

Session 2: Why We Believe

I believe in God the Creator of the Universe.



Hebrews 11 (3) By faith we understand that the universe was formed at God's command, so that what is seen was not made out of what was visible.

Romans 1 (20) For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities--his eternal power and divine nature--have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse.

John 1 (1) In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. (2) He was with God in the beginning. (3) Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made.

Be

Big Bang

Observational Evidence (*Anthropic Principle*)

Law of Morality

D_{NA}

Big Bang Theory



The Big Bang Theory is the popular explanation for where the galaxies, stars, planets and people came from. Those who believe in the big bang acknowledge that there are questions that need answering, such as where all the material that makes up the universe came from and what made the universe expand.

Before the Big Bang

- According to the scientific community, all the matter in the universe, as we know it today, began in a very tiny, hot and compacted point.

Bang

- At the moment of the big bang, the point began expanding like a balloon, versus the long-held misconception of an actual explosion. As the point of matter expands, which it continues to do today, it cools, contracts and forms stars and galaxies.

Inside

- Before the big bang, nothing existed, not even space. Space and time, according to scientists like Steven Hawking, George Ellis and Roger Penrose, were created after the big bang. The three scientists performed mathematical calculations to help prove their ideas in the 1960's and 1970's.

Evidence

- Galaxies observed from ground-based and space telescopes confirm that galaxies are moving away from the Earth. Also, telescopes with the ability to measure radiation in space detect residual radiation throughout space, which indicates that something massive occurred.

Theory

- The big bang theory remains a theory because the evidence available only traces what we can see from our place in the universe back through time, which could be incomplete. In addition, those who believe in God will not accept that the universe sprang from nothing and for no reason

<http://creation.com/before-the-big-bang>

<http://creation.com/15-questions>



British author Anthony Kenny honestly described his own predicament as an atheist in light of evidence for the Big Bang. He wrote, *"According to the Big Bang Theory, the whole matter of the universe began to exist at a particular time in the remote past. A proponent of such a theory, at least if he is an atheist, must believe that the matter of the universe came from nothing and by nothing."* (Anthony Kenny, *The Five Ways: St. Thomas Aquinas' Proofs of God's Existence* (New York: Schocken, 1969), 66.

"There is no doubt that a parallel exists between the big bang as an event and the Christian notion of creation from nothing."
~ Astrophysicist and cosmologist, George Smoot



Observational Evidence

The Anthropic Principle



One of the more extraordinary things about the universe is that it has produced beings who can observe it — namely, us. Its laws and constants are so precise that, if they were even slightly modified, no human would be here to see it. Many cosmologists and philosophers have wondered if we should read anything into all this *preciseness*: Are the finely-tuned physical laws that surround us mere coincidence, or does it imply that we are somehow meant to be here? That's where the Anthropic Principle comes into play.

Bert Thompson, Ph.D.

INTRODUCTION

On more than one occasion, evolutionary scientists, while diligently struggling to banish God from His own Universe, have inadvertently accomplished exactly the opposite, and in so doing, have come face-to-face with evidence so powerful, and so astonishing, that it enshrines Him all the more as Creator. However, rather than simply admitting that their findings confirm both a creation and a Creator, they have gone to great lengths to “explain away” the data, or their implications, so that evolution can persist as the most popular explanation for origins. The literature provides multiple instances of this kind of thinking.

For example, Stephen Hawking, in his book, *A Brief History of Time*, observed: “The whole history of science has been the gradual realization that events do not happen in an arbitrary manner, but that they reflect a certain underlying order, which may or may not be divinely inspired” (1988, p. 122). But, after acknowledging the “underlying order” in nature, Dr. Hawking quickly dispensed with it, and throughout his book extolled the rich virtues of evolution as “the way it happened.” Paul Davies, the eminent British physicist, has written a book in which the beauty, structure, and extreme complexity of both the Universe and the Earth are examined in depth. Yet Dr. Davies says we exist because of “apparent numerical accidents” and “many more apparent accidents of fortune” (1982, p. 111). Not surprisingly, then, do we discover that he titled his book *The Accidental Universe*. In that volume, we find this amazing statement:

Many of the rather basic features of the Universe are determined in essence by the values that are assigned to the fundamental constants of nature,...and these features would be drastically altered if the constants assumed even moderately different values. It is clear that for nature to produce a cosmos even remotely resembling our own, many apparently unconnected branches of physics have to cooperate to a remarkable degree (1982, p. 111).

John Gribbin, the renowned evolutionary cosmologist, has voiced his belief that “our form of life depends, in delicate and subtle ways, on several apparent ‘coincidences’ in the fundamental laws of nature which make the Universe tick. Without those coincidences, we would not be here to puzzle over the problem of their existence.... What does this mean? One possibility is that the Universe we know is a highly improbable accident, ‘just one of those things’ ” (1981, pp. 307,309). In the May, 1983 issue of *Science Digest*, Dr. Gribbin penned an article that discussed in clear terms the design which is apparent in every aspect of the creation. The article concentrated specifically on the Earth, noting how it had exactly the right distance from the Sun, exactly the right distance from the Moon, exactly the right tilt, exactly the right mass, exactly the right atmosphere, and so on. Ironically, the article was titled “Earth’s Lucky Break” (p. 36).

