

God How Do We Know He Exists and That Our God Is THE God?

Scripture quotations are taken from the following translations:

ESV® Bible (The Holy Bible, English Standard Version®), copyright © 2001 by Crossway, a publishing ministry of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations taken from the New American Standard Bible® (NASB),
Copyright © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973,
1975, 1977, 1995, 2020 by The Lockman Foundation
Used by permission. www.Lockman.org

Scripture quoted by permission. Quotations designated (NET) are from the NET Bible® copyright ©1996-2016 by Biblical Studies Press, L.L.C. <http://netbible.com> All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations marked (NLT) are taken from the Holy Bible, New Living Translation, copyright © 1996, 2004, 2015 by Tyndale House Foundation. Used by permission of Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., Carol Stream, Illinois 60188. All rights reserved.

The Good News Translation Bible (GNB) text used in this product is being used by permission. Copyright © American Bible Society, 1966, 1971, 1976, 1992

Scripture taken from the Holy Bible: International Standard Version® Release 2.0. (ISV) Copyright © 1996–2011 by the ISV Foundation. Used by permission of Davidson Press, LLC. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED INTERNATIONALLY

Ground Rules

- Questions? Please write them down.
- You can give them to us before you leave or
- Email them to kenb@calvarychurchfl.com
- Depending on the question, I will either send you an answer, send an answer to everyone, or talk about it next week.
- This class is not fully comprehensive.

Our Road Map

Week 1 – What is truth and how can we know that the Bible really is God’s word?

Week 2 – **God – How do we know He exists and that our God is THE God?**

Week 3 – Jesus Christ – Who is He, is He God and did He really rise from the dead?

Week 4 – Why am I here, how should I live and where am I going...ultimately?

We began our discussion last week with truth. What is it? And as we move forward that will continue to be a focus of ours. There is intelligent evil that has been lying to us for centuries about any and everything pertaining to God.

Because of these lies, questions now come to us from a completely and totally different presupposition. The existence of God is no longer a given, as is the existence of objective truth or the authority of the Bible.

We must not forget that historic Christianity stands on a basis of antithesis. Without it, historic Christianity is meaningless. The basic antithesis is that God objectively exists in contrast (in antithesis) to His not

existing. Which of these two are the reality, changes everything in the area of knowledge and morals and in the whole of life. (Schaffer 1982, 8)

In conversations we tend to ask the question, are you a Christian? I have heard people respond to that question in the affirmative often, but what are they really saying? Are they responding from the same worldview that you asked the question from? Probably not.

Recent research from George Barna tells us how various worldviews and presuppositions of truth have affected the response we get these days.

What do I mean by worldview? It is how you see yourself, others, the cosmos, and God. It is your religion, whether you call it that or not. It is your own personal Svengali, the all-powerful puppeteer deep within your subconscious that pulls your strings, that controls not only how you see everything but how you react to everything— (Guillen 2021, XV)

This is where we are seeing the current crisis in belief take place.

The research shows that roughly two out of every three Millennials (65%) say they are Christian. That proportion is similar to the national average (currently 69%).

The biggest generational difference, though, is that among Millennials the label “Christian” is not a statement of commitment to the namesake (Jesus Christ) or to embracing biblical beliefs and principles. Rather, that term has taken on the connotation of being a good person, regardless of religious beliefs. (Barna 2021)

So, the majority of folks we talk with say they are Christians. “But this large group entertains a wide range of perspectives that are not in harmony with biblical teachings. Among the errant perspectives most widely embraced are:

- 72% argue that people are basically good
- 71% consider feelings, experience, or the input of friends and family as their most trusted sources of moral guidance
- 66% say that having faith matters more than which faith you pursue
- 64% say that all religious faiths are of equal value
- 58% believe that if a person is good enough, or does enough good things, they can earn their way into Heaven
- 58% contend that the Holy Spirit is not a real, living being but is merely a symbol of God’s power, presence, or purity
- 57% believe in karma
- 52% claim that determining moral truth is up to each individual; there are no moral absolutes that apply to everyone, all the time (Barna, Release #6: What Does It Mean When People Say They Are “Christian”? American Worldview Inventory 2021 2021)

In other words, many who tell you they are Christians do not have a clue what it is the Bible really teaches or what a Biblical worldview consists of. Sound bite Christianity rules and the enemy is seriously behind that (Revelation 3:15 – 20). Welcome to Laodicea.

When we talk to others about the Lord, we cannot assume that the person we are talking to has the same worldview we have or that the terms even have the same meaning. I have discovered that there is now a need to learn how to frame our conversation in relation to the worldview of the person we are talking to. We also need to learn how to frame our answers in the same light.

