

# ***GOD EXISTS***®

By Randy Singer

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Without faith, we cannot reason our way to God, but reason should not keep us from God. God created our hearts *and our minds*. With our minds we consider the evidence of God manifest in His creation. While science and logic are not eyewitnesses to the existence of God, they are powerful character witnesses. We cannot see God at the end of a telescope or microscope, but we can see His character and creative hand reflected in every aspect of His creation. From the fundamental laws of physics, which hold the universe together, to the intricate details in the microscopic building blocks of our beings, the design in God's creation points unmistakably to its Designer. With the mind we consider the epistemological evidence of God – the common sense truth that someone who transcends time and space must have caused this universe to come into being.

With the heart we confirm what the mind suggests. We sense the yearning for immortality - to be part of something that transcends the mundaneness of this world. We sense the “presence of an absence” – a God-shaped vacuum in our beings that only God can fill. And, when we truly believe, we experience a personal relationship with God Himself – our heart confirming what our mind knew all along.

The pages that follow will provide detailed evidence of God's existence. We will see that the design of the universe testifies to the existence of an intelligent designer. The

biochemical building blocks of life refute the notion that we evolved by random chance. We will explore the existence of a God-shaped vacuum in each of us, placed there by the hand of the Almighty Himself. We will consider the cause and effect arguments for God's creative and eternal existence as a force that transcends time and space. And we will follow the testimony of our own moral instincts, and the existence of moral rights and wrongs in the universe, as evidence of God's law and therefore God's existence. In the final section, the advocate will become the witness and explain how the heart confirms through experience what the mind believes through logic – that God exists and desires a personal relationship with each of us.

## **II. THE DESIGN PROVES A DESIGNER**

As the twentieth century draws to a close, the tables are turning on the “scientific” theory that our universe is some cosmic accident resulting from random chance. Astronomy is coming full circle. The pendulum first swung from the discredited Copernicus view that man was the center of a universe created by God to the view that the universe developed by random chance, with man as an insignificant byproduct. Copernicus was myopic and ignorant.

But the pendulum is swinging back, not to the discredited Copernicus view, but to the analogous idea that the universe was designed specifically to support mankind's existence. Scientists are discovering that all the seemingly unrelated and arbitrary constants in physics are related in one way – they are the only values capable of producing and sustaining life.

The first step back toward the belief in a universe expressly designed by a Supreme Being was the discovery and corroboration of the Big Bang theory. In 1927, astronomer Edwin Hubble discovered that other galaxies were rushing away from ours and that the universe was constantly expanding. Critics of Hubble derisively labeled this the “Big Bang theory,” to describe the notion that the universe began by an explosion from a single point in space at some definite point in time. But the critics were largely silenced in 1964, when physicists discovered “cosmic background radiation”, the apparent echoes of the initial big bang. Today, scientists believe the Big Bang theory is almost certainly right. It follows that the universe has a definite beginning – a notion formerly rejected by many in the scientific community.

As scientists began scrutinizing the Big Bang theory, they looked closely at the fundamental forces in physics that underpin the theory. They discovered, without exception, that the fundamental constants for forces like gravity, electromagnetism, the nuclear strong force, and the nuclear weak force, are precisely formulated and tailored so that life can exist. Even the most minute adjustment to any of these unexplained “constants” would result in a universe that could not possibly support life. For example, if the ratio of gravity to electromagnetism is altered ever so slightly, stars like our sun could not exist.<sup>1</sup> Similarly, if the nuclear strong force is weakened just a little, the

---

<sup>1</sup> Patrick Glynn, God: The Evidence, (Prima Publishing, 1997) pp. 28-29.

universe would contain only hydrogen and no other chemical.<sup>2</sup> A stronger nuclear strong force would yield a universe without atoms.<sup>3</sup>

The deeper scientists dig, the more “coincidences” they uncover. Tweak the ratio between the mass of a proton and the mass of a neutron, and you will have destroyed the building blocks of chemistry, and of all life.<sup>4</sup> Toy with the unique character of water – the fact that solid water is lighter than liquid water – and the oceans will freeze from the bottom up covering the world with ice.<sup>5</sup>