THE ANTHROPIC PRINCIPLE

Perennially, evolutionists have busied themselves with avoiding the obvious design in nature, and the inescapable conclusion to be drawn from such design: there must be a designer. Realizing that design demands a designer, they have spent considerable time and effort attempting to ignore, explain away, or otherwise weaken the implications of the data. Valiant attempts have been made to give their distorted views respectability. Various “principles” of science have been elucidated to confer such respectability. For example, there is the Copernican Principle, which holds that no part of the Universe is more privileged than any other part. The Principle of Mediocrity holds that life on Earth is nothing special and that because of this, the galaxies are likely filled with other civilizations. The Perfect Cosmological Principle states that the Universe should be identical at all times. And so on.

It is, then, astonishing indeed to learn of the naming and development of one of the newest principle in science—the **Anthropic Principle**. As its name (from the Greek *anthropos*, meaning “man”) implies, this principle hinges on man’s part in the existence of the Universe. To quote Gribbin: “The ‘Anthropic Principle’ says that our Universe seems to be tailor-made for us because people like us can only evolve in this kind of Universe” (1981, p. 309).

Did Dr. Gribbin say “tailor-made”? Yes, and Robert Jastrow, founder and former director of the Goddard Institute for Space Studies at NASA, explained why:

Thus, according to the physicist and the astronomer, it appears that the Universe was constructed within very narrow limits, in such a way that man could dwell in it. This result is called the **anthropic principle**. It is the most theistic result ever to come out of science, in my view.... I really do not know what to make of this result—the Anthropic Principle (1984, pp. 21,22, emp. in orig.).

Dr. Jastrow hardly is alone in his consternation over these latest findings in science. The obvious implications of a “tailor-made” Universe have not escaped many of his colleagues. Freeman Dyson of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton commented: “As we look out 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 we were coming” (1971, p. 50). Sir Fred Hoyle of Great Britain has stronger feelings on the matter. In speaking of the precise requirements needed in nature to synthesize the proper carbon and hydrogen atoms necessary to life, Dr. Hoyle observed:

If you wanted to produce carbon and oxygen in roughly equal quantities by stellar nucleosynthesis, these are the two levels you would have to fix, and your fixing would have to be just about where these levels are actually found to be.... A commonsense interpretation of the facts suggests that a superintellect has monkeyed with physics, as well as chemistry and biology, and that there are no blind forces worth speaking about in nature (1954, p. 121).

Paul Davies also is troubled over these events.

A clear inspection shows that the Earth is endowed with still more amazing “conveniences.” Without the layer of ozone above the atmosphere, deadly ultraviolet radiation from the sun would destroy us, and in the absence of a magnetic field, cosmic subatomic particles would deluge the Earth’s surface. Considering that the Universe is full of violence and cataclysms, our own little corner of the cosmos enjoys a benign tranquility. To those who believe that God made the world for mankind, it must seem that all these conditions are in no way a random or haphazard arrangement of circumstances, but reflect a carefully prepared environment in which humans can live comfortably, a pre-ordained ecosystem into which life slots naturally and inevitably—a tailor-made world (1980, p. 143).

What is the origin of this novel and controversial position? While the words “anthropic principle” are not new, their use in this respect is. They were first applied to these matters by Brandon Carter in 1974 in a lecture to the International Astronomical Union. Dr. Carter, then at Cambridge and now at the Paris Observatory, published his comments in an article titled “Large Number Coincidences and the Anthropic Principle in Cosmology.” In his lecture, Dr. Carter observed: “What we can expect to observe must be restricted by the conditions necessary for our presence as observers” (1974, p. 291). In other words, the conditions that we observe in the Universe must include those necessary to give rise to intelligent life, or else we would not be here to observe them.

Stephen Hawking paraphrased Carter’s point like this: “We see the Universe the way it is because we exist.” He elaborates as follows: “The idea is that there are certain conditions which are necessary for the development of intelligent life: out of all conceivable universes, only in those in which these conditions occur will there be beings to observe the Universe. Thus our existence requires the Universe to have certain properties...” (1974, pp. 285-286). In his lecture, and subsequent scientific articles, Dr. Carter set forth what he called the Weak Anthropic Principle, as opposed to what he called the Strong Anthropic Principle. Here is the difference.

The Weak Anthropic Principle

Carter said that there was a “biological selection effect” in operation. These were his words, but the idea for them, and thus the idea for the Weak Anthropic Principle (which is based on the concept of “biological selection”) actually were presented thirteen years earlier in a paper in *Nature* by Robert Dicke (1961, 192:440). Here, using Dicke’s illustration, is how the Weak Anthropic Principle would work. Dicke (as an evolutionist) was attempting to answer the question, “Why do we observe the Universe to be approximately 10 billion years old?” One response, of course (from a strictly evolutionary viewpoint) might be that it is merely a coincidence that we see a Universe that is 10 billion years old. Tony Rothman, writing in the popular science magazine *Discover*, explained how this problem was solved.

