

7 Reasons to Believe in God

by Eric Lyons, M.Min.
Kyle Butt, M.Div.

How can you know that God exists? You can't see, hear, touch, smell, or taste Him. You can't weigh Him like you can a five-pound bag of potatoes. You can't put Him under an electron microscope to show your friends what He looks like on an atomic level. You can't experiment on Him with probes and scalpels. You can't take a picture of Him to show your neighbor that He's not just an imaginary friend. You can't magically make Him appear in the classroom of an atheistic professor who is challenging anyone to prove that God exists. So how can you know that God exists?



Although atheists contend that God does not exist and agnostics allege that there is a very high probability that He does not exist, theism is the rational belief that there is a God. A sincere pursuer of truth who follows the available evidence will come to the logical conclusion that God exists. Admittedly, this belief in the 21st century is not the result of seeing God's Spirit or touching His actual essence (cf. John 4:24; Luke 24:39). What we have at our fingertips, however, is a mountain of irrefutable, indirect, credible evidence that testifies on God's behalf. Consider seven lines of evidence that warrant the conclusion that an eternal, supernatural Creator (God) exists.

1. MATTER DEMANDS A MAKER

No rational person denies the fact that matter exists. The Universe and every atom that makes it up is a reality. The logical question to ask is, "Where did it all come from?" From the Milky Way to the most-distant galaxy in the Universe—what was the cause? What made matter?

A study of the material Universe reveals that every physical effect must have an adequate antecedent or simultaneous cause (an idea known as the Law of Cause and Effect or the Law of Causality). The American flag that stood erect on the surface of the moon in 1969 was neither eternal nor without a cause. Its existence on the Moon demands a sufficient cause. The robotic rovers that have rolled across the surface of Mars since the early 21st century are the effect of adequate causes. No one believes that they popped into existence from nothing or that they are the result of any number of ridiculous, insufficient causes that could be suggested (e.g., an accidental explosion in a junk yard on Earth sent metal objects spiraling toward Mars that assembled themselves into the robotic rovers). Simply put, all material effects demand adequate causes (see Miller, 2011 for more information).

EVERY MATERIAL EFFECT MUST HAVE A CAUSE THAT CAME BEFORE IT (OR WAS SIMULTANEOUS TO IT) AND IS GREATER THAN IT. THE UNIVERSE IS A MATERIAL EFFECT. THEREFORE, THE UNIVERSE MUST HAVE A CAUSE THAT CAME BEFORE IT AND WAS GREATER THAN IT.

So what caused the Universe and all of the matter in the Universe? The theory that atheistic evolutionists have advanced for several decades now, which supposedly best explains our existence from a purely naturalistic perspective, is known as the Big Bang. Allegedly, approximately 14 billion years ago **all** of the matter and energy in the Universe was concentrated in a tiny ball of matter that exploded, causing the eventual formation of galaxies throughout the Universe.

The obvious problem with this explanation is that even if the Big Bang actually happened (and sound science argues against such a theory—see May, et al., 2003), a person must still explain **whence came the "original" ball of matter**. It must have an adequate cause. What do some leading atheists and agnostics around the world argue about the cause of matter? Atheistic cosmologist Stephen Hawking stated on national television in 2011, "**Nothing** caused the Big Bang" ("Curiosity...", emp. added). In the book *The Grand Design* that Dr. Hawking co-authored, he and Leonard Mlodinow asserted: "Bodies such as stars and black holes cannot just appear out of nothing. **But a whole universe can**" (2010, p. 180, emp. added). In 2006, Todd Friel asked Dan Barker, one of America's leading atheists, "Do you really believe that something came from **nothing**?" (emp. added). Barker responded with a simple, "Yes" ("Wretched...").

The observable truth is, however, in nature, matter and energy are neither created nor destroyed. Scientists refer to this fact as the First Law of Thermodynamics. Though evolutionists have alleged that the Universe began with the explosion of a ball of matter several billion years ago, they never have provided a reasonable explanation for the cause of the “original” ball of matter. **“Nothing” is not** a reasonable explanation. In 2007, the pro-evolutionary *New Scientist* magazine ran a cover story titled “The Beginning: What Triggered the Big Bang?” in which the publication attempted to explain the origin of the Universe. But consider the last line of the featured article: “[T]he quest to understand the origin of the universe seems destined to continue until we can answer a deeper question: **why is there anything at all instead of nothing?**” (“The Universe...,” 194[2601]:33, emp. added). The implication of such a question is quite clear: if at one time in the past “nothing” existed, then nothing should exist today. A reasonable, naturalistic explanation for the origin of the “original” ball of matter that supposedly led to the Universe does not exist. One of the world’s leading atheists, Richard Dawkins, has basically admitted such.

