

## PROVING THE EXISTENCE OF GOD – OTHER ARGUMENTS

### Teleological Argument - Design

1. All designs imply a designer.
2. There is a great design to the universe.
3. Therefore, there must be a Great Designer of the universe.

### **Scientific Arguments**

You can't use the scientific method to prove God's existence. The scientific method was originally created by Christians (based on a systematic worldview) and has now been taken from us and used against us. Since God exists outside of our systematic and orderly universe we cannot use these tools to prove His existence to anyone else. It can be used to prove His existence to yourself, however.

Another point to make concerns scientism. Scientism is really the religion espoused by those hiding behind science. Scientism is a philosophy about science and is quickly dispatched.

William Paley's watch-maker argument, *Natural Theology*, 1804.

### Axiological Argument – Moral

1. All men are conscious of an objective moral law.
2. Moral laws imply a moral Lawgiver.
3. Therefore, there must be a supreme moral Lawgiver.

### **Logical Arguments**

There is no god. follow to the logical conclusion

God gave us the moral law. Without His existence there is no moral law. Without His revelation there is nothing after this life. What is the point of existence then? Why do atheists argue and promote their position when there is no point?

Moral laws don't describe what is; they prescribe what ought to be.

### Ontological Argument – Being

1. Whatever perfection can be attributed to the most perfect Being possible (conceivable) must be attributed to it (otherwise it would not be the most perfect being possible).
2. Necessary existence is a perfection which can be attributed to the most perfect Being.
3. Therefore, necessary existence must be attributed to the most perfect Being.

Is this god the God of the Bible? In Exodus (3:14) God told Moses His name - I AM WHO I AM. This refers to God's central characteristic . His Existence. His very nature is existence . infinite, eternal, unchanging, all good, and omnipotent. God is the greatest being. There is no higher being or power. When God made the promise to Abraham, since He could swear by no one greater, He swore by Himself. (Heb. 6:13)

**Satan vs. God?** Many people honestly believe that there is an ongoing battle between the opposite (but equal) forces of good and evil. C.S. Lewis cracks that one (*The Problem of Pain*). If God is pure \_\_\_\_\_, then to have an opposite you must have pure \_\_\_\_\_. You must remove all good qualities from that being (Satan?); knowledge, intellect, will, \_\_\_\_\_ō  
So you can see that \_\_\_\_\_ there can be no such thing as an opposite of God.

### God's Limitations

1. God cannot \_\_\_\_\_ (Titus 1:2)
2. God cannot \_\_\_\_\_ (Psalm 102:27)  
I am who I am. (Exodus 3:14)  
I the Lord do not change. (Malachi 3:6)
3. God cannot let you into \_\_\_\_\_ apart from salvation in \_\_\_\_\_ (John 3:5-7)

These %limitations+ would seem to contradict the definition of omnipotent. However since God is the greatest being we need to define omnipotent by His attributes. And once you analyze these limitations they would seem to be rather comforting to the open minded. Compare this to the characteristics of other so-called gods.

There is no other god. If there were two unlimited beings how would you know which one was which? Where one started and the other began? If they had separate %beings+ they would not be unlimited.

### Other Thoughts

Why do people only take God's name in vain?

C.S. Lewis elegantly refutes two %arguments+ against God and religion, in use in 1943, and still in use today in his allegorical tale, %The Pilgrim's Regress.+

1. The %Spirit of the Age+(the world, culture, humanism, etc.) wishes to allow argument and to disallow it. Anyone who argues against politically correct positions of the day is merely rationalizing his own desires (being intolerant?) and doesn't need to be answered. But they themselves argue their position! If any reasoning is invalid, then their position is worthless as it was derived by reason. If reason has validity, then our case may be presented and has the possibility of being correct (and it is.)
2. A harder concept still, is the term %wish-fulfillment dream+, which the enemy wishes to use and not to use. This relates to psychology and our %dream+ that God exists because, in our weakness, we wish it was so. It then becomes reality to us. But, %Religion (God) is a wish-fulfillment dream, whose wishes does it fulfill?+ Do psychology, humanism, scientism, etc. wish that God exists? No. They wish He did not exist and thus they apply the concept of a wish-fulfillment dream backwards to themselves. This is self-refuting logic. They label us as God wishers in terms of wish-fulfillment dreams and they actually wish the opposite in order to sleep at night. Only one alternative is true.

---

%To the old maxim, %There are no atheists in foxholes,+ I would add a proverb of my own: %There are no relativists who expect to be treated relatively.+ %Josh McDowell, %Right from Wrong+