But Dicke reasoned that the Universe must be at least old enough to have generated elements as heavy as carbon because “it is well known that carbon is required to make physicists”—at least physicists as we know them.

Carbon, as it happens, was not created in the Big Bang. Rather it was first synthesized in the earliest stars, and then scattered through space when the stars exploded in supernova, a process that continues today. The cooking time for carbon depends on the mass of a star, but averages a billion years or so. Thus, said Dicke, it would be impossible to observe a Universe younger than the shortest-lived stars, because the very elements we're composed of wouldn't exist. On the other hand, if the Universe were much older than it is, most stars would already have collapsed into white dwarfs, neutron stars, or black holes, rendering our type of life impossible for many reasons. Dicke concluded that the fact that we see the Universe to be about ten billion years old is no accident but a necessary result of the biological selection effect. The Universe's observed age, he said, "is limited by the criteria for the existence of physicists" (1987, 8[5]:91-92).

This is an example of the weak anthropic principle, and is a good illustration of what Carter meant when he said, "What we can expect to observe must be restricted by the conditions necessary for our presence as observers." The observed values of physical quantities are restricted by the requirement that they be compatible with the development of *Homo sapiens*.

Stephen Hawking, in his book, *A Brief History of Time*, provided a simple explanation of what this means:

The weak anthropic principle states that in a Universe that is large or infinite in space and/or time, the conditions necessary for the development of intelligent life will be met only in certain regions that are limited in space and time. The intelligent beings in these regions should therefore not be surprised if they observe that their locality in the Universe satisfies the conditions that are necessary for their existence. It is a bit like a rich person living in a wealthy neighborhood not seeing any poverty (1988, p. 124).

And, said Dr. Hawking, "Few people would quarrel with the validity or utility of the weak anthropic principle" (1988, p. 124).

Of course, creationists would agree, but for different reasons. We accept the fact that the Universe is intricately designed so that it supports life as we know it. We accept the fact that if this were not the case, we wouldn't be here to observe it (for how, pray tell, could we exist in a Universe that would not support our existence?). We accept Dr. Dyson's conclusion that the Universe looks as if it "knew we were coming." We accept Dr. Hoyle's assessment that a superintellect has "monkeyed with" the physics, chemistry, and biology of the Universe, and that "there are no blind forces worth speaking about in nature." We even would gladly accept Dr. Davies' suggestion that our Universe appears to be "tailor-made." And we concur with all these statements because: (a) The scientific evidence is in agreement with them; and (b) **We know the Tailor!**

The Strong Anthropic Principle

What, then, is the Strong Anthropic Principle? Carter stated it as follows: "The Universe must be such as to admit the creation of observers within it at some stage." Most scientists interpret this strong version of the Anthropic Principle to mean that the Universe must be nearly as we know it, or life could not exist. Conversely, if life did not exist, neither, then, would the Universe.

But some scientists, while passively content to accept the Weak Anthropic Principle, are visibly upset over the implications of the strong version. There is good reason for their discomfiture. Paul Davies explained why.

Now clearly the strong anthropic principle is founded on a quite different philosophical basis from the weak principle. Indeed, it represents a radical departure from the conventional concept of scientific explanation. In essence, it claims that the Universe is tailor-made for habitation, and that both the laws of physics and the initial conditions obligingly arrange themselves in such a way that living organisms are subsequently assured of existence. In this respect the strong anthropic principle is akin to the traditional religious explanation of the world: that God made the world for mankind to inhabit (1982, pp. 120-121).

Astronomers, physicists, astrophysicists, biologists, and many others of an evolutionary bent have seen the serious implications of the Strong Anthropic Principle. Dr. Hawking thus observed:

The laws of science, as we know them at present, contain many fundamental numbers, like the size of the electric charge of the electron and the ratio of the masses of the proton and the electron. We cannot, at the moment at least, predict the values of these numbers from theory—we have to find them by observation. It may be that one day we shall discover a complete unified theory that predicts them all, but it is also possible that some or all of them vary from Universe to Universe or within a single Universe. **The remarkable fact is that the values of these numbers seem to have been very finely adjusted to make possible the development of life.** For example if the electric charge of the electron had been only slightly different, stars either would have been unable to burn hydrogen and helium, or else they would not have exploded. Of course, there might be other forms of intelligent life, not dreamed of even by writers of science fiction, that did not require the light of a star like the Sun or the heavier chemical elements that are made in stars and are flung back into space when the stars explode. Nevertheless, it seems clear that there are relatively few ranges of values for the numbers that would allow the development of any form of intelligent life. Most sets of values would give rise to Universes that, although they might be very beautiful, would contain no one able to wonder at that beauty. **One can take this either as evidence of a divine purpose in Creation and the choice of the laws of science or as support for the strong anthropic principle** (1988, p. 125, emp. added).

Dr. Davies similarly stated: “If we believe in only one Universe then the remarkable uniform arrangement of cosmic matter, and the consequent coolness of space, are almost miraculous, a conclusion which strongly resembles the traditional religious concept of a world which was purpose-built by God for subsequent habitation by mankind” (1980, p. 162). Dr. Rothman was quite blunt in his remarks about where acceptance of the Strong Anthropic Principle will lead.