The “coincidences” continue at nearly every level of fundamental physics. In the formation of the universe, the balance of matter to anti-matter had to be accurate to one part per 10 billion for the universe to arise.<sup>6</sup> If the ratio varied by even one part per 10 billion, the universe would never have formed.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, if the expansion rate of the big bang had been one billionth of a percent larger or smaller, the universe would be incapable of sustaining life.<sup>8</sup>

The odds stack up. Cambridge Astronomer Fred Hoyle likens the probability of these constants happening by chance to the probability that a tornado blowing through a junkyard would spontaneously produce a Boeing 747. Other scientists compare the probabilities of

---

<sup>2</sup> Brandon Carter, “Large Number Coincidences and the Anthropic Principle in Cosmology,” in M.S. Longair, ed., Confrontation of Cosmological Theories with Observational Data, (Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1974) pp. 295-298.

<sup>3</sup> John Leslie, Universes, (London: Routledge, 1989) pp. 37-38.

<sup>4</sup> Id., pp. 39-40.

<sup>5</sup> John D. Barrow and Frank J. Tipler, The Anthropic Cosmological Principle, ((Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988) pp. 143-144; 524-541.

<sup>6</sup> J.P. Morgan and Kai Nielsen, Does God Exist?, (New York: Prometheus Books 1993) p. 143.

<sup>7</sup> Id.

this design happening “spontaneously” to the likelihood that a monkey randomly pounding on a typewriter would produce all of the sonnets of Shakespeare.

Atheists answer this overwhelming evidence of design by creating in their imagination billions of other parallel universes. The reasoning goes something like this: if there are billions of other universes, then the fact that one of these billions happens to have the right combination of physical laws to produce life is no miracle at all. In fact, given enough billions of universes, it might be expected that one of them would have just the right constants to be life sustaining.

The problem with this theory lies in its proof. None of these other imagined universes has ever been detected, nor could it be since it allegedly exists outside the reality of this universe. What this argument lacks in substance it makes up for in creativity. But in the final analysis, the notion that the intricate design of this universe can be explained away by reference to a billion other imaginary and undetectable universes is simply ludicrous. The scientific method of observation and testing cannot be hailed as the pathway to all truth by scientists who belittle those of faith, but then conveniently discarded when the truth is unwelcome. It takes far greater leaps of faith to believe in billions of other imaginary universes which we shall never see, than to believe in a God whose handiwork is evident all around us.

---

<sup>8</sup> Id.

### III. THE DIETY IS IN THE DETAILS

Either God created mankind in all his intricate detail, or mankind randomly evolved as the forces of natural selection worked their magic on chance mutations. For Darwin's evolutionary theory to be believed, and God's creative hand discarded, complex organisms must have been created by millions of minute changes in a step by step evolutionary process over billions of years. But the astonishing progress made by biochemists in the past several years proves this to be lie. What those scientists have discovered is a highly sophisticated and finely calibrated molecular system that is undeniably the intended result of "intelligent design". "The complexity of life's foundation has paralyzed science's attempt to account for it. Molecular machines raise an as – yet – impenetrable barrier to Darwin's universal reach."<sup>9</sup>

In his book on the biochemical challenge to evolution, Michael Behe, a highly respected biochemistry professor at Lehigh University, uses an illuminating analogy to illustrate the death blow dealt to evolution by this scientific research into the minutiae of life:

Suppose a 4-foot-wide ditch in your backyard, running to the horizon in both directions, separates your property from that of your neighbor's. If one day you met him in your yard and asked how he got there, you would have no reason to doubt the answer, "I jumped over the ditch." If the ditch were 8 feet wide and he gave the same answer, you would be impressed with his athletic ability. . . . If the "ditch" were actually a canyon 100 feet wide, however, you would not entertain for a moment the bald assertion that he jumped across.