In a panel discussion in 2012 on Australian national television, Dr. Dawkins was asked “how it is that something as enormous as the universes came from nothing?” Notice what Dawkins admitted: “Of course it’s **counterintuitive** that you can get something from nothing. Of course **common sense** doesn’t allow you to get something from nothing. That’s why it’s interesting. It’s got to be interesting in order to give rise to the universe at all. Something pretty mysterious had to give rise to the origin of the universe” (“Q&A...,” emp. added). Indeed, atheism’s explanation for the origin of matter is “not agreeing with what seems right or natural” (“Counterintuitive,” 2014). According to Dawkins’ own admissions, the idea of getting something from nothing in nature defies “common sense.” It is far from “sound and prudent judgment based on a simple perception of the situation or facts” (“Common Sense,” 2014).

What’s more, atheists cannot logically argue that the Universe is eternal. It seems that relatively few scientists even propose an eternal Universe anymore. (In fact, there would be no point in attempting to explain the “beginning” of the Universe in a Big Bang if atheists believed it always existed.) Furthermore, the Second Law of Thermodynamics, which states that matter and energy become less usable over time, has led most scientists to conclude that the Universe has not always existed (else we would be out of usable energy; see Miller, 2013). The fact is, the Universe had a beginning. Alex Vilenkin, cosmologist from Tufts University, pressed this fact in his book titled *Many Worlds in One*: “It is said that an argument is what convinces reasonable men and a proof is what it takes to convince even an unreasonable man. With the proof now in place, cosmologists can no longer hide behind the possibility of a past-eternal universe. There is no escape: they have to face the problem of **acosmic beginning**” (2006, p. 176, emp. added).

At one time in the past, the material Universe did not exist. Then, at some point, matter came into existence. But since matter is not eternal and cannot create itself from nothing, then something outside of the material realm must have brought matter into existence.

In short, matter demands a Maker. The evidence clearly indicates that the cause of the Universe is inexplicable without a supernatural Being. Something has to be eternally powerful, but we know it cannot be natural or material. Romans 1:20 says: “For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse.” Without some type of eternal power, our Universe cannot exist, and the atheistic answer that our Universe created itself from nothing is the furthest thing from either a scientific or a rational explanation.

2. LIFE DEMANDS A LIFE GIVER

Life does not pop into existence from nothing. Neither the puppy at the pound nor the bacteria on the doorknob spontaneously generated. Every scientist, whether theist or atheist, knows this observation to be true.

In biology, one of the most widely recognized laws of science is the Law of Biogenesis. “Biogenesis” is composed of two words—“bio,” which means life, and “genesis,” which means beginning. Thus, this law deals with the beginning of life, and it simply says that in nature life comes only from previous life of its own kind. Over the years, the truthfulness of this law has been documented by thousands of scientists, most notably Louis Pasteur. His work dealt a crushing blow to the notion of spontaneous generation.

In 1933, evolutionist John Sullivan admitted that “it became an accepted doctrine that **life never arises except from life**. So far as the actual evidence goes, this is still the **only** possible conclusion” (p. 94, emp. added). Okay, but that was 1933. As we move further into the 20th century the obvious question was “Is it still the only possible conclusion?” What have we learned since the days of Louis Pasteur in the 19th century and John Sullivan in the first half of the 20th century? Observational science has reached the same conclusion experiment after experiment, year after year. The eminent evolutionist George Gaylord Simpson and his colleagues observed that “there is no serious doubt that **biogenesis is the rule, that life comes only from other life**, that a cell, the unit of life, is always and exclusively the product or offspring of another cell” (1965, p. 144, emp. added). Evolutionist Martin Moe noted that “a century of sensational discoveries in the biological sciences has taught us **that life arises only from life**” (1981, 89[11]:36, emp. added). More recently, staunch evolutionist Neil Shubin conceded the following in his book titled *Your Inner Fish*:

I can share with you one true law that all of us can agree upon. This law is so profound that most of us take it completely for granted. Yet it is the starting point for almost everything we do in paleontology, developmental biology, and genetics. This biological “law of everything” is that **every living thing on the planet had parents**. Every person you’ve ever known has biological parents, as does every bird, salamander, or shark you have ever seen.... To put it in a more precise form: every living thing sprang from some parental genetic information (2009, p. 174).

The importance of Shubin’s concession must not be missed. He recognizes that the actual scientific information verifies that life in the natural world must come from previously existing life. Yet he refuses to carry that fact to its proper conclusion: that life could not have sprung from non-living chemicals. Materialistic evolution cannot adequately account for or explain the most basic laws of science, not the least of which is the Law of Biogenesis.

