

25-0216a Transcript

25-0216a - 7 Reasons To Believe In God, Part 1 Scott Reynolds

Bible Readers: Roger Raines and Kevin Woosley

This transcript transcribed by TurboScribe.ai

See a detailed summary: [Detailed Summary HTML](#) - [Detailed Summary PDF](#)

(Detailed Summary by Grok, xAI)

Eric Lyons, M.Min., Kyle Butt, M.A., [Apologetics Press article, October 3, 2014](#)

From Issue: Valor & Virtue – Issue 5, R&R – Issue 34 #10, Valor & Virtue – Issue 1

7 Reasons To Believe In God, Part 1

Transcript (0:04 - 32:30)

Scripture Readings

1st Reader: Roger Raines

Psalm 33:6-7,

(0:04) Good morning. We're reading from the book of Psalms, chapter 33, verses 6 and 7.

(0:12) Psalm 33, 6 and 7.

(0:16) By the word of the Lord the heavens were made, and by the breath of His mouth all their hosts. (0:24) He gathers the water of the sea together as a heap. He lays up the deeps in storehouses. (0:32) This concludes this reading. (0:34)

2nd Reader: Kevin Woosley

Psalm 148:5-6,

(0:39) The second scripture reading is out of the book of Psalms. (0:43) Psalm 148, verses 5 and 6. (0:47)

Let them praise the name of the Lord, for He commanded and they were created. (0:53) He also established them forever and ever. (0:57) He made a decree which shall not pass away. (0:59)

Transcript

Preacher: Scott Reynolds

(1:04) This is an article by Eric Lyons and Kyle Butt of Apologetics Press. (1:12) They published the article on October 3rd, 2014. (1:19) So, let's begin with seven reasons to believe God.

(1:25) How can you know that God exists? (1:28) You can't see, hear, touch, smell, or taste Him.

(1:31) You can't weigh Him like you can a five-pound bag of potatoes. (1:36) You can't put Him under an electron microscope to show your friends what He looks like on an atomic level.

(1:44) You can't experiment on Him with probes and scalpels. (1:47) You can't take a picture of Him to show your neighbor that He's not just an imaginary friend. (1:54) You can't magically make Him appear in the classroom of an atheistic professor (2:00) who is challenging anyone to prove that God exists.

(2:05) So, how can you know that God exists? (2:10) And although atheists contend that God does not exist, (2:15) and agnostics allege that there is a very high probability that He does not exist, (2:22) theism, which is what we believe, (2:25) theism is the rational belief that there is a God, (2:29) a sincere pursuer of truth who follows the available evidence (2:34) will come to the logical conclusion that God exists. (2:40) Admittedly, this belief in the 21st century (2:44) is not the result of seeing God's Spirit or touching His actual essence. (2:51) What we have at our fingertips, however, (2:55) is a mountain of irrefutable, indirect, credible evidence that testifies on God's behalf.

(3:06) Consider seven lines of evidence that warrants the conclusion that (3:11) an eternal, supernatural creator, God, exists.

(3:19) Number one, matter demands a maker. (3:23) No rational person denies the fact that matter exists.

(3:31) The universe and every atom that makes it up is a reality. (3:35) The logical question to ask is, where did it all come from? (3:41) From the Milky Way to the most distant galaxy in the universe, (3:45) what was the cause? (3:48) What made matter? (3:50) A study of the material universe reveals that every physical effect (3:56) must have an adequate antecedent or simultaneous cause, (4:02) an idea known as the law of cause and effect or the law of causality. (4:09) The American flag that stood erect on the surface of the moon in 1969 (4:15) was neither eternal nor without a cause.

(4:19) Its existence on the moon demands a sufficient cause. (4:26) The robotic rovers that have rolled across the surface of Mars since the early 21st century (4:32) are the effect of an adequate cause. (4:37) No one believes that they popped up into existence from nothing (4:42) or that they are the result of any number of ridiculous, insufficient causes (4:47) that could be suggested.

(4:49) For example, an accidental explosion in a junkyard on Earth (4:54) sent metal objects spiraling towards Mars that assembled themselves into the robotic rovers. (5:02) Simply put, all material effects demand adequate causes. (5:10) Every material effect must have a cause that came before it (5:16) or was simultaneous to it and is greater than it.