But suppose your neighbor – a clever man – qualifies his claim. He did not come across in one jump. Rather, he says, in the canyon there were a number of buttes [which have now eroded away], no more than 10 feet apart from one another; he jumped from one narrowly spaced butte to another to reach your side. . . . Very dubious, but with no easy way to prove him wrong, you change the subject to baseball. . . .

---

<sup>9</sup> Michael J. Behe, Darwin's Black Box (New York: Simon & Schuster 1998) p. 5.

. . . Many people have followed Darwin in proposing that huge changes can be broken down into plausible, small steps over great periods of time. Persuasive evidence to support that position, however, has not been forthcoming. Nonetheless, like a neighbor's story about vanishing buttes, it has been difficult to evaluate whether the elusive and ill-defined small steps could occur . . . until now.

. . . [T]he canyons separating everyday life forms have their counterparts in the canyons that separate biological systems on a microscopic scale. Like a fractal pattern in mathematics, where a motif is repeated even as you look at smaller and smaller scales, unbridgeable chasms occur even at the tiniest level of life.<sup>10</sup>

#### A. ADMISSION OF A PARTY OPPONENT

The strongest evidence available in a court of law is an “admission against interest by a party opponent.” No party's case in court can rise higher than his own statements from the witness stand. Thus, we have developed elaborate “safeguards” to insure that confessions which reach the ears of the jury have not been coerced and to prevent persons from giving testimony against themselves. As every prosecutor and defense lawyer instinctively knows, once a confession is heard by the jury, the case is over. Human nature being what it is, we do not make statements against our own self interests unless we believe them to be true. For these reasons, we should be particularly attentive to the statements Darwin made about the problems with evolutionary thinking.

Darwin recognized the Achilles' heel of his own theory:

If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Behe, pp. 13-15

<sup>11</sup> Charles Darwin, Origin of the Species, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. 1988 (New York: University Press 1872) p. 154.

It is precisely on this Achilles' heel that the poison arrow of advanced biochemical research has now landed. While scientists are not yet willing to totally flush their pet theory on the origin of life, Darwin is beginning to circle the drain.

## B. JUMPING OFF THE BANDWAGON

There is a widespread myth that all scientists are fans of Darwin and his theory. While that proposition has never been true, it is becoming even less so as the trickle of Darwin criticism shows signs of swelling into a flood based on the latest scientific discoveries. From the center of the intellectual collegiate community in the Northeast, Lynn Margulis, Distinguished University Professor of Biology at the University of Massachusetts, believes that neo-Darwinism will ultimately be regarded as nothing more than “a minor twentieth century religious sect within the sprawling religious persuasion of anglo-saxon biology.”<sup>12</sup> From the middle of the new south, University of Georgia Geneticist John MacDonald notes that the results of 20 years of research on the genetic basis of adaptation “do not support the existence of major adaptive changes for the natural populations as suggested by Darwin.”<sup>13</sup> From America's heartland, University of Chicago Professor of Ecology and Evolution Jerry Coyne “conclude[s] – unexpectedly – that there is little evidence for the neo-Darwinian view – its theoretical foundations and the experiential evidence supporting it are weak.”<sup>14</sup> And from across the Atlantic, English biologists Mae-Wan Ho and Peter Saunders join the dissent:

---

<sup>12</sup> C. Mann “Lynn Margulis: Science's Unruly Earth Mother,” Science, (1991) pp. 252, 378-381.

<sup>13</sup> J.F. McDonald, “The molecular Basis of Adaptation,” Review of Ecology and Systematics, (1983 Vol. 14) p. 93.

<sup>14</sup> H.A. Orr and J.A. Coyne, “The Genetics of Adaptation: A Reassessment,” American Naturalist, (1992) p. 726.

It is now approximately half a century since the neo-Darwinian synthesis was formulated. A great deal of research has been carried on within the paradigm it defines. Yet the successes of the theory are limited to the minutiae of evolution, such as the adaptive change in coloration of moths; while it has remarkable little to say on the questions which interest us most, such as how there came to be moths in the first place.<sup>15</sup>

While detractors of Darwin have been around since the inception of the theory, 50 years of frustrated searches for macro-evolutionary evidence, and new advances in understanding the microcosms of life's building blocks, make dissenting scientists increasingly armed and dangerous to the survival of evolutionary theory.