IN THE MATERIAL UNIVERSE, LIFE ARISES FROM PREVIOUSLY EXISTING LIFE OF ITS OWN KIND. LIFE CANNOT SPONTANEOUSLY GENERATE FROM NON-LIVING CHEMICALS. THUS, A SUPERNATURAL, INTELLIGENT MIND MUST HAVE CREATED LIVING ORGANISMS.

If it is the case that the “only possible conclusion” which scientific evidence demands is that in nature “life never arises except from life,” then, pray tell, **how did the first life come into being**? Did it somehow break the most fundamental **natural** law of biology and arise “naturally” from non-life? Or is there another possibility? The truth is, there **is** another possibility (which science has not disproved), but it is one that evolutionists such as John Sullivan admitted that “scientific men find **very difficult** of acceptance” (p. 94, emp. added). According to Sullivan, “So far as the actual evidence goes,” biogenesis “is still the only possible conclusion. But...**it is a conclusion that seems to lead back to some supernatural creative act**” (p. 94, emp. added). Do not miss the point: real, true, operational science indirectly supports a “supernatural creative act,” which implies a supernatural Creator.

Evolutionist and Harvard University Professor George Wald similarly admitted in an article he wrote titled “The Origin of Life” that there ultimately are two options for life’s origin: (1) spontaneous generation and (2) “the only alternative, to believe in a single, primary act of supernatural creation. There is no third position” (1954, p. 46). Sadly, though “[m]ost modern biologists, having reviewed with satisfaction the downfall of the spontaneous generation hypothesis,” they are “unwilling to accept the alternative belief in special creation” (p. 46). Rather than follow the evidence where it ultimately leads (to a supernatural Creator!), atheists would rather put their confidence in a theory that was disproven long ago. Antony Flew, who for five decades was the world’s leading atheistic thinker, was forced in the end to conclude: “The only satisfactory explanation for the origin of such ‘end-directed, self-replicating’ life as we see on earth is an infinitely intelligent Mind” (2007, p. 132; see Miller, 2012 for more information).

3. DESIGN DEMANDS A DESIGNER

Everyday observation reveals and confirms the obvious fact that complex, functional design demands a designer. Paintings demand painters. Poems demand poets. Architecture demands architects. And on and on we could go. Everyone knows that cars and computers, pianos and projectors all require engineers, technicians, and tuners for them to exist and function properly. But what about the Universe as a whole? Can it be described accurately as “designed”? If so, what could such design imply about its origin?

No honest, informed person can deny that the Universe is extremely fine-tuned and functionally complex. From the Earth’s precise orbit around the Sun to a shorebird’s 15,000-mile yearly migration pattern, literally millions of examples of fine-tuned design in nature could be pondered. But consider just one example involving electrons and protons. The ratio of the mass of an electron to a proton is 1:1836, which means that a proton is 1,836 times more massive than an electron. Even with this mass difference, however, electrons and protons have the same electrical charge. Scientists suggest that if the electrical charge of the electron were altered by one part in 100 billion, our bodies would instantly explode (Barrow and Tipler, 1986, pp. 293, 296). Is such precision indicative of precise design? Most certainly.

The truth is, atheists frequently testify to the “design” in nature. Australian atheistic astrophysicist Paul Davies has admitted that the Universe (which according to atheists is the result of mindless, naturalistic, random processes) is “uniquely hospitable” (2007, p. 30), “remarkable” (p. 34), and “ordered in an intelligible way” (p. 30). He even admitted to the “fine-tuned properties” of the Universe. In a 2008 *National Geographic* article titled “Biomimetics: Design by Nature,” the word “design” (or one of its derivatives—designs, designed, etc.) appeared no less than seven times in reference to “nature’s designs.” The author, evolutionist Tom Mueller, referred to nature’s “sophistication” and “clever devices” (2008, p. 79) and praised nature for being able to turn simple materials “into structures of fantastic complexity, strength, and toughness” (p. 79). After learning of the uncanny,

complicated maneuverability of a little blowfly, Mueller even confessed to feeling the need to regard the insect “on bended knee in admiration” (p. 82). Why? Because of its “mysterious” and “complicated” **design**. The fact is, as evolutionist Jerry Coyne admitted, “Nature resembles a well-oiled machine.... The more one learns about plants and animals, the more one marvels at how well their designs fit their ways of life” (2009, pp. 1,3).