Review point - Apologetics is learning how to ask questions and then listen to and rely on the Holy Spirit. We have been given all the tools necessary to do this.

John 14:26

“The Helper, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you everything and make you remember all that I have told you.” (GNB)

So, let’s talk about God. What do people believe today?

The fastest growing faith segment in our nation is classified as the “Don’ts.” They don’t know if God exists, or they don’t care if God exists. “No population segment is fueling the growth of the Don’ts more than Millennials, with 41% falling within this category.” (Barna, Indifference to God, Jesus and the Bible Drives Millennials’ Faith 2021)

If there is no God, what does that mean? When a friend or loved one tells you “It’s not rational to believe in God since there is no proof.”

How do we respond?

The primary key that I learned in knowing how to communicate my message is:

- Know your message
- Listen to the questions
- Drive back to your message
- Learn how to question the questioner
- Provide some bait
- Answer questions, or in the alternative, ask questions about the bait
- The goal is to have them examine the bait, if they at least do that, you have been successful.
- Back to the question/statement. There is no proof for God.

Point one – Do not lose your mind over the statement.

You know the message and the Holy Spirit’s got this.
We will examine Nehemiah 2 in our fourth class.

First, we need to remember to level set.

What do you mean by “God”—that is, what kind of God do you reject? What specifically is irrational about believing in God? Since you’re concerned about proof for God’s existence, what kind of evidence would you find acceptable? What arguments for God have you considered, and what did you find wrong with them? (Koukl 2019, 54)

This line of questioning helps us to prepare where to go next. And don’t worry or stress about it...the Holy Spirit is using you and He is the one guiding the conversation.

We need to remember the square or world view this is coming from...atheism is one. Materialism may be another.

Atheism declares that there is no God, and it claims that this is a rational position; but atheism does not attempt to do much beyond convincing people of this idea. (Metaxas 2021, 8-9)

“Who am I?” man asks. “Why am I here? Where am I going?” Since the Enlightenment, when he threw off the shackles of religion, man has tried to answer these questions without reference to God. But the answers that came back were not exhilarating, but dark and terrible. “You are the accidental by-product of nature, a result of matter plus time plus chance. There is no reason for your existence. All you face is death.”

Modern man thought that when he had gotten rid of God, he had freed himself from all that repressed and stifled him. Instead, he discovered that in killing God, he had also killed himself.

For if there is no God, then man's life becomes absurd. (Craig 1994, 57)

If there is no God, then there is no life after death, no future, what you have is the here and now and there is no need to live for anything or anyone other than self. You are the master of your fate. This is a familiar lie.

Genesis 3:4–5

““You won't die!” the serpent replied to the woman. “God knows that your eyes will be opened as soon as you eat it, and you will be like God, knowing both good and evil.”” (NLT)

Eve said yes to the lie, and we have been embracing our truth over “THE TRUTH” ever since.

How do we respond to this?

The temptation is to tell the skeptic that it is impossible to prove the existence of God, you just have to take it by faith. That is not entirely true since in the Bible we read the following.

Psalms 19:1–3

“How clearly the sky reveals God's glory! How plainly it shows what he has done! Each day announces it to the following day; each night repeats it to the next. No speech or words are used, no sound is heard;” (GNB)

Romans 1:20

“Ever since God created the world, his invisible qualities, both his eternal power and his divine nature, have been clearly seen; they are perceived in the things that God has made. So those people have no excuse at all!” (GNB)

I want to cover some of the standard arguments in use today. They are still hotly debated even though one of them dates from the middle ages.

At the end of the day, we must rely on the Holy Spirit to work on the heart and mind of the one we are talking to.

The Arguments

- Anthropological Argument
- Ontological Argument
- Cosmological Argument
- Teleological Argument
- Moral Argument

Anthropological Argument

This is relatively simple when compared to some of the other arguments. We have been created in the image of God and as such reflect, poorly, God.

Genesis 1:26–27

“Then God said, “Let Us make mankind in Our image, according to Our likeness; and let them rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over the livestock and over all the earth, and over every crawling thing that crawls on the earth.” So God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.” (NASB 2020)

Humankind was created as God's image. If we think of imaging as a verb or function, that translation makes sense. We are created to image God, to be his imagers. It is what we are by definition. The image

is not an ability we have, but a status. We are God's representatives on earth. To be human is to image God. (Heiser, *The Unseen Realm: Recovering the Supernatural Worldview of the Bible* 2015, 42-43)

We, prior to the fall, perfectly reflected who God is. This reflection became a fading representation of reality as time moved from the fall to the present. Jesus pointed out to us His intent to correct that and let us see God.