### C. DARWIN'S ACHILLES' HEEL REVISITED

As noted above, Darwin admits that his theory fails if complex organisms exist which could not have been formed by numerous successive, slight modifications. Darwin's theory hinges on the belief that natural selection chooses slight biological mutations which, over time, gradually produce a better beast.

But this mutation process cannot work for organ and sub-organs that are "irreducibly complex," i.e. organs which have several interrelated parts that create a useful function as a result of their interaction but each part serves no useful purpose on its own. Natural selection only works if it has some mutation to select now that makes the organism more fit for survival. Natural selection will not select, in fact it will affirmatively reject, mutations that are useless or inhibit efficiency or survival. Mutations that serve no function by themselves will simply serve as a drag on the biological system of the animal and presumably be discarded over time. But an irreducibly complex mechanism consists

---

<sup>15</sup> M.W. Ho and P.T. Saunders "Beyond Neo-Darwinism – An Epigenetic Approach to Evolution," Journal

of several interrelated parts each of which would never evolve on their own because they are useless unless combined in a precise ratio with each of the other parts. Most of our seemingly simple biochemical processes are irreducibly complex in this way. Scientists have discovered that it would take dozens or even hundreds of simultaneous mutations in order to evolve these processes, because it is the interaction of these enormously complex parts which creates a useful biochemical mechanism. The parts on their own, if they evolved one at a time, would have no value and no chance for survival. As scientists discover increasing numbers of interrelated parts in the most basic biochemical functions, and as scientists confirm that each “part” would be useless unless it existed at the same time as the other parts and in precisely the same relationship as it now exists, they realize that Darwin’s game of chance mutation could never randomly generate such intricate design.

Take the simple biological function of blood clotting, for example. Professor Behe, after discussing the details of blood clotting and the need for simultaneous mutations to inject three new types of proteins into the “coagulation cascade” all at the same time, concludes this simultaneous mutation of proteins is mathematically impossible. It would never have occurred even if we assume that the earth is 10 billion years old:

We calculated the odds of getting TPA alone to be  $1/10^{18}$  to the eighteenth power. The odds of getting TPA and its activator together would be about  $1/10^{36}$  to the 36<sup>th</sup> power! That is a horrendously large number. Such an event would not be expected to happen even if the universe’s 10 billion year life were compressed into a single second and relived every second for 10 billion years. The situation is actually much worse: if a protein appeared in one step with nothing to do, then mutation and natural selection would *tend to eliminate it*. Since it is doing nothing critical, its loss would not be detrimental, and production of the gene and protein would cost energy that other animals aren’t spending. So producing the

useless protein would, at least to some marginal degree, be detrimental. Darwin's mechanism of natural selection would actually hinder the formation of irreducibly complex system such as the clotting cascade...

Blood coagulation is a paradigm of the staggering complexity that underlies even apparently simple bodily processes. Faced with such complexity beneath even simple phenomena, Darwinian theory falls silent.<sup>16</sup>

The silence of those who support Darwin on this point is deafening. If Darwin's theory could really explain the evolution of irreducibly complex molecular structures, you would expect to see at least one study outlining the explanation as to how it could occur. As professor Behe points out, no such study exists:

“Publish or perish” is a proverb that academicians take seriously. If you do not publish your work for the rest of the community to evaluate, then you have no business in academia (and if you don't already have tenure, you will be banished). But the same can be applied to theories as well. If a theory claims to be able to explain some phenomenon but does not generate even an attempt at an explanation, then it should be banished. Molecular evolution has never addressed the question of how complex structures came to be. In effect, the theory of Darwinian molecular evolution has not published, and so it should perish.<sup>17</sup>

The silence of Darwin's supporters stands in stark contrast to the noise emanating from the other side of the aisle. The complexity and intricate design of the biochemical processes of our bodies poses a massive challenge to those who cling desperately to faith in Darwinism and reject the evidence of intelligent design. The blood clotting process is but one example. The immune system, the synthesis of AMP, the development of “swimming” cells like cilium, the biosynthesis of the large amino acids, these and hundreds of other biochemical processes all reveal staggering complexity with hundreds of precisely tailored parts that could not evolve through some step by step process (since most of the parts are useless alone).