But how can you get design without purpose, intelligence, and deliberate planning? The first three definitions the *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary* gives for “design” (noun) are as follows: “1a: a particular **purpose** held in view by an **individual or group**...b: **deliberate purposive planning**... 2: a mental project or scheme in which means to an end are laid down; 3a: a **deliberate** undercover project or scheme” (“Design,” 2014, emp. added). After defining “design” as a drawing, sketch, or “graphic representation of a **detailed plan**...,” the *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* noted that design may be defined as “[t]he **purposeful or inventive arrangement** of parts or details” (“Design,” 2000, p. 492, emp. added). A design is preceded by “deliberate purposive planning,” “a detailed plan,” or an “inventive arrangement.” A design is the effect, not of time, chance, and unintelligent, random accidental explosions (what nonsense!), but of the purposeful planning and deliberate actions of an inventor or designer. Literally, **by definition**, design demands a designer; thus the designed Universe demands a Designer.

ANYTHING THAT EXHIBITS COMPLEX, FUNCTIONAL DESIGN DEMANDS AN INTELLIGENT DESIGNER. THE UNIVERSE EXHIBITS COMPLEX, FUNCTIONAL DESIGN. THEREFORE, THE UNIVERSE MUST HAVE A DESIGNER.

According to Paul Davies: “Our universe seems ‘just right’ for life. **It looks as if...a super-intellect has been monkeying with physics**” (2007, p. 30). Similarly, well-known skeptic Michael Shermer conceded, “The reason people think that a Designer created the world is because **it looks designed**” (2006, p. 65, emp. added).

Indeed, both honest observation and rational thought should lead every truth-seeking individual to the same conclusion that the psalmist came to 3,000 years ago: “The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament shows His handiwork” (19:1). “The whole earth is full of His glory” (Isaiah 6:3). Both the heavens and the Earth testify day after day and night after night to anyone and everyone who will listen (Psalm 19:2-4). “Lift up your eyes on high, and see Who has created these things” (Isaiah 40:26).

Since the Universe exhibits complex, functional design, and (by definition) complex, functional design demands a designer, then the Universe must have an intelligent designer. This argument for God is logically sound and observationally true. A person can know (without a doubt) that God exists if for no other reason than that the Universe’s design demands a Designer. “For every house is built by someone, but He Who built all things is God” (Hebrews 3:4).

4. INTELLIGENCE DEMANDS AN INTELLIGENT CREATOR

Intelligence is defined as “the capacity to acquire and apply knowledge” (“Intelligence,” 2000, p. 910); “the ability to learn or understand things or to deal with new or difficult situations” (“Intelligence,” 2014). It is not difficult to identify certain things that have some measure of “intelligence,” while recognizing other things that have no intelligence. Man obviously has an extremely high level of intelligence. He has constructed spaceships that he can guide 240,000 miles to the Moon while both the Earth and the Moon are in motion. He has built artificial hearts that can extend the lives of the sick. He continues to construct computers that can process billions of pieces of information a second. He can write poetry, calculate where Mars will be 50 years from the present, and build everything from pianos to PlayStation video game consoles. Man is an intelligent being.

Although there is a great chasm between mankind and the animal kingdom, animals do possess a measure of intelligence. Dogs can learn to sit, stay, roll over, and play dead. Dolphins can learn to jump through hoops on command. Birds can make helpful “tools” from twigs in order to accomplish some basic tasks. A few years ago, two colorful, eight-legged cephalopods, known as cuttlefish, graced the cover of the journal *New Scientist*. The authors referred to this amazing sea creature as a “sophisticated,” “inventive,” eight-legged “genius” with “intelligence” and a “secret code” (Brooks, 2008).

ANYTHING THAT POSSESSES INTELLIGENCE MUST HAVE BEEN CAUSED BY SOMETHING INTELLIGENT. ORGANISMS SUCH AS ANIMALS AND HUMANS POSSESS INTELLIGENCE. THEREFORE, ANIMALS AND HUMANS MUST HAVE BEEN CREATED BY AN INTELLIGENT BEING.

According to atheistic evolution, billions of years ago “nothing” caused a tiny ball of matter to explode. Then, billions of years after this Big Bang, galaxies began to form from lifeless, mindless, unintelligent particles floating around in space in massive clouds of dust. Allegedly, Earth eventually evolved from such a dust cloud. Hundreds of millions of years later, intelligent animals and humans evolved.

What humans have consistently observed in nature, however, is that intelligence demands previous intelligence. The reason that humans in the 21st century are intelligent is because our ancestors were intelligent. The reason that animals have some measure of intelligence is due to intelligent creatures that came before them. Dust does not give way to organized dust particles that have “the capacity to acquire and apply knowledge.” Water does not think. The mindless mud that evolutionists contend gave way to intelligent life on Earth is nothing but a delusional tale unsupported by everything we know from observation and experience. Neither “nothing” nor inorganic matter ever produces intelligent creatures. So how did the first intelligent creatures come to inhabit the Universe? Just as the first life demands a supernatural life Giver, so the first intelligent beings demand a self-existent, miracle-working Creator of intelligence.