(5:22) The universe is a material effect. (5:26) Therefore, the universe must have a cause that came before it and was greater than it. (5:35) So what caused the universe and all of the matter in the universe? (5:40) The theory that atheistic evolutionists have advanced for several decades now (5:45) which supposedly best explains our existence from a purely naturalistic perspective (5:53) is known as the Big Bang.

(5:56) Allegedly, about 14 billion years ago, (6:00) all of the matter and energy in the universe was concentrated in a tiny ball of matter (6:07) that exploded, causing the eventual formation of galaxies throughout the universe. (6:15) The obvious question with this inadequate explanation is (6:19) that even if the Big Bang actually happened, and sound science agrees, argues rather, (6:27) sound science argues against such a theory, (6:32) a person must still explain whence came the

original ball of matter. (6:37) It must have an adequate cause.

(6:39) What do some leading atheists and agnostics around the world argue about the cause of matter? (6:49) Atheistic cosmologist Stephen Hawking stated on national television in 2011, (6:59) nothing causes the Big Bang. (7:03) In the book, *The Grand Design*, that Dr. Hawking co-authored, (7:07) he and Leonard Mlodinoff asserted, (7:11) bodies such as stars and black holes cannot just appear out of nothing, (7:18) but the whole universe can. (7:23) Todd Friel asked Dan Barker, one of America's leading atheists, (7:30) do you really believe that something came from nothing? (7:34) And Barker responded with a simple, yes.

(7:39) The observable truth is, however, in nature, (7:43) matter and energy are neither created nor destroyed. (7:49) Scientists refer to this fact as the first law of thermodynamics. (7:55) Though evolutionists have alleged that the universe began with the explosion of a ball of matter (8:00) several billion years ago, (8:02) they never have provided a reasonable, naturalistic explanation (8:07) for the cause of the original ball of matter.

(8:12) Nothing is not a reasonable explanation. (8:17) In 2007, the pro-evolutionary *New Scientist* magazine (8:22) ran a cover story titled, *The Beginning, What Triggered the Big Bang?* (8:28) in which the publication attempted to explain the origin of the universe. (8:34) But consider the last line of the featured article.

(8:38) The quest to understand the origin of the universe seems destined (8:42) to continue until we can answer a deeper question. (8:47) Why is there anything at all instead of nothing? (8:54) The implication of such a question is quite clear. (8:57) If at one time in the past, nothing existed, (9:02) then nothing should exist today.

(9:06) The fact is, a reasonable, naturalistic explanation for the origin (9:11) of the original ball of matter that supposedly led to the universe (9:17) does not exist. (9:20) One of the world's leading atheists, Richard Dawkins, (9:23) has basically admitted such. (9:25) In a panel discussion in 2012 on Australian national television, (9:32) Dr. Dawkins was asked, (9:34) How is it that something as enormous as the universe came from nothing? (9:40) Notice what Dawkins admitted.

(9:43) Of course, it's counterintuitive that you can get something from nothing. (9:48) Of course, common sense doesn't allow you to get something from nothing. (9:53) But that's why it's interesting.

(9:56) It's got to be interesting in order to give rise to the universe at all. (10:01) Something pretty mysterious had to give rise to the origin of the universe. (10:08) Indeed, atheism's explanation for the origin of matter is (10:12) not agreeing with what seems right or natural.

(10:15) That's counterintuitive. (10:18) According to Dawkins' own admission, the idea of getting something from nothing (10:22) in nature defies common sense. (10:26) And it is far from a sound and prudent judgment based on a simple perception (10:31) of the situation or facts.

(10:33) And that's common sense. (10:36) So what more? (10:38) Atheists cannot logically argue that the universe is eternal. (10:45) It seems that relatively few scientists even propose an eternal (10:51) universe anymore.

(10:54) In fact, there would be no point in attempting to explain the beginning of (11:00) the universe in a big bang if atheists believed it always existed. (11:07) Furthermore, the second law of

thermodynamics, which states that matter (11:12) and energy become less usable over time, and that is that things wear out, (11:17) has led most scientists to conclude that the universe has not always existed, (11:25) or else we would be out of usable energy. (11:30) The fact is, the universe had a beginning.

(11:34) Alex Vilenkin, cosmologist from Tufts University, pressed this fact in his (11:40) book titled, *Many Worlds in One*. (11:43) He says, (11:45) It is said that an argument is what convinces reasonable men, (11:50) and a proof is what it takes to convince even an unreasonable man. (11:56) With the proof now in place, he continues, cosmologists can no longer (12:01) hide behind the possibility of a past eternal universe.