John 14:8–9

“Philip said to Him, “Lord, show us the Father, and it is enough for us.” Jesus said to him, “Have I been with you for so long a time, and yet you have not come to know Me, Philip? The one who has seen Me has seen the Father; how can you say, ‘Show us the Father?’” (NASB 2020)

“...the anthropological argument indicates that the elements which are recognized as the innate properties of man must be possessed by his Creator.” (Chafer 1993, 155)

The elements of the proof are as follows:—(a) Man, as an intellectual and moral being, has had a beginning upon the planet. (b) Material and unconscious forces do not afford a sufficient cause for man's reason, conscience, and free will. (c) Man, as an effect, can be referred only to a cause possessing self-consciousness and a moral nature, in other words, personality. (Strong 1907, 81)

In other words, God exists because He is the only one who could have made us to be intellectual and moral.

Ontological Argument

This argument comes from Anselm of Canterbury who wanted to find a single argument that not only God exists, but He does so with all the attributes the Bible teaches.

Therefore, if that, than which nothing greater can be conceived, exists in the understanding alone, the very being, than which nothing greater can be conceived, is one, than which a greater can be conceived. But obviously this is impossible. Hence, there is no doubt that there exists a being, than which nothing greater can be conceived, and it exists both in the understanding and in reality. (Saint Anselm of Canterbury 1939, 8)

AND it assuredly exists so truly, that it cannot be conceived not to exist. For, it is possible to conceive of a being which cannot be conceived not to exist; and this is greater than one which can be conceived not to exist. Hence, if that, than which nothing greater can be conceived, can be conceived not to exist, it is not that, than which nothing greater can be conceived. But this is an irreconcilable contradiction. There is, then, so truly a being than which nothing greater can be conceived to exist, that it cannot even be conceived not to exist; and this being thou art, O Lord, our God. (Saint Anselm of Canterbury 1939, 8-9)

God cannot be conceived not to exist.—God is that, than which nothing greater can be conceived.—That which can be conceived not to exist is not god.

Another way of putting this, says Anselm, is the following: a being whose non-existence is inconceivable is greater than a being whose non-existence is conceivable. But God is the greatest conceivable being. Therefore, God's non-existence must be inconceivable. There is no contradiction involved in this notion. Therefore, God must exist. (Craig 1994, 79)

Cosmological Argument

This argument is a family of proofs for the existence of God. The roots for it go back to Greek philosophers and it was developed by those who wanted to prove the existence of God. This included medieval Jewish, Christian and Islamic thinkers.

In logical form, the argument goes like this:

1. Everything that had a beginning had a cause.
2. The universe had a beginning.
3. Therefore the universe had a cause. (Geisler and Turek 2004, 75)

And there begins the battle, the issue of a beginning cause. All throughout the centuries God as the creator was accepted as irrefutable, until the advent of scientific materialism. “Scientific materialists have traditionally answered that question by affirming that matter, energy, and/or the laws of physics are the entities from which everything else came and that those entities have existed from eternity past as the uncreated foundation of all that exists. Matter, energy, and physical laws are, therefore, viewed by materialists as self-existent.” (Meyer 2021, 7)

Those who lean towards being materialists deny that there is a creator or design intelligence. “Because materialists think that matter and energy are the foundational realities from which all else comes, they deny the existence of immaterial entities such as God, free will, the human soul, and even the human mind conceived as an entity in some way distinct from the physiological processes at work in the brain.” (Meyer 2021, 7)

The cosmological argument does indeed intersect with science. As Christians, many of us have not bothered to look to science as a potential proof, but the cosmological argument coupled with what we now know about what is called the Big Bang coupled with the anthropic cosmological principle has changed all of that.

The Big Bang

It is essential to bear in mind that science has not provided explanations for the two principal starting points in our lives: the start of our universe and the start of life itself. When we try to describe the conditions at that crucial interface between total nothingness and the start of our universe, we are confronted with a point of space having infinitely high density and infinitely small dimensions. In the language of physics, such a point is called a singularity.