5. MORALITY DEMANDS A MORAL LAW GIVER

Why do people generally think that some actions are “right” and some actions are “wrong,” regardless of their subjective opinions? Why do most people believe that it is “evil” or “wicked” (1) for an adult to torture an innocent child simply for the fun of it? (2) for a man to beat and rape a kind, innocent woman? or (3) for parents to have children for the sole purpose of abusing them sexually every day of their lives? Because, as evolutionist Edward Slingerland noted, humans have metaphysical rights—rights that are “a reality beyond what is perceptible to the senses” (“Metaphysical,” 2014)—and “rely on moral values” (as quoted in Reilly, 2007, 196[2629]:7). The fact is, most people, even many atheists, have admitted that real, objective good and evil exist.

Although objective morality may be outside the realm of the scientific method, every rational person can know that some actions are innately good, while others are innately evil. Antony Flew and Wallace Matson, two of the leading atheistic philosophers of the 20th century, forthrightly acknowledged the existence of objective morality in their debates with theistic philosopher Thomas B. Warren in the 1970s (see Warren and Flew, 1977; Warren and Matson, 1978). Atheist Michael Ruse admitted in his book *Darwinism Defended* that “[t]he man who says that it is morally acceptable to rape little children, is just as **mistaken** as the man who says that $2 + 2 = 5$ ” (1982, p. 275, emp. added). Philosophers Francis Beckwith and Gregory Kousser said it well: “**Those who deny obvious moral rules**—who say that murder and rape are morally benign, that cruelty is not a vice, and that cowardice is a virtue—do not merely have a different moral point of view; they **have something wrong with them**” (1998, p. 59, emp. added).

Most rational people do not merely feel like rape and child abuse may be wrong; they **are** wrong—innately wrong. Just as two plus two can really be known to be four, every rational human can know that some things are objectively good, while other things are objectively evil. However, reason demands that objective good and evil can only exist if there is some real, objective point of reference. If something (e.g., rape) can be legitimately criticized as morally wrong, then there must be an objective standard—“some ‘higher law which transcends the provincial and transient’ which is other than the particular moral code and which has an obligatory character which can be recognized” (Warren and Matson, p. 284).

IF OBJECTIVE, MORAL VALUES EXIST, THEN GOD EXISTS. OBJECTIVE MORAL VALUES SUCH AS GOOD AND EVIL, JUSTICE AND INJUSTICE, DO EXIST. THEREFORE, GOD EXISTS.

Recognition by atheists of anything being morally wrong begs the question: How can an atheist logically call something atrocious, deplorable, evil, or wicked? According to atheism, man is nothing but matter in motion. Humankind allegedly evolved from rocks and slime over billions of years. How could moral value come from rocks and slime? Who ever speaks of “wrong rocks,” “moral minerals,” or “corrupt chemicals”? People do not talk about morally depraved donkeys, evil elephants, or immoral monkeys. Pigs are not punished for being immoral when they eat their young. Komodo dragons are not corrupt because 10% of their diet consists of younger Komodo dragons. **Killer** whales are not guilty of murder. Male animals are not tried for rape if they appear to forcibly copulate with females. Dogs are not depraved for stealing the bone of another dog. Moral value could not arise from rocks and slime.

The fact that humans even contemplate morality testifies to the huge chasm between man and animals and the fact that moral value could not have arisen from animals. Atheistic evolutionists have admitted that morals arise only in humans. George Gaylord Simpson, one of the most recognized atheistic evolutionists of the 20th century, confessed that “[g]ood and evil, right and wrong, **concepts irrelevant in nature except from the human viewpoint**, become **real** and pressing features of the whole cosmos as viewed morally because **morals arise only in**

man" (1951, p. 179, emp. added). Atheists admit that people (i.e., even "atheists") have "their own **innate** sense of morality" ("Do Atheists...?", n.d.). No rational person makes such admissions about animals. "**Humans**," not animals, "rely on moral values" (as quoted in Reilly, 2007, 196[2629]:7).

The moral argument for God's existence exposes atheism as the self-contradictory, atrocious philosophy that it is. Atheists must either reject the truthfulness of the moral argument's first premise ("If objective moral value exists, then God exists") and illogically accept the indefensible idea that objective morality somehow arose from rocks and reptiles, or (2) they must reject the argument's second premise ("Objective moral values exist"), and accept the insane, utterly repulsive idea that genocide, rape, murder, theft, child abuse, etc. can **never once** be condemned as objectively "wrong." What's more, if atheism is true, individuals could never logically be punished for such immoral actions, since "no inherent moral or ethical laws" would exist (Provine, 1988, p. 10).

