

June 28, 2009

Jeffery D. Woodhams

## THE EXISTENCE OF GOD, Part One

This week marked the groundbreaking of a 550 million dollar project to build a science lab deep underground. How deep? The deepest part is 8,000 feet underground, which is the equivalent of six Empire State Buildings. So why must America spend a projected 550 million dollars on this laboratory? We must build it, we are told, so that we can detect dark matter (and its related phenomenon, dark energy<sup>1</sup>) without that annoying cosmic radiation interfering.<sup>2</sup> And this is only one of many such projects worldwide and in space! Finding dark matter must be extremely important to humanity to make conscionable such expenses when so much of humanity is in dire poverty and our own economy is, in the words of Warren Buffet, “in shambles.”

Dark matter is the assumed explanation of a riddle: spiral galaxies are spinning so fast, and have been doing so for so long, that they should be spread out. Dark matter in theory is a mysterious substance that is made up of such small particles that the particles themselves are nearly impossible to detect individually, but there are supposed to be so many of them that they can hold the galaxies in their current shape for the billions of years of their existence. In short, dark matter is supposed to hold things together.

What is dark energy and why do we need to find it? I’m not going to go into the whole explanation this morning, but it basically comes down to a philosophical assumption: the earth is in an unremarkable place in a borderless, centerless universe that is expanding from the Big Bang. The expansion should be slowing as time passes, but there are indications that the expansion is actually accelerating. What could make it speed up? The theoretical answer is dark energy. Theoretically, there must be huge, huge amounts of it to accomplish this; according to NASA, dark energy makes up about 75% of the universe and dark matter makes up about 25%, leaving less than 5% for what we call “normal matter” and energy.<sup>3</sup> (Yes, that’s 105%). In short, dark energy is assumed to push things apart, as opposed to dark matter, which is supposed to hold things together. However, consider this from an April 2009 article in *Scientific American* entitled “Does Dark Energy Really Exist?”:

Nothing meeting the description of dark energy appears in physicists' Standard Model of fundamental particles and forces. It is a substance that has not as yet been measured directly, has properties unlike anything we have ever seen and has an energy density some  $10^{120}$  times less than we may have naively expected. Physicists have ideas for what

---

1 Related by ideological ties, not by phenomenological ties. Since we know nothing of either, we do not know what relation they have to each other, if any at all.

2 Steven Goldmeier, “Dark Matter Lab Dedicated 5,000 Feet Underground.” Available at <http://io9.com/5301462/dark-matter-lab-dedicated-5000-feet-underground>.

3 “Dark Energy, Dark Matter.” Available at <http://nasascience.nasa.gov/astrophysics/what-is-dark-energy>.

it might be, but they remain speculative [see "The Quintessential Universe," by Jeremiah P. Ostriker and Paul J. Steinhardt; *Scientific American*, January 2001]. *In short, we are very much in the dark about dark energy.* Researchers are working on a number of *ambitious and expensive* ground- and space-based missions to find and characterize dark energy, whatever it may be. To many, it is the greatest challenge facing modern cosmology [emphasis added].<sup>4</sup>

I want to make this clear: a philosophical assumption, that man is not special and therefore cannot have a special place in the universe, is the driving force for trying to find dark energy and dark matter.

Another of these assumptions is the Copernican principle, which holds that the universe has no edge and no center. It assumes that there are no unique places and that the position of the earth is therefore not special. If this principle is *rejected*, however, then the same general relativity equations used in the standard model could describe a universe that does have a center and edges. When this bounded universe is fed into the same astronomical equations, "dark energy" is no longer required. The trade-off for this solution, however, is admitting the possibility that earth is uniquely positioned, as though it were specially placed by an entity outside the universe....To evolutionary scientists, this concept is anathema.<sup>5</sup>

So here we have a choice. If we accept the possibility that the earth is in a special place in the universe, namely, near the center, then the mathematical difficulties that require dark matter and dark energy completely disappear. It is only by rejecting that the earth *could* be in a special place that enormous difficulties appear.

