

What Atheism Cannot Account For

When scientists investigate complex natural phenomena, they are not content to just naysay ideas that *others* offer. Rather, they **seek for a superior explanation** to the data. Only by *reconciling the facts* into the **most plausible hypothesis**,¹ is the goal of science *fulfilled*.² Since *skeptics* habitually dismiss the Bible for, as they charge, "*getting the science wrong*," they inadvertently set up that standard which they oblige themselves to obey too. Reason indeed demands they identify **the specific scientific forces** they believe³ **better explain** existence than does the God of Genesis 1:1. I urge you to decide this question for yourself. Which view do you judge; theism⁴ or atheism,⁵ **best accounts for the following?**

1. **The universe had an absolute beginning from out of nothing at the Big Bang (BB).** A sizable list of *scientific facts*⁶ establish, as unassailable,⁷ the certitude of this event. Yet it is **impossible** that science could itself be the *cause*⁸ of the universe since, **prior to the BB nothing physical existed at all**,⁹ **NOT matter nor energy nor time nor space** existed in which *scientific processes could* exist *to* create anything. Consequently the BB was **not a cause**, but the **effect** of a **far greater cause!** Notice from the above list of lacks that the BB was instead a **sheer miracle!** While skeptics *assert* that quantum tunnelling and gravity are both indicators that matter *can* just pop into reality from nothing, they fail to grasp that both also began to exist as *created* entities!¹⁰ So, what can atheists conceivably posit that **better** explains existence than does the God of Genesis 1:1 who, by His *transcending* nature,¹¹ can simply *speak* a cosmos into existence (Hebrews 11:3)?
2. At the **first** moments of creation, an **extensive array of extremely fine-tuned initial forces were in place almost instantly.** They included **both (1) the structure of the strong and weak nuclear forces** that manage protons inside atoms, and the **strength** of both the **electromagnetic force and gravity**, and **(2) the conditional factors** resulting from that beginning, including the **amount of physical mass created**, as well as the **rate of its expansion.** The settings of every factor were precisely set as was required in order to yield a universe having those natural conditions which enable it to support life.¹² The fact of their being present at the earliest moments of the BB excludes the possibility of being the result of mindless pre-biologic evolution since **no** progress was even possible before *intact* atoms were in place. Theists claim that God is the sole sufficient cause of the cosmos. What *superior* alternative do atheists suggest, to posit in His place?
3. **The genetic code "housed" in DNA abounds within every single multi-cell life form.** Dr. Hugh Ross states, "*Genetic research indicates that not even a simple parasite can survive without at least 250 functioning gene products.*"¹³ As Dr. Stephen Meyer, author of a landmark book on this matter¹⁴ wrote, "*The ability of the cell depends on the precise sequential arrangement of the*

¹ A "hypothesis" is a tentative explanation that is a work in progress. It is further refined with the accumulation of further evidence.

² Stephen Meyer. Return of the God Hypothesis. (Harper One, 2021), pp. 226f. This competition is called "inference to the best explanation."

³ Atheism as the denial of the existence of God, is every bit as much of a belief system as is the biblical claim, since neither view can be proved.

⁴ "Theism" is belief in the God of the Bible.

⁵ Far from denying science, theism expressed in the Bible (Romans 1:18f), forbids suppressing scientific knowledge. Theism acknowledges that God most often, by far, works His purposes through *natural* (secondary) causes. So theism is in principle compatible with *natural* causation.

⁶ For immediate access to the data see my pamphlet, "God's Prints are Everywhere" at my website: www.christianityontheoffense.com

⁷ Those lauded scientists that reject BB creation such as Stephen Hawking do so by evading testable evidence supportive of the BB. They do so by in part **postulating hypothetical notions that evade being discredited.** Hugh Ross. The Creator and the Cosmos. 4th ed. (RTB, 2018), p. 85f.

⁸ While the Big Bang didn't have a naturalistic *cause*, the broad array of unassailable scientific *data* (Ibid) indicates it nevertheless *did* occur.

⁹ "*At some time in the past...the distance between neighboring galaxies must have been zero.*" Stephen Hawking. Quoted in Op.cit (2), p. 94.

¹⁰ While Stephen Hawking wrote, "*Because there is a law like gravity, the universe can and will create itself from nothing.*" (Hawking and Mlodinow. The Grand Design. (Bantam, 2012), p. 180.), **** Yet**, John Lennox **refutes** Hawking. (Lennox. God and Stephen Hawking. (Lion, 2011.)).