---

<sup>16</sup> Behe, pp. 96-97.

Behe compares the intricate design of these biochemical processes to an elaborately designed Rube Goldberg machine. The murmur of support for intelligent design becomes a roar of approval as the intricacies are uncovered :

Like some ultimate Rube Goldberg machine, the clotting cascade is a breathtaking balancing act in which a menagerie of biochemicals - sporting various decorations and rearrangements conferred by modifying enzymes – bounce off one another at precise angles in a meticulously ordered sequence until, at the denouement, Foghorn Leghorn pushes off the telephone poll and gets up from the ground, the bleeding from his wounds stopped. The audience rises to its feet in sustained applause.<sup>18</sup>

#### **IV. A GOD-SHAPED VACUUM**

Evidence of God’s existence is most powerful when we try to ignore Him. By denying God’s existence we reject God’s peace. We are each created with a God-shaped vacuum in our hearts, and contentment eludes us until we fill that vacuum with God’s presence. Those that deny the existence of God do so at the risk of never being able to enjoy the peace and happiness which are byproducts of a personal relationship with Him.

Dr. Patrick Glynn, author of God: the Evidence, and Scholar in Residence at George Washington University, describes the heartbreak in his “discovery” that atheism was the only logical extension of Western Philosophy:

The embrace of atheism did not bring joy. Somewhere, despite my “agnosticism,” I had clung to the hope that I might be proven wrong. The day I grasped that the entire tradition of western philosophy, from ancient to modern times, was essentially a refutation of the religious world view – of the idea of God – was not a happy one.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Id., p. 186.

<sup>18</sup> Id., p. 97.

<sup>19</sup> Glynn, p. 5.

Glynn's perspective is typical. Recent studies provide empirical evidence for what we all know by instinct: that we are designed with the yearning to know God intimately. Our happiness and emotional well-being are intricately tied to our belief in and relationship with God.

According to various Gallop surveys, 94 percent of Americans believe in God and 90 percent pray.<sup>20</sup> While the existence of God cannot and should not be determined by a popularity poll, the very existence of such an overwhelming majority is strong evidence that we were *made* to believe in God and communicate with God. Both our mental and physical well-being are tied to our spiritual health. Thus, filling the void in our God-shaped vacuum pays verifiable dividends emotionally and physically. Phrased differently, we are not whole without the presence of God. Human beings who merely evolved through survival of the fittest would never develop such a strong yearning for God and inclination to believe in Him. Belief in a God who does not even exist could never deliver such verifiable therapeutic benefits.

## B. PSYCHOLOGY AND FAITH

Since the ascendance of Freud, the study of the mind and emotions has been largely entrusted to those who do not believe in God. Freud himself called faith a collective mental disorder, a “universal obsessional neurosis,” one caused by “infantile” and “narcissistic” patterns of thought.<sup>21</sup> A 1972 poll of the American Psychological

---

<sup>20</sup> George Gallup, Jr. and Jim Catelli, The People's Religion: American Faith in the 90s, (New York: MacMillan 1989) pp. 45, 58.

<sup>21</sup> Sigmund Freud, The future of an Illusion, (New York: Norton 1961) pp. 16-21; 55.

Association showed that only 1.1 percent of psychologists were believers.<sup>22</sup> It is not surprising then, that this bastion of unbelief largely fails to appreciate the direct correlation between spiritual health and mental health. But such a correlation unquestionably exists.