Let me also make it clear that the Bible does NOT say that God placed the earth in the center of the universe; however, in the creation model, there is no difficulty in accepting this as a possibility. It is only among evolutionary scientists who reject this on *philosophical*, not *scientific*, grounds that a difficulty arises—a difficulty so great that billions of dollars must be diverted from the public good. "Edwin Hubble himself—famous for Hubble's Law, a mathematical description of the expansion of the universe—remarked that he added a term to an equation 'to escape the horror of a unique position.'"<sup>6</sup>

Now all of this makes for a long and technical introduction, I realize. Why does this even matter? It matters because it shows the desperate measures that intelligent, educated people will go to in

---

4 Timothy Clifton and Pedro Ferreira, "Does Dark Energy Really Exist?" *Scientific American*, April 2009. Available at <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=does-dark-energy-exist&page=2>.

5 Brian Thomas, "Science Still in the Dark about Dark Energy." Available at <http://www.icr.org/article/science-still-about-dark-energy/>.

6 Edwin Hubble, *The Observational Approach to Cosmology* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932), 59. Quoted in "Science Still in the Dark about Dark Energy" by Brian Thomas.

order to rule out the possibility of God. The foundational physical and scientific inquiries I've discussed are entirely grounded in philosophy and theology, not science. What we actually have is one example of scientists *working against* and *explaining away* the improbabilities of evolution. There are many more examples that could be offered, a few of which I may touch on as the series continues. The point is that evolutionary models are fraught with impossibilities at every level, and yet we are forced to accept, with our taxpayer dollars, the indoctrination of every generation of children with this dogma. I may, in fact, bring some of our modern textbooks and show examples of evolutionary teachings that are known to be false and have been abandoned by evolutionists which are still being taught to our children as science. But if anyone tries to point this out, they are ridiculed. Those who promote evolution-only teaching are honored, such as Eugenie Scott, who was given a distinguished scientific award recently, not for contributing anything to science, but for enforcing evolutionary dogma within the public schools!

I want to read to you certain excerpts from a recent article by Ken Ham entitled "Already Gone: Why the Church Is Dying."

Earlier this year I attended Sunday services at an impressive 19th-century church in London. In a building with seating for 3,000 in ornate pews, a handful of elderly people sat inside . . . in chairs set up in the foyer.

The service, held in a vibrant city full of millions of people, reminded me of a funeral—not the funeral of a person, the funeral of a once-great institution. In the past 40 years, 1600 churches in England, with hundreds of years of ministry behind them, have shut their doors . . .

Today, few Americans are aware of the spiritual epidemic that wiped out the land of our Christian forefathers. Even fewer are aware that the same epidemic has reached our own shores, spreading like a virus.

American Christianity could become extinct in less than two generations—if Christians in this country don't act quickly and decisively. **Respected pollster George Barna was one of the first to put numbers to this epidemic, finding that six out of ten 20-somethings who were involved in a church during their teen years are already gone.** Since that research was published in 2000, survey after survey has confirmed the same basic trend.

The problem, in both the United Kingdom and America, began when the Church basically disconnected the Bible from the real world. Churches in America are not places where people typically talk about dinosaurs, fossils, or the age of the earth—that is left up to the secular schools and colleges. Effectively, the Church concentrates on the spiritual and moral aspects of Christianity.

But the Bible is not some "pie in the sky" theoretical book. It's a real book connected to the real world. It has everything to do with history, geology, biology, anthropology, and

sociology. It provides the true history of the world, as opposed to evolution over millions of years.

The “disconnect” between faith and fact is an illusion created by an overwhelming misinterpretation of the facts. Observational science confirms the Bible’s history and, thus, also the Christian doctrines (like the gospel) that are based in that history....

The Word of God has never changed, but the Church’s perception of the Word of God changed when it failed to engage the evolutionist scientific community on matters of evidence as well as faith. Typical churches use resources that are more geared for what could be called the “Jew in Jerusalem” who has developed a religious background and lives in a religiously friendly society.