Singularities cannot be handled mathematically in the dimensions we experience: the length, width, and height of things and the passage of time. Changing to imaginary dimensions of time allows the math to be handled but does nothing to remove the fact that an untenable singularity existed in real time at the Big Bang. (Schroeder 1990, 24)

Contrary to what many physicists have claimed in the popular press, we have had a Theory of Everything for about thirty years. Most physicists dislike this Theory of Everything because it requires the universe to begin in a singularity. That is, they dislike it because the theory is consistent only if God exists, and most contemporary scientists are atheists. They don't want God to exist, and if keeping God out of science requires rejecting physical laws, well, so be it. My approach to reality is different. I believe that we have to accept the implications of physical law, whatever these implications are. If they imply the existence of God, well then, God exists. (Tipler 2007, Kindle Locations 51-56)

Dr. Allan Sandage

...the discovery of the expansion of the Universe with its consequences concerning the possibility that astronomers have identified the creation event does put astronomical cosmology close to the type of medieval natural theology that attempted to find God by identifying the first cause. Astronomers may have found the first effect, but not, thereby, necessarily the first cause sought by Anselm and Aquinas. Nevertheless, there are serious scientific papers discussing events very shortly after the big bang creation (ex nihilo?) out of which all the types of matter that we know (baryons, electrons, photons, etc.) were made, and in what quantities.

Even the creation of matter is said now to be understood. Astronomical observations have also suggested that this creation event, signaled by the expansion of the Universe, has happened only once. The expansion will continue forever, the Universe will not collapse upon itself, and therefore this type of creation will not happen again.

But knowledge of the creation is not knowledge of the creator, nor do any astronomical findings tell us why the event occurred. It is truly supernatural (i.e. outside our understanding of the natural order of things), and by this definition a miracle. But the nature of God is not to be found within any part of these findings of science. For that, one must turn to the scriptures, if indeed an answer is to be had within our finite human understanding. (Sandage 2020)

All you have to do is study a little bit of astronomy to find out there is a thing called red shift. It is observable

In 1929, Edwin Hubble announced that almost all galaxies appeared to be moving away from us. In fact, he found that the universe was expanding - with all of the galaxies moving away from each other. This phenomenon was observed as a redshift of a galaxy's spectrum. This redshift appeared to be larger for faint, presumably further, galaxies. Hence, the farther a galaxy, the faster it is receding from Earth. The velocity of a galaxy could be expressed mathematically as

$$v = H \times d$$

where v is the galaxy's radial outward velocity, d is the galaxy's distance from Earth, and H is the constant of proportionality called the Hubble constant.

Doctor Sandage stated that a miracle is the cause for the very beginning.

From the skeptic - Supernatural, I reject that anything supernatural can occur. Science has shown us that miracles do not occur.

Since science only measures natural causes and effects, it's not capable of ruling out supernatural causes, even in principle. (Koukl 2019, 104)

In reality, this is an adjunct to the materialism we discussed earlier and leads you, philosophically, back to Charles Darwin and to then further back to David Hume.

A miracle is a violation of the laws of nature; and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can possibly be imagined. (Hume 2019, 21)

This is the square of the materialist.

According to a common interpretation of Hume's argument against miracles, miracles violate inviolable natural law and hence are impossible. Most scholars today note that if this is Hume's argument, it is a circular argument by fiat of definition and therefore proves nothing. Other questions aside, if a deity genuinely generated the patterns of nature, no logical necessity precludes that deity from acting at will on nature at a more complex level, just as lesser intelligent agents within nature can do. Hume also argued, apparently based on this first argument against miracles, that eyewitness testimony can never be sufficiently persuasive to overcome the uniform experience against miracles.

If this argument against testimony is understood as it usually is, it likewise constitutes a circular argument, since whether human experience is uniformly against miracles is precisely the question under debate. Given abundant and sometimes well-attested claims of miracles today, Hume's argument on this point should appear even less persuasive in a twenty-first-century multicultural context than it appeared in his

own day. Hume's argument proceeds mostly by definition rather than induction, and is logically unworkable even on his own philosophic premises.

It succeeded historically largely on the weight of his intellectual prestige and its appeal to some popular trends in his intellectual milieu. As Oxford theologian Keith Ward points out, Hume's arguments regarding miracles "are exceptionally poor and are found acceptable only by those who are (rightly) impressed by his general philosophical acuteness—an acuteness that does not carry over into his remarks on miracles." (Keener 2011, Kindle Locations 4460 - 4470)

Part of this bias against the supernatural is cultural. Because the culture today is strongly biased against the supernatural, we are seeing a generation, which is looking for an anchor, not being able to find one. We must take a step back and look at the scriptures through an entirely old lens. That of the author. Seeing the Bible through the eyes of an ancient reader requires shedding the filters of our traditions and presumptions. They processed life in supernatural terms. Today's Christian processes it by a mixture of creedal statements and modern rationalism. (Heiser, *The Unseen Realm: Recovering the Supernatural Worldview of the Bible* 2015, 13)