Faith gives purpose to life. An extensive study of suicide victims in 1972 revealed that persons who did not attend church were four times as likely to commit suicide as those who were frequent church attenders.<sup>23</sup> The authors of the study concluded that lack of church attendance is the single best predictor of suicide rates.<sup>24</sup>

Faith helps us deal with reality, not seek escape. A comprehensive study of 14,000 young people and their usage of illegal drugs demonstrated that there is a direct inverse correlation between a young person's strength of religious beliefs and likelihood of drug abuse.<sup>25</sup>

Faith brings satisfaction to life. In a Gallop survey of life satisfaction, those who described their religious faith as "the most important influence in my life," were twice as

---

<sup>22</sup> Edwin R. Wallace, IV, "Psychiatry and Religion: A Dialogue," in Joseph H. Smith and Susan A. Handelman, eds., Psychoanalysis and Religion, (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press 1990) p. 105.

<sup>23</sup> David R. Larson and Susan S. Larson, The Forgotten Factor in Physical and Mental Health: What Does the Research Show?, (Rockville, MD: National Institute of Healthcare Research 1994) p. 69.

<sup>24</sup> Id.

<sup>25</sup> R.B. Loch and R. H. Hughes, "Religion and Youth Substance Abuse," Journal of Religion and Health 24, no. 3 (1985) pp. 197-208.

likely to describe themselves as “very happy”.<sup>26</sup> In a similar vein, studies show that faith is a key to long lasting marriages, and even greater satisfaction with marital sex.<sup>27</sup>

Deriders of religious faith call it “the opiate of the people” and condescendingly observe that “if God did not exist, man would certainly have needed to invent Him.” But if religion is an opiate, then it is a powerful mood enhancer indeed, and one with no perceptible crash. And if God is an invention, a mere figment of our imagination, then He is the most powerful, enduring daydream ever imagined, one with amazing therapeutic benefits. No other imaginary friend has so helped mankind. It is far more reasonable to conclude that God is real, that He created us for a relationship with Him, and that we are happiest when that relationship exists.

## B. PHYSIOLOGY AND FAITH

Faith not only affects our state of mind, it affects our state of health. As a respected medical school professor at Harvard describes it, our mind and body are “wired for God.”<sup>28</sup> Physicians today are reluctantly admitting the direct relationship between faith and health as numerous studies confirm that our physical well-being is “wired” to our spiritual well-being.

---

<sup>26</sup> David G. Myers, “Pursuing Happiness,” Psychology Today, July-August 1992, pp. 32-37.

<sup>27</sup> N.D. Glenn and C. N. Weaver, “A Multivariate, Multi-Survey Study of Marital Happiness,” Journal of Marriage and the Family 40 (1978): 269-282; see also C. Tarvis and S. Sadd, The Redbook Report on Female Sexuality, (New York: Delacorte Press 1977).

<sup>28</sup> Herbert Benson and Marg Stark, Timeless Healing, (New York: Simon & Schuster 1996) pp. 193-213.

Blood pressure is affected by religion. A 1989 study found that religiously committed individuals had significantly lower blood pressure levels than those who were not so committed.<sup>29</sup>

Heart disease is affected by religion. A 1972 study that examined causes of death in Washington County, Maryland, and statistically adjusted those deaths for risk factors such as smoking, socioeconomic status, etc., found that risk of arteriosclerotic heart disease for men who attended church regularly was only 60 percent of the total for those who did not attend church regularly.<sup>30</sup> Similarly, the risk of death from heart disease, emphysema and suicide was only one half as high for frequent church attenders as for those who did not attend.<sup>31</sup>

Even smokers benefit from religion. In the 1989 study referenced above, those smokers who ranked religion as very important were seven times less likely to have abnormal blood pressure problems as those smokers who did not regard religion as important.<sup>32</sup>

Prayer works. A widely discussed study conducted on 393 coronary care patients by cardiologist Randolph Byrd at San Francisco General Hospital uncovered a dramatic difference between the health of patients prayed for by self-professing born again Christians and the health of a control group. The “prayed for” group experienced significantly fewer cases of congestive heart failure, cardiac arrest and pneumonia. Not

---

<sup>29</sup> D. B. Larson et al., “The Impact of Religion on Men’s Blood Pressure,” Journal of Religion and Health 28, no. 4 (1989) pp. 265-278.