If there is no God, then there is no objective basis to say that some things are right and others are wrong. Reason demands that objective good and evil can only exist if there is some real, objective reference point outside of nature. The only reasonable answer to an objective moral law for humans is a supernatural, moral law Giver.

6. THE BIBLE'S SUPERNATURAL ATTRIBUTES DEMAND A SUPERNATURAL AUTHOR

Christians do not believe that God exists simply because the Bible teaches that He does, nor do Christians believe that the Bible is the Word of God simply because the Bible claims to be inspired by God. Anyone can make claims about whatever they wish. Simply because a person claims to have revelation from a supernatural Creator does not make it so (e.g., the Book of Mormon; see Miller, 2009). However, if the Bible possesses attributes that are super-human, then the Bible proves itself to be of supernatural origin and has indirectly proven the existence of the supernatural Author. American atheist Dan Barker alluded to the legitimacy of this argumentation for God's existence in 2009 when he explained that one of the things which could falsify atheism would be if God spoke to man and gave him specific information about future events (see Butt and Barker, pp. 50-51).

Indeed, one extremely valuable line of evidence that confirms that the Bible is the inspired Word of God is the presence of accurate, predictive prophecy contained in its pages. Not only are the prophecies of the Bible fulfilled in minute detail with complete accuracy, but these fulfillments are often accomplished centuries after the prophecies were made. Even the skeptic understands that if this is the case, a supernatural agent must be responsible for the writing of the Bible. That is why the skeptic attempts to discredit the prophecies by claiming that they were written after the events or by claiming that they were not fulfilled in detail. By attempting to disparage the prophecies using these methods, the skeptic admits that if the prophecies were written centuries before the events, and if they are fulfilled in detail, then a supernatural agent is responsible for them. As the prophet Jeremiah wrote: "As for the prophet who prophecies of peace, when the word of the prophet comes to pass, the prophet will be known as one whom the Lord has truly sent" (28:9). Completely accurate, fulfilled prophecy is a characteristic that verifies the divine inspiration of the Bible.

IF ANYTHING IN THE WORLD EXHIBITS QUALITIES THAT ARE SUPERNATURAL, THEN THERE MUST BE SOMETHING SUPERNATURAL. THE BIBLE EXHIBITS CHARACTERISTICS SUCH AS PREDICTIVE PROPHECY THAT ARE SUPERNATURAL. THEREFORE, A SUPERNATURAL MIND MUST EXIST, AND THE BIBLE MUST BE THE PRODUCT OF THAT MIND.

One such prophecy concerned a man named Cyrus and two nations: Babylon and the Medo-Persian Empire. Isaiah, who prophesied around 700 B.C., vividly described how God would destroy the powerful kingdom of Babylon, "the glory of kingdoms" (13:19). Writing as if it had already occurred (commonly known as the "prophetic perfect," frequently employed in the Old Testament to stress the absolute certainty of fulfillment, e.g., Isaiah 53), Isaiah declared Babylon would fall (21:9). He then prophesied that Babylon would fall to the Medes and Persians (Isaiah 13; 21:1-10). Later, he proclaimed that the "golden city" (Babylon) would be conquered by a man named Cyrus (44:28; 45:1-7). This is a remarkable prophecy, especially since Cyrus was not born until almost 150 years after Isaiah penned these words.

Not only did Isaiah predict that Cyrus would overthrow Babylon, but he also wrote that Cyrus, serving as Jehovah's "anointed" and "shepherd," would release the Jews from captivity and assist them in their return to Jerusalem for the purpose of rebuilding the temple. Isaiah's prophecies were recorded almost 200 years before Cyrus conquered Babylon (539 B.C.). Amazing! [NOTE: Secular history verifies that all of these events came true. There really was a man named Cyrus who ruled the Medo-Persian Empire. He did conquer Babylon. And just as Isaiah prophesied, he assisted the Jews in their return to Jerusalem and in the rebuilding of the temple.]

Truly, "no prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation, for prophecy never came by the will of man, but holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit" (2 Peter 1:20-21). And, if men were inspired **of God**

to write the Scriptures (2 Timothy 3:16), then God exists. In short, the Bible's supernatural attributes logically demand a supernatural Author (see Butt, 2007 for more information).

7. THE HISTORICAL, MIRACLE-WORKING, RESURRECTED JESUS DEMANDS A SUPERNATURAL EXPLANATION

Human beings can do many amazing things. They can run 26.2 miles without stopping. They can show remarkable courage in the face of great danger. They can even walk along a tightrope hundreds of feet above the ground. But there are certain actions that are humanly impossible. Humans cannot walk on water unassisted, give sight to the blind, instantly reattach severed ears with only their hands, or raise the dead. If ever such a "man" existed, his life would logically testify to the existence of a supernatural Being.