It’s not a big step from the SAP to the Argument from Design. You know the Argument from Design: it says that the Universe was made very precisely, and were it ever so slightly different, man wouldn’t be here. Therefore, Someone must have made it.

Even as I write these words my pen balks, because as a twentieth century physicist I know that the last step is a leap of faith, not a logical conclusion.

When confronted with the order and beauty of the Universe and the strange coincidences of nature, it's very tempting to take the leap of faith from science into religion. I am sure many physicists want to. I only wish they would admit it (1987, p. 99).

Realizing the obvious implications of the scientific evidence supporting both the weak and strong versions of the Anthropic Principle, many evolutionary scientists have rebelled at even the mere mention of it in the halls of science. Yet, in their more candid moments, even these evolutionists are hard pressed to avoid the clear implications of their findings. Listen to Dr. Hawking's admission on this very topic.

In the hot big bang model described above, there was not enough time in the early Universe for heat to have flowed from one region to another. This means that the initial state of the Universe would have to have had exactly the same temperature everywhere in order to account for the fact that the microwave background has the same temperature in every direction we look. The initial rate of expansion also would have had to be chosen very precisely for the rate of expansion still to be so close to the critical rate needed to avoid recollapse. This means that the initial state of the Universe must have been very carefully chosen indeed if the hot big bang model was correct right back to the beginning of time. **It would be very difficult to explain why the Universe should have begun in just this way, except as the act of a God who intended to create beings like us** (1988, pp. 126-127, emp. added).

Little wonder, then, that Dr. Jastrow referred to the Anthropic Principle as "the most theistic result ever to come out of science." And, it hardly is surprising to hear Dr. Davies state: "Many people of a religious persuasion will no doubt find support from these ideas for the belief that the Creator did not aim the cosmic pin at random, but did so with finely computed precision, with the express purpose of selecting a Universe that would be suitable for habitation" (1982, p. 123). That is exactly what the creationists have said all along! It is comforting to see that certain evolutionary scientists finally understand why.

The Anthropic Principle

CALCULATING PROBABILITIES

A few years ago, I wrote a book on Biblical creation and science, titled "In the Beginning," showing that current scientific evidence is in remarkable agreement with the Biblical account of the origin and development of the universe. My book has enjoyed a measure of success, and has been reprinted ten times and translated into Hebrew, Russian, French, Spanish, Portuguese and Norwegian.

However, the book was not to everyone's taste. Professor Raphael Falk, a geneticist at the Hebrew University and a militant secularist, was so outraged by my book that he published a 10-page article devoted solely to attacking both my book and me personally.

It is important to explain what is wrong with Falk's argument, because his error is not immediately obvious and, in fact, has been repeated by many other writers.

A rare, extremely improbable event occurs if one defines the conditions before knowing what will happen.

For example, he writes: "I pull a \$1 note from my wallet and observe its serial number to be G65538608D ... [probability for occurrence] was less than 1 in 10 billion. Thus, undeniably, I am faced here with an extremely rare event ... but I am not surprised. What is essential is to make the crucial distinction between improbable events that are genuinely surprising and those that are not..."

What is wrong with this reasoning?

There was a probability was not 1 in 10 billion but 100 percent that the dollar note pulled from the wallet had G65538608D for its serial number! Why? Because this number was chosen by looking at the serial number on the \$1 note. In other words, one was simply asking, "What is the probability that the serial number on the note is the serial number on the note?" And the answer to this question, clearly, is 100 percent. Since the event was not improbable at all -- but certain -- there is no reason whatever to be surprised by its occurrence...

A rare, extremely improbable event occurs if one defines the conditions before knowing what will happen.

For example, if one chooses a serial number before pulling the \$1 note from the wallet, and then find that the number chosen is exactly the same as the number on the note, we would all be absolutely astonished -- and with good reason!

PLAYING THE LOTTO

Among the popular national lotteries in Israel is "Lotto." Say, for example, that one million people buy a Lotto ticket each week. If I am informed that this week's winner is Chaim Cohen from Afula, I will certainly not get very excited about it. But why not? The chances that Chaim Cohen would be the winner were only 1 in 1 million -- and it happened!

The reason for my lack of excitement is the following. I could not care less if the Lotto winner is Chaim Cohen from Afula, Sarah Levi from Beer Sheva, or Shmerel Berel from Ramat Gan. In other words, each of the 1 million Lotto players is completely equivalent in my eyes to Chaim Cohen from Afula. (The technical term for this in statistics is "equivalent microstates.") Although the chances were only 1 in 1 million that the winner would be Chaim Cohen from Afula, there exist 1 million "equivalent" Chaim Cohens. Therefore, the substance of what I heard is that someone won the Lotto this week. And the chances for that event happening -- someone winning -- are 100 percent. Hence, I have no reason to be surprised.