<sup>30</sup> G. W. Comstock and K. B. Partridge, “Church Attendance and Health,” Journal of Chronic Disease 25 (1992) pp. 665-672.

all patients were cured, of course, but prayer made a quantifiable difference.<sup>33</sup> The issue of God's sovereign response to mankind's prayers is beyond the scope of this brief. God is not a celestial Santa Clause waiting to respond to our beck and call. But God does answer prayer, not always in the way we believe best, but in a way He knows is best. The point here is that faithful prayer can, and often does, lead to improvements in physical and emotional health when those events are in God's will.

These and similar case studies dealing with the link between spiritual and physical health were comprehensively surveyed and analyzed in a 1991 report conducted by the National Opinion Research Center. The conclusion: levels of religious commitment bear a direct relationship to health status.<sup>34</sup>

We are indeed "wired for God". Short circuit this intricate system by denying the God who wired us, and you affect not just spiritual health but also physical health. The effect is not coincidental. It is compelling evidence for God's existence and His affect on our lives.

## **V. MORALS MUST HAVE MOORINGS**

Hitler's actions were the natural extension of Darwin's theory. The theory of evolution, founded on the notion of survival of the fittest and combined with a strong denial of any

---

<sup>31</sup> Id.

<sup>32</sup> Larson et al., pp. 665-672.

<sup>33</sup> Dale A. Matthews, David B. Larson and Constance P. Barry, The Faith Factor: An Annotated Bibliography of Clinical Research on Spiritual Subjects, (Rockville, MD: National Institute for Healthcare Research 1993) p. 52.

<sup>34</sup> K. f. Ferraro and C. M. Albrecht-Jensen, "Does Religion Influence Adult Health?" Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 30, no. 2 (1991) pp. 193-202.

deity, is a powerful rationalization for all manner of atrocity in the name of ethnic cleansing. If there is no God, and we are left to our own devices, there is no absolute truth. Without absolute truth – that universal sense of right and wrong – there is no difference between Hitler and Mother Teresa. If God is dead, on what basis could Hitler be condemned?

Lest this sounds alarmist, let us not soon forget this country's own history when it comes to outgrowths of Darwinian thought. When Darwin's theory was gaining momentum in the decades after the turn of the century, it birthed the *eugenics* movement designed to "improve the human race by better heredity."<sup>35</sup> This new "science" was first proposed by Darwin's cousin to accelerate the process of human evolution, and Darwin's son eventually assumed the presidency of the national Eugenics Education Society.<sup>36</sup> The movement quickly went from the classroom to the legislative halls. Justifying their actions by resort to evolutionary biology and genetics, thirty-five states passed laws directing the sexual segregation and in some instances sterilization of those deemed genetically unfit.<sup>37</sup> The genetically unfit included the mentally ill and retarded, habitual criminals, and epileptics.<sup>38</sup> The best selling biology textbook at the time made the case this way:

If such people were lower animals, we would probably kill them off to prevent them from spreading. . . Humanity will not allow this, but we do have the remedy of separating the sexes in asylums or other places and in various ways preventing intermarriage and the possibility of perpetuating such a low and degenerate race.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Edward J. Larson, Summer for the Gods: The Scopes Trial, and America's Continuing Debate over Science and Religion, (New York: BasicBooks 1997) p. 27.

<sup>36</sup> Id.

<sup>37</sup> Id.

Belief in God makes us transcend our own self interest. Darwin says that only the fit should survive. The Bible says, “The meek shall inherit the earth”. Darwin says that this is a dog-eat-dog world – we must put our own survival above all else. Christ said that the first and greatest command is to love God completely; the second command, like the first, is to love your neighbor as yourself. The best thoughts, the best motives, the best actions of our human existence spring from belief in a Being that is greater (and more important) than us. Sacrifice, duty, honor, love, humility, patience – all of these virtues make sense only in a universe ordered by God and lose their significance in a random universe ruled by natural selection and survival.