¹¹ To *transcend* in this context means to stand entirely outside, apart, and conceptually different from the *physical* universe.

¹² Stephen Meyer. <https://evolutionnews.org/i/fine-tuning-parameters/>

¹³ Hugh Ross. Creation as Science: A Testable Model Approach to End Creation/Evolution Wars. NavPress, 2006), p. 127.

¹⁴ Stephen Meyer. Signature in the Cell: DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design. (Harper One, 2009), p. 109.

["letters"] in DNA..." He further states, "*The design patterns exemplified in the cell's information processing system also exhibit specifications. Why? Because we recognize [that those features] match ones we know from...our own information technology.*" So, he concludes, "*Specified digital information in the DNA molecule provides strong grounds for inferring that intelligence played a role in the origin of DNA.*"¹⁵ Generally, seekers for the source of any body of information **limit their target to intelligent agents** (think "SETI")! Excluding the factor of *personality* in a search for an information-source, is an **oxymoron**. Since science seeks for the *best* explanation; "**How** then, *Atheists, does materialism account for information in DNA best of all?*"

4. **Self-Consciousness.** The actuality, firstly, of our awareness of the external world and secondly, our comprehension of both our *inner-self* and our capacity to *reflect* on the complexity entailed in discerning the impressions confronting us through our senses, should instill within us a sense of wonder. Further, our means of being *inspired* and at times even *led*, by the imagination, and our capacity to reach solutions to *complex* problems, also raises the question of how *unguided* evolution could conceivably be **more**¹⁶ successful than are technicians at, for example, *Apple* and *Microsoft*? For Christians, these reflections point to a *personal* God who *made* humans in *His image* (Gen. 1:26). But concerning atheists, **far from** seeking to **account** for such experiences on their *materialistic* terms, they **outright deny** the array of the same volitional capacities that **all human beings exercise** continually (even in denial of God). Can these denials be sourced in the reality that the very act of humans asserting we are "*just machines*,"¹⁷ is self-contradictory?
5. **Personal Free-Will.** Philosophical materialists hold that physical matter is all there is, which is why they hold that neither God exists, nor *souls within* people. For that very reason they insist that the only *processes* which are real are interactions governed by intractable scientific laws. Consequently, free will cannot even possibly exist. Indeed, our sensation of *choosing* what to do or even what to think, is deceptive too since, as they imagine, we are just machines in which the events within our brains are *merely* electro-chemical interactions between the synapses of our neural system. Atheism too, embraces this view. Now I hope that it is becoming apparent that, despite being embraced by a myriad of academics, this view is logically incoherent. If it were actually true, it applies not only to the professors who propagate it, but also to their students sitting before them. Notice then its' absurdity: In the absence of free-will, by what conceptual means are professors to have formulated so-called ideas from the *mechanical* meatball resting on their necks; and also, by what means do they seek to steer the "mechanistic receptacles" before them, possessing non-existent "minds", to be persuaded of the merits of materialism?

Alas, atheists habitually **resist** "*stepping up to the plate*" as suggested in the last line of my first paragraph. Instead of establishing a testable case for the beliefs they embrace, they attack *theists* for positing a *personal* Creator, despite the fact that science and philosophy have no valid means to exclude a personal agent as a potential cause of anything. Atheists need instead to account for all five points **on their own terms**, including the final two which entail such self-contradiction, they entangle staunch materialists into violating the *First Principle* of the "Law of Non-Contradiction."¹⁸

Gary Jensen, NALC Lutheran Pastor, retired © December 7, 2022

Gjensen549@gmail.com ** Christianityontheoffense.com ** offensivechristianity.blogspot.com

M.Div. Degree from Luther Theological Seminary ** M.A. Degree with Honors in "*Science and Religion*" from BIOLA University

¹⁵ Ibid. p. 347, 368.

¹⁶ Such researchers and technicians create and manufacture only machines that cannot equal the multitask capacity of the average human.

¹⁷ Daniel Dennett. [youtube.com/watch?v=JP1nmExfgpg](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JP1nmExfgpg), states, "*There is no inner show and...no single inner witness [in the brain]*" (11:20).

¹⁸ "*Something cannot be both true and not true at the same time while dealing with the same context.*" <https://carm.org/dictionary/law-of-non-contradiction/>