Now consider a slightly different scenario. If I were informed the following week that Chaim Cohen from Afula again won the Lotto, I would most certainly be amazed, and so would anyone else. But why? The chances of Chaim Cohen winning Lotto the second week were exactly the same as his chances of winning the first week. The answer is that the context is entirely different.

In the first week, Chaim Cohen was just 1 out of 1 million *equivalent* Lotto players. But in the second week, he has become a unique individual -- the fellow who won last week. In other words, in the second week, there exists only one Chaim Cohen -- *only one* previous week's winner. When such a rare event occurs, we are all genuinely surprised.

Finally, if we were to learn that Chaim Cohen from Afula had again won the Lotto for the third consecutive week, it is clear that suspicion, not surprise, would be the natural reaction. Indeed, there is little doubt that the fraud division of the police department would soon be paying Chaim Cohen a visit to discuss with him just how it happened that Chaim won the Lotto for three consecutive weeks.

But why? The chances of Chaim Cohen winning Lotto in the third week were exactly the same as his chances of winning first week. The answer again lies in the context of the event. In the third week, Chaim Cohen is an extremely unusual individual -- the fellow who has already won the Lotto for two weeks running. The chances that same person will win the Lotto again are easily shown to be one in a million-millions. Such events so rare that they simply do not occur. Therefore, the police department directly suspects that a guiding hand behind Chaim Cohen's triple win.

A guiding hand in the creation of the universe means the intercession of Almighty, but a guiding hand in "determination of the Lotto winner" means five years in prison!

REFERENCES

Carter, Brandon (1974), "Large Number Coincidences and the Anthropic Principle in Cosmology," *Confrontation of Cosmological Theories with Observational Data*, ed. M.S. Longair (Dordrecht, Holland: Reidel).

Davies, Paul (1980), *Other Worlds* (New York: Simon & Schuster).

Davies, Paul (1982), *The Accidental Universe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Dyson, Freeman (1971), *Scientific American*, September.

Gribbin, John (1981), *Genesis: The Origins of Man and the Universe* (New York: Delacorte Press).

Gribbin, John (1983), "Earth's Lucky Break," *Science Digest*, 91[5]:36,37,40,102, May.

Hawking, Stephen (1974), "The Anisotropy of the Universe at Large Times," *Confrontation of Cosmological Theories with Observational Data*, ed. M.S. Longair (Dordrecht, Holland: Reidel).

Hawking, Stephen (1988), *A Brief History of Time* (New York: Bantam).

Hoyle, Fred (1954), in *Astrophysics Journal Supplement*, Vol. I; see also Hoyle, Fred (1964), *Galaxies, Nuclei and Quasars* (New York: Harper & Row).

Jastrow, Robert (1984), "The Astronomer and God," *The Intellectuals Speak Out About God*, ed. Abraham Varghese (New York: Regnery Gateway).

Rothman, Tony (1987), "A 'What You See Is What You Beget' Theory," *Discover*, 8[5]:90-99, May.

[AUTHOR'S NOTE: Probably the most definitive book yet written on the subject of the Anthropic Principle is the 706-page volume, *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*, co-authored by John D. Barrow and Frank J. Tipler (1986, Oxford University Press). Those interested in additional information on this topic may wish to examine this book for further insight.]

Law of Morality



The moral argument begins with the fact that all people recognize some moral code (that some things are right, and some things are wrong). Every time we argue over right and wrong, we appeal to a higher law that we assume everyone is aware of, holds to, and is not free to arbitrarily change. Right and wrong imply a higher standard or law, and law requires a lawgiver. Because the Moral Law transcends humanity, this universal law requires a universal lawgiver. This, it is argued, is God.

As I recall Zacharias in his book *Cries of the Heart* stated, "If there is a moral law you must posit a moral law giver. But that is who you are trying to disprove and not prove. If there is no moral lawgiver, there is no moral law. If there is no moral law, there is no good. If there is no good there is no evil." (pg. 66-67). Here's one such instance of a question in one of Zacharias' question periods, this was posed, I believe, at the University of Nottingham (the 'speaker' is Zacharias):

Student: There is too much evil in this world; therefore, there cannot be a God!

Speaker: Would you mind if I asked you something? You said, "God cannot exist because there is too much evil." If there is such a thing as evil, aren't you assuming that there is such a thing as good?

Student: I guess so.

Speaker: If there is such a thing as good, you must affirm a moral law on the basis of which to differentiate between good and evil.

Speaker: In a debate between the philosopher Frederick Copleston and the atheist Bertrand Russell, Copleston said, "Mr. Russell, you do believe in good and bad, don't you?" Russell answered, "Yes, I do." "How do you differentiate between good and bad?" challenged Copleston. Russell shrugged his shoulders and said, "On the basis of feeling – what else?" I must confess, Mr. Copleston was a kindlier gentleman than many others. The appropriate "logical kill" for the moment would have been, "Mr. Russell, in some cultures they love their neighbors; in other cultures they eat them, both on the basis of feeling. Do you have any preference?"