If there is no God, no being that transcends ourselves, then our every action should be designed to maximize our own existence and pleasure. Why would a lawyer not lie in the courtroom to win her client’s case and enhance her own reputation? Why would a businessman not pad his expense account if he knew he would not be caught? Why would an inner city gang member not beat up a younger and smaller neighborhood kid just to take his sneakers? Why would a husband not cheat on his wife if he thought it could bring greater satisfaction and it would go undetected? Why not terminate the lives of those who have become a burden to the rest of society?

The answer to each of these questions hangs on an appeal to a higher moral authority. To believe in a higher moral authority is to acknowledge that God exists. You simply cannot create coherent and transcendent moral values apart from God. And you cannot have a

---

<sup>38</sup> Id.

<sup>39</sup> George William Hunter, A Civic Biology, (New York: American 1914) p. 263.

fulfilling or meaningful life, or even a well functioning society, without those transcendent values.

## **V. DADDY, WHO MADE GOD?**

At some point, most parents must answer this profound and innocent question. It takes various forms: “Where did God come from?” “Does God have a daddy?” “Who made God?” Regardless of form, the truth instinctively conveyed in this question remains the same – unless something transcends time and space it must have a beginning and it must be caused by something or someone else.

By definition God transcends time and space. He existed from eternity past; He will exist into eternity future. He always was, always is, and always will be. God created, preceded and transcended all things. The answer to the child’s question of who created the world is simple and straightforward: “God.” The answer to the child’s question of who created God is equally simple and straightforward: “Nobody, God has always been there.”

Accounting for the existence of our universe, including ourselves, apart from God is no simple matter. We know that the universe, as we understand it, is bounded by time and space. (While a few scientists may continue to argue a “steady state” theory – that the universe has always existed – that theory is no longer viewed as viable by most.) We also know that the universe did not just spontaneously erupt from nothingness. What (or who) caused the universe to come into existence? What (or who) existed just before the

dawn of time to cause the creation of the earth, moon and stars? If God does not exist, then how does something come out of nothing at a time before time existed?

These questions are rhetorical. Something does not come from nothing. A time before time is no time at all (even though some philosophers attempt to avoid this by referring to “imaginary” time or “time minus one second”). To think of a universe that was not created at some finite point in time is to chase your intellectual tail. It requires gigantic leaps of faith to believe in the spontaneous combustion of the universe from a state of nothingness. It takes far less faith to believe in an eternal God.

There is a force, beyond our comprehension, that created the universe at the beginning of time. That is the only concept that makes sense in response to the most innocent of all childhood inquiries. That creative force has a name. We call Him God.

## **VI. The Lawyer Testifies**

In a court of law, a lawyer is forbidden from expressing a personal belief in the guilt or innocence of her client. The rule exists because the lawyer’s personal belief is irrelevant, because she has no first hand knowledge of the facts, and because the jury would put too much weight on the lawyer’s personal belief.

But this is no court of law. And religion is intensely personal. Moreover, about this matter I do have first hand knowledge and it would be inappropriate to remain silent.

God exists. I know it. I believe it. I experience it.

I communicate with God. My prayers have been answered.

God changed my life. I wrote earlier about the God-shaped vacuum which causes us loneliness and despair. Our sinful nature separates us from God. It is a painful and lonely existence – never quite satisfied; never quite at peace.

But God provided a way to overcome the separation by the sacrifice of His only Son – Jesus Christ. I accepted that sacrifice of the perfect “Lamb of God” as atonement for my sins. Christ became my Saviour and Lord. The vacuum was filled. The relationship restored.

Men can argue with me about the evidence for God’s existence. But they can never convince me that the peace and joy of a personal relationship with God through Christ is nonexistent. That relationship, based on my own personal experience, is exhibit A for my belief that God exists. Exhibit A turns an intellectual belief into a personal experience. I know Him. I believe Him. I experience Him.

Note: These materials are Copyrighted by Randy Singer. May be reprinted and used by permission.