Creation; and The Conscience**.

I. Natural Revelation

A. The Creation (outward revelation)

The creation proves that God exists—

Romans 1:20 (NKJV)

²⁰ For since the creation of the world His invisible *attributes* are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even* His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse.

Psalms 19:1–4a (NKJV)

¹ The heavens declare the glory of God; And the firmament shows His handiwork. ² Day unto day utters speech, And night unto night reveals knowledge. ³ *There is no speech nor language Where their voice is not heard.* ⁴ Their line has gone out through all the earth, And their words to the end of the world...

The Bible never tries to *prove* the existence of God, it doesn't need to—the creation does that!
Last week we started looking at 3 arguments from creation that proves the existence of God.

1. The Cosmological Argument
2. The Teleological Argument
3. The Moral Argument

To our first argument:

1. The Cosmological Argument

The word **cosmological** comes from the word 'cosmology'—which is the study of the universe. The Cosmological Argument for the existence of God has 2 parts to it:

- a. Everything that had a beginning had a cause (because nothing can't produce something)
- b. The universe had a beginning—therefore the universe had to have a beginning cause (Creator)

2. The Teleological Argument

This is the argument from design. The **teleological argument** basically contends that—every design has to have a *designer*, every composition has a composer, every painting has to have a painter, every sculpture has to have a sculptor, etc.

Therefore, if the universe in general and life in particular demonstrates highly complex design, it would prove that the universe and life had a Designer. The only thing we need to determine is—does the universe and life demonstrate design?

a. Life demonstrates complex design

The problem with many scientists is that they refuse to acknowledge the '*specified*' complexity in nature that points to a Creator. But it's ridiculous to believe that there is no Intelligence behind the complexity we see in even simple life on the earth.

Yet Carl Sagan, before he died and other evolutionists continue to tell us that all of this happened through random forces and natural processes without any intelligent intervention and design.

The Bible talks about those people who are '*willingly ignorant*' and therefore will have no excuse when they stand before God on the Day of Judgment.

In a book published near the end of his life, Sagan wrote,

“Our planet is a lonely speck in the great enveloping dark cosmos. In our obscurity, in all this vastness, there is no hint that help will come from elsewhere to save us from ourselves.” [check out Luke 19:10]]

How tragic, Sagan spent his whole adult life studying the creation and yet refused to see the hand of the Creator in any of it. As such life became meaningless to him and he died in utter despair without hope of anything more than this present evil fallen world.

If only he had looked into the electron microscope which his colleague A.E. Wilder-Smith invited him to look into (which we talked about last week) at the incredible complexity in the human cell—maybe his eyes would have been opened at last to the design that unmistakably points to the Creator.

Michael Behe in his book, *Darwin’s Black Box*, destroys Darwinian evolution by documenting the incomprehensible complexity of life at its most basic chemical, cellular level. He said:

“Evolution cannot explain the origin of the complex biochemical structures that Under-gird life—it doesn’t even try. The conclusion of intelligent design flows naturally from the data itself—not from sacred books or sectarian beliefs.”

Behe said that a single cell from a human being could have 100,000 molecules and 10,000 intricately interrelated chemical reactions going on at one time (all necessary and dependent upon each other to make life possible)—his conclusion, ‘cells couldn’t arise by chance.’

Michael Behe has shown that there is such a thing as “irreducible complexity” in a cell using a mouse trap as an illustration. Which simply means that you have to have the basic parts of a cell all there *simultaneously* or the cell, not only won’t work—it can’t even exist!

These basic components of the cell can’t evolve separately; they have to all be present together at the same time.

Back in 1996, I was at a Bible conference where Dr. John MacArthur was speaking and told this story—

“I received a call one day from a man named Dr. Richard Lumsden. Dr. Lumsden was the chairman of the Science Department at Tulane University. He was a renowned microbiologist who does electron microscopy and looks in there and sees DNA strips and studies chromosomes. His premier work had been on cell membranes.

Every cell has a membrane, and he was struggling professionally with that issue as a staunch evolutionist because there was no way the membrane could evolve to keep the cell contained. They would have had to come into existence simultaneously and there was no way that that could have happened scientifically by using evolution as an explanation—and so he was struggling.