Speaker: When you say there is evil, aren't you admitting there is good? When you accept the existence of goodness, you must affirm a moral law on the basis of which to differentiate between good and evil. But when you admit to a moral law, you must posit a moral lawgiver. That, however, is who you are trying to disprove and not prove. For if there is no moral lawgiver, there is no moral law. If there is no moral law, there is no good. If there is no good, there is no evil. What, then, is your question?

Student: What, then, am I asking you?

C.S. Lewis' Moral Argument for the Existence of God

by [Jack Wellman](#)

C.S. Lewis, a former atheist, plainly says, 'If the solar system was brought about by an accidental collision, then the appearance of organic life on this planet was also an accident, and the whole evolution of Man was an accident too. If so, then all our present thoughts are mere accidents-the accidental by-product of the movement of atoms. And this holds for the thoughts of the materialists and astronomers as well as for anyone else's. But if their thoughts-i.e. of materialism and astronomy-are merely accidental by-products, why should we believe them to be true? I see no reason for believing that one accident should be able to give me a correct account of all the other accidents. It's like expecting that the accidental shape taken by the splash when you upset a milk jug should give you a correct account of how the jug was made and why it was upset.' ¹

The Moral Argument for C.S. Lewis is as follows:

- 1.) If God does not exist, objective moral values and duties do not exist.
- 2.) Objective moral values & duties do exist.
- 3.) Therefore, God exists.

Now this is a logical reason, since 3 follows necessarily if premises 1 and 2 are true. Premise 2 seems intuitively obvious to most people. Mass murdering is unequivocally, objectively wrong. Killing innocent children, torturing animals, have dog fights...all for fun is objectively wrong. That is it is wrong for most of humanity, everywhere. These morals exist worldwide as universal morals. Now if anyone denies premise 2, they don't need an argument, they need help.

The evolutionary explanation strips morality from humans and reduces it to mere descriptions of animal behavior or conduct, a simple physiochemical reaction of the brain's cognitive functions. Darwinist can only explain past conduct...past behavior. It cannot inform or predict a human's future behavior. It only serves to reduce morality to mere descriptions of behavior, which involve both motive and intent. Both of these behaviors are nonphysical elements that can not, even in principle, evolve in a Darwinian sense. So where do morals come from? Why do they seem to apply only to human beings? Are they the product of chance? What world view makes sense out of morality? Why are babies born with what developmental psychologist's call an intrinsic compassion (one baby cry's in the nursery, and the others join in).

Moral laws suggest a moral lawgiver, one who communicates through higher, moral laws. For example, most people would not murder someone. They deem this to be morally wrong. He expects His imperatives to be obeyed or certain consequences occur. Danish philosopher Soren Kierkegaard pointed out that a person could not have anything on his conscience if God did not exist. Morality is grounded in our hunger for justice. We desire for a day when all wrongs are made right, when innocent suffering is finally redeemed, and when the un-caught guilty are finally punished.

This also explains our own personal sense of dread. We feel guilty because we are guilty and most people seem to sense that we might have to answer for our own crimes.

Robert Wright offers no empirical evidence whatsoever for his thesis. He seems to assume that moral qualities are in the genes because he must; his paradigm will not work otherwise.

Take this comment as an example: "Human beings are a species splendid in their array of moral equipment, tragic in their propensity to misuse it, and pathetic in their constitutional ignorance of the misuse" (emphases mine).^{*} Wright reflects on the moral equipment randomly given to us by nature, and then bemoans our immoral use of it with words like "tragic," "pathetic," and "misuse."²

When he's asked about the origin of life I have never seen anyone who supposedly is an expert on the subject more tongue-tied. He simply doesn't know what to say except that maybe life emerged on planet earth as a result of extraterrestrials, which, of course, must mean that life did come from some sort of intelligent design. Of course he doesn't recognize that he actually spoke in favor of intelligent design while disparaging it.

One notable example of this challenge to the transcendent nature of morality mentioned in his book is what he calls the new science of evolutionary psychology. Its adherents advance a simple premise: The mind, just like every part of the physical body, is a product of evolution. Everything about human personality marital relationships, parental love, friendships, dynamics among siblings, social climbing, even office politics can be explained by the forces of neo-Darwinian evolution.²

Even the moral threads that make up the fabric of society are said to be the product of natural selection. Morality can be reduced to chemical relationships in the genes chosen by different evolutionary needs in the physical environment. Love and hate; feelings of guilt and remorse; gratitude and envy; even the virtues of kindness, faithfulness, and self-control can all be explained mechanistically through the cause and effect of chance genetic mutations and natural selection.

This explains the moral universals found in almost every part of the world. If these are simply chemical reactions, then taking a human life is just part of the natural, evolutionary process in the brain. How could the killer be held responsible. He is a victim of his brain chemistry. Logic tells us that, by necessity, a Creator or Moral Lawgiver was required to impart internal, intrinsic morals and that this is where they came from and the Source of them. Moral, values and character are not just a bunch accidental or random chemical reactions in the brain are they? I thought the theory held that it was all about survival of the fittest, not making decisions not based solely on self, but only the animal species benefiting from any given situation and even at the expense of others? C.S. Lewis (1898-1963), *The Business of Heaven*, Fount Paperbacks, U.K., p. 97, 1984. 2. Robert Wright, *The Moral Animal Why We Are the Way We Are: The New Science of Evolutionary Psychology* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1994), 23.