(12:07) There is no escape. (12:09) They have to face the problem of a cosmic beginning. (12:15) At one time in the past, the material universe did not exist.

(12:20) Then, at some point, matter came into existence. (12:24) But since matter is not eternal, and cannot create itself from nothing, (12:29) then something outside of the material realm must have brought matter into existence. (12:38) In short, matter demands a maker.

(12:45) The evidence clearly indicates that the cause of the universe is inexplicable (12:50) without a supernatural being. (12:54) Something has to be eternally powerful. (12:57) But we know it cannot be nature or material.

(13:01) That is why Romans 1.20 says, (13:06) For since the beginning of the world his invisible attributes are clearly seen, (13:13) being understood by the things that are made, even as eternal power and Godhead, (13:21) so that they are without excuse. (13:24) Without some type of eternal power, our universe cannot exist. (13:30) And the atheistic answer that our universe created itself from nothing (13:35) is the furthest thing from either a scientific or a rational explanation.

(13:43) Number two. (13:46) Life demands a life giver. (13:49) Life does not pop into existence from nothing.

(13:52) Neither the puppy at the pound nor the bacteria on the doorknob spontaneously generated. (14:00) Every scientist, whether theist or atheist, knows this observation to be true. (14:08) In biology, one of the most widely recognized laws of science is the law of biogenesis.

(14:16) Biogenesis is composed of two words. (14:20) Bio, which means life, and genesis, which means beginning. (14:25) Thus, this law deals with the beginning of life.

(14:30) And it simply says that in nature, life comes only from previous life of its own kind. (14:39) Over the years, the truthfulness of this law has been documented by thousands of scientists, (14:46) most notably Louis Pasteur. (14:49) His work dealt a crushing blow to the notion of spontaneous generation.

(14:57) In 1933, evolutionist John Sullivan admitted that (15:02) it became an accepted doctrine that life never arises except from life. (15:09) So far as the actual evidence goes, this is still the only possible conclusion. (15:15) Okay, but that was 1933.

(15:18) As we move further into the 20th century, the obvious question was, (15:22) is it still the only possible conclusion? (15:26) What have we learned since the days of Louis Pasteur in the 19th century? (15:30) And John Sullivan in the first half of the 20th century? (15:35) Observational

science has reached the same conclusion, (15:40) experiment after experiment, year after year. (15:44) The eminent evolutionist George Gaylord Simpson and his colleagues observed (15:49) that there is no serious doubt that biogenesis is the rule (15:56) that life comes only from other life, (15:59) that a cell, the unit of life, is always and exclusively the product or offspring of another cell. (16:09) Evolutionist Martin Moe noted that a century of sensational discoveries in the biological sciences (16:16) taught us that life arises only from life.

(16:21) More recently, staunch evolutionist Neil Shubin conceded the following in his book titled (16:29) *Your Inner Fish*. (16:32) I can share with you one true law that all of us can agree upon. (16:37) This law is so profound that most of us take it completely for granted.

(16:42) Yet, it is the starting point for almost everything we do in paleontology, (16:49) developmental biologies, and genetics. (16:54) This biological law of everything is that every living thing on the planet had parents. (17:04) Every person you've ever known has biological parents, (17:08) as does every bird, salamander, or shark you've ever seen.

(17:13) To put it in a more precise form, every living thing sprang from some parental genetic information. (17:23) The importance of Shubin's concession must not be missed. (17:28) He recognizes that the actual scientific information verifies (17:33) that life in the natural world must come from previously existing life.

(17:40) Yet, he refuses to carry that fact to its proper conclusion, (17:46) that life could not have sprung from non-living chemicals. (17:51) Materialistic evolution cannot adequately account for or explain the most basic laws of science, (18:00) not the least of which is the law of biogenesis. (18:04) In the material universe, life arises from previously existing life of its own kind.

(18:16) Life cannot spontaneously generate from non-living chemicals. (18:21) Thus, a supernatural intelligent mind must have created living organisms. (18:29) If it is the case that the only possible conclusion which scientific evidence demands (18:38) is that in nature, life never arises except from life, (18:46) then, pray tell, how did the first life come into being? (18:51) Did it somehow break the most fundamental natural law of biology (18:55) and arise naturally from non-life? (18:59) Or is there another possibility? (19:02) The truth is, there is another possibility which science has not disproved.