As a completely secular humanist he was teaching his classes in the graduate school of Tulane and a Christian girl came up after class and he said she asked me, ‘Dr. Lumsden, may I talk to you and ask you some questions? He said, ‘Of course’ and he said, ‘she asked me all the standard questions that Christians ask evolutionists.

(I found Dr. Lumsden’s testimony and the questions she asked him—“How did life arise? . . . Isn’t DNA too complex to form by chance? . . . Why are there gaps in the fossil record between major kinds? . . . What are the missing links between apes and man?”)

“So, she asked me all the standard questions that Christians ask evolutionists. She didn’t act judgmental or provocative—she just wanted to know. I’d heard these same question on other occasions, and I gave her the

standard answers I had given to others over the years. She gave me a brief comment after each one and then thanked me and left.'

And when she walked away, he said, all I heard was the echo of my own stupidity. And I said to myself, 'If you believe what you just told that girl—you're an idiot!'

I went home that day, and I got a Bible and in a matter of a few weeks I committed my life to Jesus Christ, and I became a creationist, and not only a creationist—I became a 6-day creationist—it was the only thing that made sense scientifically to me.

I was immediately terminated at the university. I lost my job and my career (this was a Harvard educated man); I had to reconstruct my world view. I started a business and for the next five years made my living from this business while I went back through everything I had ever studied scientifically in the light of what I knew about the Creator.

MacArthur said,

'At the end of the five years he offered himself to the Institute of Creation Research in San Diego and became the most formidable debater against evolutionists across America on university campuses until they wouldn't debate him anymore.

Then he came to teach at the Master's Seminary until he retired."

So, the first part of the **Teleological Argument** (which proves the existence of God) says that:

a. Life demonstrates complex design

Okay, but what about the universe (our second point in this argument)?

b. The universe demonstrates complex design

So, just as with our first point—the universe demonstrates complex design which proves it also had to have a Designer and Creator. No principle in modern science has given more impetus to the belief that there must be an Intelligent Creator than the Anthropic Principle.

Back in 1997 a movie came out starring Jodie Foster and Matthew McConaughey called. "*Contact*." [The novel, from which the movie was taken, was written by none other than Carl Sagan.]

The main thought or theme of the movie (which was repeated 3 times in the movie)—"*If there isn't intelligent life out there then there is a lot of wasted space in the universe.*" Now, that sounds logical given the incredible size of the universe—but the Anthropic Principle proves that that statement is not true.

The Anthropic Principle demonstrates that, for life on earth to be possible, the universe needed to be exactly the size that it is. The Anthropic Principle says that the universe has been finely tuned—precisely "tweaked" to support life here on earth.

Jeff Miller PhD—"*The Anthropic Principles in cosmology states that the Universe as a whole appears to have been designed for humans to inhabit it. The existence of a Universe Designer still stands as the most logical explanation for its origin, and the naturalistic community cannot help but concede it.*"

In the words of Princeton professor emeritus and theoretical physicist Freeman Dyson,

"As we look into the universe and identify the many accidents of physics and astronomy that have worked together to our benefit, it almost seems as if the universe must in some sense have known that we were coming. Bottom line: the Universe appears to be designed for us to live in it."

According to Tim Folger, writing in *Discover* magazine,

*“The idea that the universe was made just for us—known as the **anthropic principle**—debuted in 1973. Since then, the mountain of evidence supporting the principle has drastically grown...”*