DNA



DNA is not merely a molecule with a pattern; it is a code, a language, and an information storage mechanism.

All codes we know the origin of are created by a conscious mind.

Therefore DNA was designed by a mind, and language and information are proof of the action of a Superintelligence.

Is God Real?

Science gives ample reason to believe in God. Why is DNA important?

British philosopher, Dr. Antony Flew, has been a leading spokesperson for atheism, actively involved in debate after debate. However, scientific discoveries within the last 30 years brought him to a conclusion he could not avoid. In a video interview in December 2004 he stated, "Super-intelligence is the only good explanation for the origin of life and the complexity of nature."¹ Prominent in his conclusion were the discoveries of DNA. Here's why.

computer programming:



DNA code:



DNA in our cells is very similar to an intricate computer program. In the photo on the left, you see that a computer program is made up of a series of ones and zeros (called binary code). The sequencing and ordering of these ones and zeros is what makes the computer program work properly.

In the same way, DNA is made up of four chemicals, abbreviated as letters A, T, G, and C. Much like the ones and zeros, these letters are arranged in the human cell like this: CGTGTGACTCGCTCCTGAT and so on. The order in which they are arranged instructs the cell's actions.

What is amazing is that within the tiny space in every cell in your body, this code is *three billion letters long*!!²

To grasp the amount of DNA information in one cell, "a live reading of that code at a rate of three letters per second would take thirty-one years, even if reading continued day and night."³ Wait, there's more.

It has been determined that 99.9% of your DNA is similar to everyone's genetic makeup.⁴ What is uniquely *you* comes in the fractional difference in how those three billion letters are sequenced in your cells.

The U.S. government is able to identify everyone in our country by the arrangement of a nine-digit social security number. Yet, inside every cell in you is a three-billion-lettered DNA structure that belongs only to you. This code identifies you and continually instructs your cells' behavior.

You Can See Why DNA Is Important

Dr. Francis Collins, director of the Human Genome Project (that mapped the human DNA structure) said that one can "think of DNA as an instructional script, a software program, sitting in the nucleus of the cell."⁵

Perry Marshall, an information specialist, comments on the implications of this. "There has never existed a computer program that wasn't designed...[whether it is] a code, or a program, or a message given through a language, there is always an intelligent mind behind it."⁶

Just as former atheist Dr. Antony Flew questioned, it is legitimate to ask oneself regarding this three billion letter code instructing the cell...who wrote this script? Who placed this working code, inside the cell?

It's like walking along the beach and you see in the sand, "Mike loves Michelle." You know the waves rolling up on the beach didn't form that--a person wrote that. It is a precise message. It is clear communication. In the same way, the DNA structure is a complex, three-billion-lettered script, informing and directing the cell's process.

How can one explain this sophisticated messaging, coding, residing in our cells?

On June 26, 2000, President Clinton congratulated those who completed the human genome sequencing. President Clinton said, "Today we are learning the language in which God created life. We are gaining ever more awe for the complexity, the beauty, the wonder of God's most divine and sacred gift."⁷ Dr. Francis Collins, director of the Human Genome Project, followed Clinton to the podium stating, "It is humbling for me and awe inspiring to realize that we have caught the first glimpse of our own instruction book, previously known only to God."⁸

When looking at the DNA structure within the human body, we cannot escape the presence of intelligent (incredibly intelligent) design.

According to the Bible (which is itself incredibly complex) God is not only the Author of our existence, but he is the Relationship that makes our existence meaningful. All the intangibles in life that we crave...enough strength for any situation, joy, wisdom, and knowing we are loved...God alone gives these to us as we listen to him and trust him. He is our greatest, reliable guide in life. Just as he has engineered DNA to instruct the cell, he offers to instruct us to make our lives function well, for his glory and for our sake, because he loves us.

Why is DNA important? It's one more proof for God. He designed our bodies. He can also be trusted to design your life. Have you ever begun a relationship with God? This explains how you can: [Knowing God Personally](#) **Jeffrey:** All right, so what do you, Dr. Stephen Meyer, what do you say caused the first life to have DNA that had this coding that would determine the shape and the destiny of this creature

<http://cnsnews.com/news/article/how-dna-proves-god-made-all-creatures-great-and-small>

How DNA Proves God Made All Creatures Great and Small

July 10, 2009

Charles Darwin's theory of natural selection may be able to explain how living creatures can evolve from one form to another, but it cannot explain how something that was not alive evolved into the first life on Earth.

By [Terence P. Jeffrey](#)

Subscribe to [Terence P. Jeffrey](#) RSS

(CNSNews.com) - Charles Darwin's theory of natural selection may be able to explain how living creatures can evolve from one form to another, but it cannot explain how something that was not alive evolved into the first life on Earth.

Stephen C. Meyer, a Cambridge trained scholar in the philosophy of science, does have an explanation for how life on Earth began: the DNA in every cell of every creature shows unmistakable evidence of having been deliberately designed by an intelligent being.