Miracle claims, especially regarding healings, are by Western standards surprisingly common (though by no means universal) in regions of the world where such events are expected. These claims include, as in the Gospels and Acts, the healing of the blind, those unable to walk, and the raising of the dead, among many others. To acknowledge the frequency of such claims is not to pass judgment on their accuracy or to prejudge their theological meaning. Their frequency does, however, at least bring into question some traditional critics' suppositions that any such claims must reflect a lengthy period of legendary accretion. (Keener 2011, Kindle Location 13380)

Here's what we know

S The Second Law of Thermodynamics is true The universe is indeed running from order to disorder, it had a beginning

U The universe began at a point in time and is expanding.
All time, all matter and all space exploded out of nothing (Genesis 1:1). MIRACLE

R Background radiation from the Big Bang is still hanging around.
Observable

G Great galaxy ripples, variations in the temperature of the background radiation
Verified by COBE satellite and announced in 1992.

E Einstein's theory of relativity.

The theory itself, which has been verified to five decimal places, demands an absolute beginning for time, space, and matter. It shows that time, space, and matter are co-relative. That is, they are interdependent—you can't have one without the others. (Geisler and Turek 2004, 83-84)

The universe had a beginning.

The problem many have after that revelation is the realization that this points to a cause, a creator or designer who made it all and brought it into being.

Einstein disagreed with his theory at first because it pointed to the necessity for a beginning for the universe. Because of his bias towards materialism, he introduced a fudge factor. "Later Einstein said that his postulation of an arbitrary value for the cosmological constant—his cosmic fudge factor—was "the greatest blunder" of his life. Indeed, by seeking to preserve a static universe, Einstein inadvertently concealed an important cosmological reality implicit in his own theory of gravitation." (Meyer 2021, 124)

A finite universe, by contrast, would force scientists to confront uncomfortable questions about the ultimate beginning of the material universe itself. It also raised the possibility that the universe had begun in something like a creation event produced by a cause that existed independently of matter, space, time, and energy. (Meyer 2021, 125)

One more thing the universe is fine tuned for the existence of life to be right here on planet earth. This is called the Anthropic Cosmological Principle.

The conclusion of Drs. John D. Barrow and Frank J. Tipler is summed up in the following: “the evidence is very strong that intelligent life is restricted to a single planet which is but one of nine circling a star which itself is only one of about 10^{11} stars in the Galaxy and our Galaxy is but one of some 10^{12} galaxies in the visible universe.” (Barrow and Tipler 1986, 613)

“...the anthropic principle, which says that everything about the universe tends toward man, toward making life possible and sustaining it. The first popularizer of the principle, American physicist John Wheeler, describes it in this way: “A life-giving factor lies at the centre of the whole machinery and design of the world.”” (Ross 1991, 120)

Twentieth-century physics has discovered that the gross properties of stars, planets, and even people are neither random nor the result of any progressive evolutionary process. They are a consequence of the relative and absolute strengths of the different forces of nature and the masses of the most basic particles of matter. The spectrum of objects that can exist is determined by the values of the fixed constants in nature. (Barrow, Life, the Universe, and the Anthropic Principle 1987, Kindle Location 26)

Six Numbers

Two of them relate to the basic forces; two fix the size and overall ‘texture’ of our universe and determine whether it will continue forever; and two more fix the properties of space itself:

1. The cosmos is so vast because there is one crucially important huge number \mathcal{N} in nature, equal to 1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000. This number measures the strength of the electrical forces that hold atoms together, divided by the force of gravity between them. If \mathcal{N} had a few less zeros, only a short-lived miniature universe could exist: no creatures could grow larger than insects, and there would be no time for biological evolution.
2. Another number, ϵ , whose value is 0.007, defines how firmly atomic nuclei bind together and how all the atoms on Earth were made. Its value controls the power from the Sun and, more sensitively, how stars transmute hydrogen into all the atoms of the periodic table. Carbon and oxygen are common, whereas gold and uranium are rare, because of what happens in the stars. If ϵ were 0.006 or 0.008, we could not exist.
3. The cosmic number Ω (omega) measures the amount of material in our universe - galaxies, diffuse gas, and ‘dark matter’. Ω tells us the relative importance of gravity and expansion energy in the universe. If this ratio were too high relative to a particular ‘critical’ value, the universe would have collapsed long ago; had it been too low, no galaxies or stars would have formed. The initial expansion speed seems to have been finely tuned.
4. Measuring the fourth number, λ (lambda), was the biggest scientific news of 1998. An unsuspected new force - a cosmic ‘antigravity’ - controls the expansion of our universe, even though it has no discernible effect on scales less than a billion light-years. It is destined to become ever more dominant over gravity and other forces as our universe becomes ever darker and emptier. Fortunately for us (and very surprisingly to theorists), λ is very small. Otherwise its effect would have stopped galaxies and stars from forming, and cosmic evolution would have been stifled before it could even begin.