For example—

1. *Oxygen comprises 21% of the atmosphere. If it were 25% spontaneous fires would break out. If it were 15% we’d suffocate—in other words, 21% is exactly what we need and it’s exactly what we have.*
2. *The gravitational force, if it were altered by 1 part in 10 to the 40th power, our Sun would not exist. The moon would crash into the earth or fly off into space. (That is an incredibly minute change in the gravitational force which would prohibit life on this planet)*
3. *If the centrifugal force did not precisely balance the gravitational force nothing would be held in orbit and the planets could crash into each other.*
4. *The universe is expanding. If it were expanding at a rate 1/millionth slower than it is now the temperature on earth would be 10,000 degrees.*
5. *The average distance between stars in our galaxy (which contains roughly 300 to 400 billion stars), is 30 trillion miles (the space shuttle travels at 17,000 miles per hour or 5 miles a second—at that speed it would take over 1.7 billion years to travel from one star to another in our galaxy). If the distance between those stars were altered slightly, the orbits would become erratic and extreme temperature variations would occur here on earth making life impossible.*
6. *Anyone of the laws of physics can be described as a function of the velocity of light; therefore, even the slightest variations in the speed of light would alter all the other constants and negate the possibility of life here on earth.*
7. *If Jupiter wasn’t the size, it is or in its current orbit, life on earth probably wouldn’t be possible. You see because Jupiter is so big it acts like a cosmic vacuum cleaner. Its gravitational field is so strong that all the asteroids and other space junk that could slam into the earth get sucked into Jupiter.*
8. *The thickness of the earth’s crust is just right to support life.*
9. *The rotation of the earth is just right—24 hours. If it were faster, say 15 hours the wind velocities along the surface of the earth would be too great, if it were slower, say 36 hours the temperature of the earth would be too hot during the day and too cold at night for us to survive.*
10. *The axial tilt of the earth is exactly what it needs to be for life to be possible on this planet—23.5%.*
11. *God has even designed lightening for a purpose and precisely regulates it. If the atmospheric discharge rate was greater there would be too much fire destruction, if it were less there would be too little nitrogen fixing in the soil.*

And we could go on and on—but I think you get the picture.

Professor Jeff Miller concludes:

"Truly, the Universe is replete with decisive evidences of design. So much so, that even atheists cannot help but concede that truth...the Universe seems to have resulted in it being "custom tailored" ('fine-tuned') for humans.

But how can there be "fine-tuning" if no One exists to tune in the first place? How can the Universe be "custom tailored," and yet there be no Tailor? The Anthropic Principle—defined by cosmologists—is a blatant admission by the naturalistic community that theists have been right all along: the Universe is replete with evidences of design. If one is to be rational—drawing appropriate conclusions from the evidence—he must recognize that there are implications to realizing that the Universe is finely tuned and tailor made. The design in the Universe demands the existence of a Universal Designer and, further, the Universe was designed, specifically, with humans in mind."

In light of the Anthropic Principle—I haven't got enough faith to be an atheist!

And any scientist that rejects the overwhelming evidence for creation sticking rather to evolution as the explanation for the existence of the universe is not practicing science but 'scientism.'

Chuck Colson—

"Scientism assumes that science is the controlling reality about life, so anything that can be validated scientifically ought to be done. Other things are subjective fantasy—like love, beauty, good, evil, conscience, ethics.

So science, which originally simply meant the study of the natural world, has in this view been conflated with scientific naturalism, a philosophy that the natural world is all that exists.

Humans are reduced to "objects" that can be inspected, experimented on, and ultimately controlled.

In 1922, G.K. Chesterton warned that scientism had become a "creed" taking over our institutions, a "system of thought which began with Evolution and has ended in Eugenics."

C.S. Lewis warned that the rise of scientific naturalism would lead to "the abolition of man," for it denies the reality of those things central to our humanity: a sense of right and wrong, of purpose, of beauty, of God.

And if we deny the things that make us truly human, by definition we create a culture that is inhuman—a culture that, for example, embraces moral horrors like the killing of humans at the earliest stage of life on the spurious grounds that doing so might cure other people's diseases. Or cloning. Or medical experiments on humans, as the Nazis conducted.

Our task is to expose the flaws in scientific naturalism—not because we are against science but because we want it to fill its proper role as a means of investigating God's world and alleviating suffering within ethical boundaries.

And it's right that we should be doing this because it was a Christian view of reality that led to the scientific method, investigating all the things God has created...[to better know God Himself]"

The universe demonstrates such precision and intricate design, it has been so finely tweaked to support life here on earth, that there is absolutely no other explanation than what the Bible says—

Genesis 1:1 (NKJV)

¹ In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.

Psalms 19:1 (NASB95)

¹ The heavens are telling of the glory of God; And their expanse is declaring the work of His hands.

Next week we'll look at the 'Moral Argument' for the existence of God.

If you would like to know more about what it means to be a Jesus-follower— please, reach out to us. It would be our greatest privilege to lead you into a saving relationship with Jesus Christ.

Reach out to us [here](#).

Catch this weeks' audio, video, study and sermon notes [HERE](#).