(19:08) But it is one that evolutionists such as John Sullivan admitted (19:13) that scientific men find very difficult of acceptance. (19:19) According to Sullivan, so far as the actual evidence goes, (19:25) biogenesis is still the only possible conclusion. (19:31) But it is a conclusion that seems to lead back to some supernatural creative act.

(19:38) Do not miss the point. (19:41) Real, true, operational science indirectly supports a supernatural creative act, (19:49) which implies a supernatural creator. (19:55) Evolutionist and Harvard University professor George Wald similarly admitted (20:01) in an article he wrote titled, *The Origin of Life*, (20:05) that there ultimately are two options for life's origin.

(20:10) Number one, spontaneous generation. (20:13) And number two, the only alternative to believe in a single primary act of supernatural creation. (20:23) There is no third position.

(20:28) Sadly though, most modern biologists, (20:31) having reviewed with satisfaction the downfall of the spontaneous generation hypothesis, (20:37) are unwilling to accept the alternative belief in special creation. (20:43) Rather than follow the evidence where it ultimately leads to a

supernatural creator, (20:50) atheists would rather put their confidence in a theory that was disproven long ago. (20:56) Antony Flew, who for five decades was the world's leading atheistic thinker, (21:02) was forced in the end to conclude, (21:06) the only satisfactory explanation for the origin of such indirected self-replicating life (21:14) as we see on Earth is an infinitely intelligent mind.

(21:23) Number three, design demands a designer. (21:27) Every day, observation reveals and confirms the obvious fact (21:33) that complex functional design demands a designer. (21:39) Paintings demand painters.

(21:41) Poems demand poets. (21:43) Architecture demands architects. (21:45) And on and on we go.

(21:47) Everyone knows that cars and computers, pianos and projectors, (21:51) all require engineers, technicians and tuners for them to exist and function properly. (22:02) But what about the universe as a whole? (22:04) Can it be described accurately as designed? (22:08) If so, what could design imply about its origin? (22:14) No honest, informed person can deny the fact (22:20) that the universe is extremely fine-tuned and functionally complex. (22:25) From the Earth's precise orbit around the sun (22:29) to a shorebird's 15,000 yearly migration pattern (22:34) and the amazing digestive system of the human body, (22:39) literally millions of examples of fine-tuned design in nature (22:43) can be pondered.

(22:46) Consider just one example involving electrons and protons. (22:53) The ratio of the mass of an electron to a proton is 1 to 1836, (23:01) which means that a proton is 1836 times more massive than an electron. (23:10) And even with this mass difference, (23:14) electrons and protons have the same electrical charge.

(23:19) Scientists suggest that if the electrical charge of the electron (23:23) were altered by one part in 100 billion, (23:26) our bodies would instantly explode. (23:31) If it were off just by 100 billion, we would explode. (23:39) Is such precision indicative of precise design? (23:44) Most certainly.

(23:46) The truth is, atheists frequently testify to the design in nature. (23:52) Australian atheist, atheistic astrophysicist, Paul Davies, (23:56) has admitted that the universe, which according to the atheists, (24:00) is the result of mindless, naturalistic, random processes, (24:04) is uniquely hospitable, remarkable, and ordered in an intelligible way. (24:14) He even admitted to the fine-tuned properties of the universe.

(24:19) In a 2008 National Geographic article titled (24:28) Biometrics Designed by Nature, (24:31) the word design appeared no less than seven times in reference to nature's designs. (24:40) The author, evolutionist Tom Mueller, referred to nature's sophistication (24:46) and clever devices and praised nature for being able to turn simple materials (24:51) into structures of fantastic complexity, strength, and toughness. (24:57) After learning of the uncanny, complicated maneuverability of a little blowfly, (25:05) Mueller even confessed to feeling the need to regard the insect on Bended Knee in admiration.

(25:13) Why? (25:14) Because of its mysterious and complicated design. (25:19) The fact is, as evolutionist Jerry Coyne admitted, (25:26) nature resembles a well-oiled machine. (25:30) The more one learns about plants and animals, (25:32) the more one marvels at how well their designs fit their ways of life.