5. The seeds for all cosmic structures - stars, galaxies and clusters of galaxies - were all imprinted in the Big Bang. The fabric of our universe depends on one number, Ω which represents the ratio of two fundamental energies and is about 1/100,000 in value. If Ω were even smaller, the universe would be inert and structureless; if Ω were much larger, it would be a violent place, in which no stars or solar systems could survive, dominated by vast black holes.
6. The sixth crucial number has been known for centuries, although it's now viewed in a new perspective. It is the number of spatial dimensions in our world, \mathcal{D} , and equals three. Life couldn't exist if \mathcal{D} were two or four. Time is a fourth dimension, but distinctively different from the others in that it has a built-in arrow: we 'move' only towards the future. Near black holes, space is so warped that light moves in circles, and time can stand still. Furthermore, close to the time of the Big Bang, and also on microscopic scales, space may reveal its deepest underlying lying structure of all: the vibrations and harmonies of objects called 'superstrings', in a ten-dimensional arena. (Rhees 1999, Kindle Locations 45-63)

Does everyone buy into that scientific conclusion? Hardly. There is still an active search for extraterrestrial life and there is also ongoing scientific research into UFOs and things such as that. Others postulate LGM (little green men) are out there.

The UFOs do not seem to exist as tangible, manufactured objects. They do not conform to the accepted natural laws of our environment. They seem to be nothing more than transmogrifications tailoring themselves to our abilities to understand. The thousands of contacts with the entities indicate that they are liars and put-on artists. The UFO manifestations seem to be, by and large, merely minor variations of the age-old demonological phenomenon. (Keel 2013, 326)

What About the Drake Equation?

When we take account of realistic uncertainty, replacing point estimates by probability distributions that reflect current scientific understanding, we find no reason to be highly confident that the galaxy (or observable universe) contains other civilizations, and thus no longer find our observations in conflict with our prior probabilities. We found qualitatively similar results through two different methods: using the authors' assessments of current scientific knowledge bearing on key parameters, and using the divergent estimates of these parameters in the astrobiology literature as a proxy for current scientific uncertainty.

When we update this prior in light of the Fermi observation, we find a substantial probability that we are alone in our galaxy, and perhaps even in our observable universe (53%–99.6% and 39%–85% respectively). (Sandberg, Drexler and Ord 2018, 16)

In response to a question on their official Exoplanet Exploration website—"Are there any exoplanets like Earth?"—NASA replies, "We have found many Earth-sized rocky exoplanets, some of which are in the habitable zones of their stars," but "we haven't found a planet that can support life like Earth. So far, our home is unique in the universe." (Guillen 2021, 149)

This leads us to the Teleological Argument.

Teleological Argument

Perhaps the oldest and most popular of all the arguments for the existence of God is the teleological argument. It is the famous argument from design, and it infers an intelligent designer of the universe just as we infer an intelligent designer for any product in which we discern evidence of purposeful adaptation of means to some end (telos). (Craig 1994, 83)

At the other end of the spectrum is preached the ancient teleological view that the universe was made especially for living beings like our selves - tailor-made for human life by some form of providential design. The latter remained the view of many biologists until in the mid-1800s, Charles Darwin and Alfred Russel

Wallace made their crucial observations of the evolutionary adaptation of organisms to their environment and proposed the mechanism of natural selection. Since that time, biologists have rejected any notion of evolution as being goal-directed in some way. If the environment were to change in some unusual way so as to render intelligence a liability, then we would cease to be well adapted, and might well be facing the same sort of demise as the dinosaurs. (Barrow, Life, the Universe, and the Anthropic Principle 1987, Kindle Locations 20-27)

Isaiah 40:25–26

““To whom can you compare me? Whom do I resemble?” says the Holy One. Look up at the sky! Who created all these heavenly lights? He is the one who leads out their ranks; he calls them all by name. Because of his absolute power and awesome strength, not one of them is missing.”” (NET)

Psalms 19:1–6

“The heavens declare the glory of God; the sky displays his handiwork. Day after day it speaks out; night after night it reveals his greatness. There is no actual speech or word, nor is its voice literally heard. Yet its voice echoes throughout the earth; its words carry to the distant horizon. In the sky he has pitched a tent for the sun. Like a bridegroom it emerges from its chamber; like a strong man it enjoys running its course. It emerges from the distant horizon, and goes from one end of the sky to the other; nothing can escape its heat.” (NET)