Atheists understand the rationality of this argument. Dan Barker once said on record, "If Jesus were to materialize" and work any number of miraculous deeds, atheism would be disproven (see Butt and Barker, p. 51), and thus theism would be established as a fact. The truth is, the very proof that Barker and other atheists request was provided 2,000 years ago when God put on flesh and came to Earth in the form of man. And He did not merely claim to be God; He did what a reasonable person could expect if God were ever to prove His divinity on Earth—He fulfilled precise prophecies and worked supernatural miracles, including coming back from the dead Himself. (For more information, see Butt and Lyons, 2006). The life and works of Jesus testify to the existence of a supernatural Being.

IF EVEN ONE PERSON WERE TO PERFORM SUPERNATURAL FEATS, SUCH AS RAISING THE DEAD AND FULFILLING PROPHECY, THEN A SUPERNATURAL BEING MUST EXIST. JESUS CHRIST DID PERFORM SUPERNATURAL FEATS IMPOSSIBLE TO PERFORM IN A PURELY MATERIALISTIC WORLD. THEREFORE, A SUPERNATURAL BEING [GOD] MUST EXIST.

In 2012, renowned atheist Richard Dawkins was questioned about his unbelief in God. Specifically, he was asked, "What proof, by the way, would change your mind?" He quickly responded by saying, "That is a very difficult and interesting question because, I mean, I used to think that if somehow, you know, great, big, giant 900-foot high Jesus with a voice like Paul Robeson suddenly strode in and said, 'I exist and here I am,' but even that, I actually sometimes wonder if that would..." ("Q&A...", 2012). So, though Dr. Dawkins raises the possibility of the legitimacy of disproving atheism with a 900-foot high, hypothetical Jesus, He continually rejects the historical, miracle-working, resurrected-from-the-dead Jesus Who walked the Earth 2,000 years ago. Sadly, such irrational, hard-hearted unbelief is nothing new. Even some in the very presence of Jesus in the first century, who testified to the supernatural feats that He worked, rejected Him (cf. John 11:45-53; 12:9-11). Thus, it should not be surprising that many will reject the Lord God today despite the evidence for His existence.

CONCLUSION

Atheists are fond of claiming that their way of thinking is logical, reasonable, and intellectual. Yet atheism irrationally says that everything came from nothing. Atheism says that an explosion caused exquisite order. It says that random chances produced precision and that life popped into existence in nature from non-life. Atheism contends that a well-designed Universe could come about without a Designer. Atheism says that fish and frogs are man's distant forefathers and that intelligence is ultimately the result of non-intelligence. Atheism alleges that either man is on the same moral plane as a moose, or he actually evolved a sense of morality from amoral mice. While trying to convince others he is galloping confidently atop a stallion called Common Sense, atheism stumbles on the back of a donkey called Foolishness.

Theism, on the other hand, is absolutely rational. Why? Because (among other things) (1) matter demands a Maker; (2) life demands a Life Giver; (3) design demands a Designer; (4) intelligence demands an Intelligent Creator; (5) morality demands a Moral Law Giver; (6) the Bible's supernatural attributes demand a Supernatural Author; and (7) the historical, miracle-working, resurrected Jesus demands a supernatural explanation (which demands God). Indeed, the Christian can say with all confidence, "I know that God exists." As former atheist Antony Flew so eloquently concluded: "I must say again that the journey to my discovery of the Divine has thus far been a pilgrimage of reason. I have followed the argument where it has led me. And it has led me to accept the existence of a self-existent, immutable, immaterial, omnipotent, and omniscient Being" (2007, p. 155).

REFERENCES

Barrow, John D. and Frank Tipler (1986), *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle* (Oxford, England: Oxford University Press).

Beckwith, Francis and Gregory Koukl (1998), *Relativism: Feet Firmly Planted in Mid-Air* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).

Brooks, Michael (2008), "Do You Speak Cuttlefish?" *New Scientist*, 198[2653]:28-31, April 26.

Butt, Kyle (2007), *Behold! The Word of God* (Montgomery, AL: Apologetics Press).

Butt, Kyle and Eric Lyons (2006), *Behold! The Lamb of God* (Montgomery, AL: Apologetics Press).

Butt, Kyle and Dan Barker (2009), *Does the God of the Bible Exist?* (Montgomery, AL: Apologetics Press).

"Common Sense" (2014), *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/common%20sense>.

"Counterintuitive" (2014), *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/counterintuitive>.

Coyne, Jerry (2009) *Why Evolution is True* (New York: Viking).

"Curiosity: Did God Create the Universe?" (2011), *Discovery Channel*, August 7.

Davies, Paul (2007), "Laying Down the Laws," *New Scientist*, 194[2610]:30-34, June 30.