(25:38) But how can you get design without purpose, intelligence, and deliberate planning? (25:45)

The first three definitions the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary gives for design, a noun, are as follows. (25:55) 1. A particular purpose, held in view by an individual or group. (26:02) 1b.

Deliberate, purposive planning. (26:06) 2. A mental project or scheme in which means to an end are laid down. (26:12) 3a.

A deliberate, undercover project or scheme. (26:18) After defining design as a drawing, sketch, or graphic representation of a detailed plan, (26:25) the American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language noted that design may be defined as (26:31) the purposeful or inventive arrangement of parts or details. (26:37) A design is preceded by deliberate, purposeful planning, (26:44) a detailed plan, or an inventive arrangement.

(26:48) So we see then, a design is the effect, (26:53) not of time, chance, and unintelligent, random, accidental explosions, (26:59) but of the purposeful planning and deliberate actions of an inventor or designer. (27:06) Literally, by definition, design demands a designer. (27:13) Thus, the designed universe demands a designer.

(27:18) Anything that exhibits complex functional design demands an intelligent designer. (27:25) The universe exhibits complex functional design. (27:29) Therefore, the universe must have a designer.

(27:33) According to Paul Davies, our universe seems just right for life. (27:39) It looks as if a super-intellect has been monkeying with physics. (27:46) Similarly, well-known skeptic Michael Shermer conceded, (27:50) the reason people think that a designer created the world is because it looks designed.

(27:57) Indeed, both honest observation and rational thought (28:02) should leave every truth-seeking individual to the same conclusion (28:06) that the psalmist came to 3,000 years ago. (28:12) The heavens declare the glory of God, (28:15) and the firmament shows His handiwork. (28:18) The whole earth is full of His glory, Isaiah 6.3. (28:23) Both the heavens and the earth testify day after day, night after night, (28:28) to anyone and everyone who will listen, Psalm 19.2.4. (28:34) Lift up your eyes on high and see who has created these, Isaiah 40.26. (28:43) Since the universe exhibits complex functional design, (28:47) and by definition, complex functional design demands a designer, (28:53) then the universe must have an intelligent designer.

(28:59) This argument for God is logically sound and observationally true. (29:05) A person can know without a doubt that God exists (29:09) if for no other reason than that the universe's design demands a designer. (29:15) For every house is built by someone, (29:20) but he who built all things is God, Hebrews 3.4. (29:27) So, in conclusion, (29:31) atheists are fond of claiming that their way of thinking (29:34) is logical, reasonable, and intellectual.

(29:38) Yet atheism irrationally says that everything came from nothing. (29:42) Atheism says that an explosion caused exquisite order. (29:48) It says that random chances produced precision, (29:52) and that life popped into existence in nature from non-life.

(29:57) Atheism contends that a well-designed universe could come about without a designer. (30:05) Atheism says that fish and frogs are men's distant forefathers, (30:10) and that intelligence is ultimately the result of non-intelligence. (30:16) Think about that one.

(30:19) Atheism alleges that either man is on the same moral plane as a moose, (30:26) or he

actually evolved a sense of morality from amoral mice. (30:32) While trying to convince others, (30:34) he's galloping confidently atop a stallion called common sense. (30:40) Atheism stumbles on the back of a donkey called foolishness.

(30:45) Theism, on the other hand, is absolutely rational. (30:50) Why? (30:51) Because, among other things, (30:55) matter demands a maker. (30:57) Life demands a life giver.

(31:01) Design demands a designer. (31:03) And tonight we'll talk about (31:06) intelligence demands an intelligent creator. (31:11) Morality demands a moral law giver.

(31:15) The Bible's supernatural attributes demand a supernatural author. (31:21) And, the last one, (31:23) the historical, miracle-working, resurrected Jesus (31:27) demands a supernatural explanation (31:30) which demands God. (31:33) As former atheist Antony Flew so eloquently concluded, (31:41) I must say again that the journey to my discovery (31:46) of the divine has thus far (31:51) been a pilgrimage of reason.

(31:55) I have followed the arguments where it has led me, (31:58) and it has led me (32:00) to accept the existence (32:02) of a self-existent, immutable, immaterial, (32:06) omnipotent, and omniscient being. (32:11) Indeed, the Christian can say (32:14) with all confidence, (32:17) I know that God exists. (32:23) We're sending the invitation (32:26) to all who are subject to it.

(32:29) And, while we sing...