Meyer lays out his analysis in a new book, *Signature in the Cell: DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design*. He discussed his book and his case for an Intelligent Designer with CNSNews.com Editor in Chief Terry Jeffrey.

Meyer: Well, I think we're looking at a distinctive hallmark of intelligent activity. Information, based on what we know from our uniform and repeated experience, which is the basis of all scientific reasoning about the past, always comes from an intelligent source. If you look at a hieroglyphic inscription or a section of machine code, or a headline in a book or article, and you trace it back to its ultimate source, it always comes back to a mind, not a material process. So, when we look, when we see that there's information embedded in DNA, and we see that that information is necessary to the beginning of the first life, I think what we're seeing is that there must have been an intelligence that was, that played a role in the origin of life. That's the most logical thing to conclude.

Jeffrey: That designed DNA?

Meyer: That designed the information that is the source of the information of DNA.

Jeffrey: At the beginning. Now, that doesn't mean that after DNA was designed and creatures were created, that things might not have evolved or gone through natural selection.

Meyer: Yeah, exactly. As I say, there's a debate about that, but my book is arguing that, whatever you think about biological evolution, the origin of the first life has not been explained by what's called chemical evolution, and instead, there is a cause that we know that's sufficient to produce information, and that cause is intelligence.

Jeffrey: Well, are there scientists who contest that there is in fact information encoded in DNA.

Meyer: No. Well, there are some people that want to say, "Well that's just a metaphor." But I address that in the book. It turns out that it really isn't a metaphor, that Crick was right. His sequence hypothesis--that these characters along the spine of DNA actually function like digital code. They are. It is digital code.

Bill Gates says DNA is like a software program, but much more complex than everything we've ever written. Richard Dawkins acknowledges that it's a machine code. Leroy Hood, a famous scientist out in Seattle, works in the biotech industry, calls it digital code. This is pretty well accepted. There's only a few people that have tried to quibble about that, and I address that in the book.

Jeffrey: To what degree do you think that the scientific community basically agrees with you and understands this point of view, and to what degree to they not agree with you?

Meyer: Well, as I mentioned, there's a lot of submerged, or suppressed, dissent about the whole Darwinian synthesis, and the materialistic understanding of biological origins generally. So we have I would say a growing minority of scientists who are very sympathetic to intelligent design. I made a trip to Britain in the spring. I spoke at the city of Darwin's birth to commemorate his anniversary, and the day before the meeting we had, or the day before the talk, we had a meeting a number of British scientists, full professors of science, many very prominent British scientists have been following our work on intelligent design, and they told us they were entirely on side.

Jeffrey: But do you have tenured professors at major American universities who are looking into this?

Meyer: Oh yeah, yeah. They're in the minority view. But I think what's really interesting about the nature of the debate is the people who oppose us don't do so because there's, for example, no one says, "We have a better explanation for the origin of the first life." What they do say instead is, "Well, intelligent design isn't science"--and they try to define science in such a way to exclude consideration of the design hypothesis.

Jeffrey: Why would people be upset if objective observation of the physical world pointed to a Creator?

Meyer: Well, they may hold a worldview that excludes the existence of a Creator, and they may hold it very strongly. And for that reason, the evidence that we're pointing to and the argument that we're developing--or that I'm developing in this case--would be a challenge to what is, in essence, a religious or quasi-religious perspective that people may hold, either explicitly or kind of as a default way of looking at the world.

Jeffrey: So, actually, you believe that some people, some of your critics, may start out with the hypothesis: “There is no God, therefore there can’t be any design, therefore I’m going to refute any argument that presents evidence that there is design.”

Meyer: Oh, I think many do. Just as you may have people that start out with the assumption that there is evidence of, or that there is a God, and therefore they might welcome the kind argument I’m making.

We have this idea of scientists as completely objective guys in white coats who just, you know, look at the evidence and then the theory pops off the evidence and it’s just, it’s obvious. But scientists have ideological commitments, and those differ from scientist to scientist, and that’s one of the reasons that you have controversy.

Jeffrey: Well, Dr. Meyer, in a country that was founded on principle that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, where most people are in fact believers in God and adherents to religion, why is it that we have so much trouble in public schools even entertaining the idea that there is an intelligent designer behind the creation of life on Earth?

Meyer: Well, there’s an old saw that says that if the Indians, I mean the East Indian nation, is the most religious country on Earth and the Swedes are the least, America is a nation of Indians governed by Swedes. Our elite culture has very much tapped into this materialistic worldview, the view that the universe is eternal, self-existent. Matter and energy are the fundamental explanatory principles. There is no God or purpose or objective moral order, that sort of thing. But the common culture is still much more sympathetic to a broadly theistic perspective. So, there’s, in a sense, a contest of ideas within the culture. But many folks who are in the law schools, the courts, the scientific world certainly hold this materialistic worldview, and so the case for intelligent design being a challenge to the idea that matter and energy are the whole show--we’re saying that, no, there’s something else, and it’s called information, and information always comes from a mind or intelligence--that’s a troubling argument to someone that holds that view.