Why does God tell us to compare him with the heavens? Because God has no limits, and from our perspective neither do the heavens. God is the unlimited limiter—the uncreated Creator—of all things. He’s the self-existing, infinite Being who created this vast and beautiful universe out of nothing and who holds it all together today. There’s only one entity in our experience that can provide an analogy to the infinity of God. An image intended to depict God won’t do. It merely limits his majesty. Only the heavens scream out infinity. (Geisler and Turek 2004, 109)

If, then, the happiness which God always enjoys is as great as that which we enjoy sometimes, it is marvellous; and if it is greater, this is still more marvellous. Nevertheless it is so. Moreover, life belongs to God. For the actuality of thought is life, and God is that actuality; and the essential actuality of God is life most good and eternal. We hold, then, that God is a living being, eternal, most good; and therefore life and a continuous eternal existence belong to God; for that is what God is. (Aristotle 1933)

When confronting design, in the stars, in DNA or anywhere else observed, how do many react? Romans 1:20–23 “For his invisible attributes, namely, his eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly perceived, ever since the creation of the world, in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse. For although they knew God, they did not honor him as God or give thanks to him, but they became futile in their thinking, and their foolish hearts were darkened. Claiming to be wise, they became fools, and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man and birds and animals and creeping things.” (ESV)

Panspermia

Panspermia is actually an umbrella term that describes any scientific theory that posits that all life as we know it on earth began in outer space. (Heiser, Panspermia: What It Is and Why It Matters: An Introductory Essay n.d.)

Panspermia, correctly applied, refers to the hypothesis that life existed in some basic form elsewhere in the universe and was spread to Earth and/or some other planets. Directed panspermia is even more specific, proposing that these basic forms, or “life-seeds,” were deliberately spread in all directions by some advanced alien race in an effort to begin life wherever they may have landed. (Got Questions Ministries 2002-2013)

Indeed, cosmologists and physicists have found that the existence of life depends upon a dozen or so of these highly improbable finely tuned parameters. Many have also noted that this fine tuning strongly

suggests design by a preexistent intelligence. As the British physicist Paul Davies put it in 1988, “The impression of design is overwhelming.” (Meyer 2021, 174)

Here is the thing, we were indeed visited. “One of them in particular visited Earth two thousand years ago, and his stay is documented in striking detail in the most widely read book in human history—an ancient tome that has survived centuries of scrutiny by countless skeptics and is today supported by volumes of well-documented historical and physical evidence. A book that squarely takes on the question: “Are we alone?” and gives us the definitive answer: No, we are not.” (Guillen 2021, 155)

Moral Argument

The other, more prevalent form of the argument, infers from some facts about morality, such as the existence of objective moral laws or the fact of conscience, that God is their cause. (Feinberg 2001, 199)

Put another way, because we have a conscience and a sense of right and wrong, this implies that only God could be the result of that.

When a man is getting better he understands more and more clearly the evil that is still left in him. When a man is getting worse he understands his own badness less and less. A moderately bad man knows he is not very good: a thoroughly bad man thinks he is all right. (Lewis 2009, 93)

The moral argument acknowledges that man has an awareness of right and wrong, a sense of morality. Where did this sense of moral justice come from? (Enns 1989, 184)

Romans 2:14–15

“The Gentiles do not have the Law; but whenever they do by instinct what the Law commands, they are their own law, even though they do not have the Law. Their conduct shows that what the Law commands is written in their hearts. Their consciences also show that this is true, since their thoughts sometimes accuse them and sometimes defend them.” (GNB)

We have flown over five arguments for the existence of God. You can go even deeper if you care to. The one thing we must learn to do I alluded to earlier. When we are talking to someone, we need to follow the leadings of the Holy Spirit. We need to ask questions and then we need to listen. We also need to realize all we may be doing is sowing some seed here and there and turning a shovel or two. If you get to close the deal, great, if not, just be faithful to what it is He has called you to do.