We are now in the era of the “Greeks”—like the secular philosophers the Apostle Paul encountered on Mars Hill—yet our churches and Sunday schools are still teaching us like Jews.

See the problem?

Our society is immersed in secularism. It’s essential that we learn how to defend the Bible and the Christian faith for our sake and our children’s. If we don’t, the empty and obsolete churches in England will foreshadow the future in America [emphasis added].<sup>7</sup>

Contrary to all that society tells us, evolutionary scientists do not have all the answers. I’ve given quotes from evolutionists to that effect in previous sermons. The problem is that we are made to believe that they do, and that therefore there is *no God* or that *He is unknowable*, but in either case there is *no need of Him*.

I propose to you that *there is a God*, that *He is knowable*, and that *we do need Him*. It’s going to take more than one Sunday to do this.

The Bible begins with those famous words, “In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth.” There is no explanation of who or what made God; His existence is merely assumed. Later in the Scriptural record, we are told that God is, in fact, eternal and uncreated—He is the great I AM.

Exodus 3:14—And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.

Job 38:4—Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding.

Psalms 90:1–2—LORD, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were born, Or Thou didst give birth to the earth and the world, Even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God.

---

<sup>7</sup> Ken Ham, “Already Gone.” Available at <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/2009/06/24/already-gone>.

John 8:58—Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am.

It is a fair question, and one often asked, “Who made God?” or “Where did God come from?” We ask this because in all things we understand that there is a law of cause and effect (which is universally accepted and followed in every field of science): for every effect, there must be an *equal* or *greater* cause. To put it another way, for every action, there is an *equal* and *opposite* reaction, but because some energy may become less useful or unusable in the reaction, the cause may be *equal* to or *greater* than the effect, but never *less* than it. We instinctively know this. It is both scientific and logical. However, we can only observe this cause and effect relationship in the present; we must extrapolate it into the past, and when we do that, we will find only a philosophical answer: “In the beginning, God created...” or “In the beginning, time, chance and matter created...” But even if we choose to believe that time, chance and matter made everything, we *still* do not have a first cause: What made time, chance, and matter? (or at the very least, What made matter?). So the question of First Cause *cannot* be answered by science.

Let us consider then, this First Cause:

The First Cause of limitless Space must be infinite.  
The First Cause of endless Time must be eternal.  
The First Cause of boundless Energy must be omnipotent.  
The First Cause of universal Interrelationships must be omnipresent.  
The First Cause of infinite Complexity must be omniscient.  
The First Cause of Moral Values must be moral.  
The First Cause of Spiritual Values must be spiritual.  
The First Cause of Human Responsibility must be volitional.  
The First Cause of Human Integrity must be truthful.  
The First Cause of Human Love must be loving.  
The First Cause of Life must be living.

We conclude from the law of cause-and-effect that the First Cause of all things must be an infinite, eternal, omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient, moral, spiritual, volitional, truthful, loving, living Being! Do such adjectives describe Matter? ... To state that Matter and its innate properties constitute the ultimate explanation for the universe and its inhabitants is equivalent to saying that the Law of Cause-and-Effect is valid only under present circumstances, not in the past.<sup>8</sup>

Since the Law of Cause and Effect demands a First Cause that is equal to or greater than the sum total of the universe, we can reasonably assign this First Cause to an eternal God. It also seems reasonable to conclude that God as First Cause is preferable to Matter (and ultimately *nothing*) as First Cause.

---

<sup>8</sup> Henry M. Morris (ed.), *Scientific Creationism* (El Cajon, CA: Master Books, 1985), p. 20.

Next time we will consider two other powerful indications that belief in the existence of God is not only reasonable, but lends itself perfectly to what we actually find in science: design and information. For now it is sufficient to say that I find it perfectly reasonable to believe in God, and that there is nothing in science to disprove His existence and His hand in creation. I hope that you will consider the evidence carefully and evaluate why you believe what you believe.