"Design" (2000), *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin), fourth edition.

"Design" (2014), *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/design>.

"Do Atheists Have Morals?" (no date), <http://www.askanatheist.org/morals.html>.

Flew, Antony and Roy Varghese (2007), *There Is a God: How the World's Most Notorious Atheist Changed His Mind* (New York: Harper Collins).

Hawking, Stephen and Leonard Mlodinow (2010), *The Grand Design* (New York: Bantam Books).

"Intelligence" (2000), *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin), fourth edition.

"Intelligence" (2014), *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/intelligence>.

May, Branyon, et al. (2003), "The Big Bang Theory—A Scientific Critique [Parts 1-2]," *Reason & Revelation*, 23[5-6]:33-47,49-63.

"Metaphysical" (2014), *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/metaphysical>.

Miller, Dave (2009), "Is the Book of Mormon from God? [Part 1]," <http://www.apologeticspress.org/APContent.aspx?category=108&article=2787>.

Miller, Jeff (2011), "God and the Laws of Science: The Law of Causality," <http://www.apologeticspress.org/APContent.aspx?category=12&article=3716>.

Miller, Jeff (2012), "The Law of Biogenesis [Part 1]," <http://www.apologeticspress.org/APContent.aspx?category=9&article=4165&topic=93>.

Miller, Jeff (2013), "Evolution and the Laws of Science: The Laws of Thermodynamics," <http://www.apologeticspress.org/APContent.aspx?category=12&article=2786>.

Moe, Martin (1981), "Genes on Ice," *Science Digest*, 89[11]:36,95, December.

Mueller, Tom (2008), "Biomimetics: Design by Nature," *National Geographic*, 213[4]:68-91, April.

Provine, William (1988), "Scientists, Face It! Science and Religion are Incompatible," *The Scientist*, 2[16]:10, September 5, <http://www.the-scientist.com/?articles.view/articleNo/9707/title/Scientists--Face-It--Science-And-Religion-Are-Incompatible/>.

"Q&A: Religion and Atheism" (2012), ABC Australia, April 9, <http://www.abc.net.au/tv/qanda/txt/s3469101.htm>.

Reilly, Michael (2007), "God's Place in a Rational World," *New Scientist*, 196[2629]:7, November 10.

Ruse, Michael (1982), *Darwinism Defended: A Guide to the Evolution Controversies* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley).

Shermer, Michael (2006), *Why Darwin Matters* (New York: Henry Holt).

Shubin, Neil (2009), *Your Inner Fish* (New York: Vintage Books).

Simpson, George Gaylord (1951), *The Meaning of Evolution* (New York: Mentor).

Simpson, G.G., C.S. Pittendrigh, and L.H. Tiffany (1965), *Life: An Introduction to Biology* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World).

Sullivan, John (1933), *The Limitations of Science* (New York: Viking Press).

"The Universe Before Ours" (2007), *New Scientist*, 194[2601]:28-33, April 28.

Vilenkin, Alex (2006), *Many Worlds in One: The Search for Other Universes* (New York: Hill and Wang).

Wald, George (1954), "The Origin of Life," *Scientific American*, 191[2]:44-53, August.

Warren, Thomas B. and Antony G.N. Flew (1977), *Warren-Flew Debate* (Jonesboro, AR: National Christian Press).

Warren, Thomas B. and Wallace I. Matson (1978), *The Warren-Matson Debate* (Jonesboro, AR: National Christian Press).

"Wretched: Nothing Made Everything" (2006), http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=sK2yNkTuJkY.

Copyright © 2014 Apologetics Press, Inc. All rights reserved.

We are happy to grant permission for items in the "Existence of God" section to be reproduced in part or in their entirety, as long as the following stipulations are observed: (1) Apologetics Press must be designated as the original publisher; (2) the specific Apologetics Press Web site URL must be noted; (3) the author's name must remain attached to the materials; (4) textual alterations of any kind are strictly forbidden; (5) Some illustrations (e.g., photographs, charts, graphics, etc.) are not the intellectual property of Apologetics Press and as such cannot be reproduced from our site without consent from the person or organization that maintains those intellectual rights; (6) serialization of written material (e.g., running an article in several parts) is permitted, as long as the whole of the material is made available, without editing, in a reasonable length of time; (7) articles, excepting brief quotations, may not be offered for sale or included in items offered for sale; and (8) articles may be reproduced in electronic form for posting on Web sites pending they are not edited or altered from their original content and that credit is given to Apologetics Press, including the web location from which the articles were taken.

For catalog, samples, or further information, contact:

Apologetics Press
230 Landmark Drive
Montgomery, Alabama 36117
U.S.A.
Phone (334) 272-8558

<http://www.apologeticspress.org>