1 Corinthians 3:6–8

“I planted, Apollos watered, but God was causing the growth. So then neither the one who plants nor the one who waters is anything, but God who causes the growth. Now the one who plants and the one who waters are one; but each will receive his own reward according to his own labor.” (NASB 2020)

Bibliography

- Aristotle. 1933. *Metaphysics*. Vol. 17, in *Aristotle in 23 Volumes*, translated by Hugh Tredennick. Medford, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Barna, George. 2021. "Indifference to God, Jesus and the Bible Drives Millennials' Faith." *Arizona Christian University Cultural Research Center*. December 7. Accessed January 13, 2022. https://www.arizonachristian.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/CRC_Millennial_Report03_Digital_01_20211207.pdf.
- . 2021. "Release #6: What Does It Mean When People Say They Are "Christian"? American Worldview Inventory 2021." *Arizona Christian University Cultural Research Center*. August 31. Accessed January 13, 2022. https://www.arizonachristian.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/CRC_AWVI2021_Release06_Digital_01_20210831.pdf.
- Barrow, John D. 1987. *Life, the Universe, and the Anthropic Principle*. Kindle Edition. The World & I Online.
- Barrow, John D., and Frank J. Tipler. 1986. *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chafer, Lewis Sperry. 1993. *Systematic Theology*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications.
- Craig, Willima Lane. 1994. *Reasonable Faith: Christian Truth and Apologetics*. Revised Edition. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books.
- Enns, Paul P. 1989. *The Moody Handbook of Theology*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.
- Feinberg, John S. 2001. *No One Like Him: The Doctrine of God, The Foundations of Evangelical Theology*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books.
- Geisler, Norman L., and Frank Turek. 2004. *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books.
- Got Questions Ministries. 2002-2013. *Got Questions? Bible Questions Answered*. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software.
- Guillen, Michael. 2021. *Believing Is Seeing: A Physicist Explains How Science Shattered His Atheism and Revealed the Necessity of Faith*. Kindle Edition. Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale Refresh.
- Heiser, Michael S. n.d. *Panspermia: What It Is and Why It Matters: An Introductory Essay*. Kindle Edition. BlindSpot Press.
- . 2015. *The Unseen Realm: Recovering the Supernatural Worldview of the Bible*. First Edition. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press.
- Hume, David. 2019. *Of Miracles: Skeptical Empiricism vs. Supernaturalism and Religious Faith (Philosophy and Christianity)*. Kindle Edition. Edited by D. S. Dorius. D. S. Dorius Publishing.
- Keel, John A. 2013. *Operation Trojan Horse: The Classic Breakthrough Study of UFO's*. Kindle Edition. San Antonio, TX: Anomalist Books.
- Keener, Craig S. 2011. *Miracles: The Credibility of the New Testament Accounts*. Kindle Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Koukl, Gregory. 2019. *Tactics: A Game Plan for Discussin Your Christian Convictions*. Updated and Expanded, 10th Anniversary Edition, Kindle Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Lewis, C. S. 2009. *Mere Christianity*. Kindle Edition. New York, NY: HarperCollins eBooks.
- Metaxas, Eric. 2021. *Is Atheism Dead?* Kindle Edition. Washington D.C.: Salem Books.

- Meyer, Stephen C. 2021. *Return of the God Hypothesis: Three Scientific Discoveries That Reveal the Mind Behind the Universe*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.
- Rhees, Martin. 1999. *Just Six Numbers: The Deep Forces That Shape the Universe*. Kindle Edition. Lymington: Basic Books.
- Ross, Hugh. 1991. *The Fingerprint of God: Recent Scientific Discoveries the Unmistakable Identity of the Creator*. Orange, CA: Promise Publishing Co.
- Saint Anselm of Canterbury. 1939. "Proslogium or Discourse on the Existence of God." In *Proslogium; Monologium; An Appendix, In Behalf of the Fool, by Gaunilon and Cur Deus Homo*, by Sidney Norton Deane. Chicago, IL: The Open Court Publishing Company.
- Sandage, Allan. 2020. "A Scientist Reflects on Religious Belief." *LeadershipU.com*. Nov 18. Accessed January 13, 2022. <http://www.leaderu.com/truth/1truth15.html> .
- Sandberg, Anders, Eric Drexler, and Toby Ord. 2018. *Dissolving the Fermi Paradox*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Schaffer, Francis A. 1982. *The God Who Is There*. Vol. 1, in *The Complete Works of Francis Schaeffer*, by Francis A. Schaffer. Westchester, IL: Crossway Books.
- Schroeder, Gerald L. 1990. *Genesis and The Big Bang: The Discovery of Harmony Between Modern Science and the Bible*. Kindle Edition. New York, NY: Random House Publishing Group.
- Strong, Augustus Hopkins. 1907. *Systematic Theology*. Philadelphia, PA: American Baptist Publication Society.
- Tipler, Frank J. 2007. *The Physics of Christianity*. Kindle Edition. New York, NY: The Crown Publishing Group.