



Part One – Science and Morality

By

Mark McGee

Chapters

<i>Introduction</i>	3
<i>Questions</i>	9
<i>Science</i>	16
<i>Design</i>	16
<i>Fine-Tuning</i>	23
<i>Causality</i>	29
<i>Thermodynamics</i>	34
<i>Morality</i>	38

Introduction

[The following is a compilation of articles written for FaithandSelfDefense.com during 2012-2013]

So, you don't believe there's a God. I understand. I didn't believe in God either, until May of 1971. Most atheists I've talked with about the existence of God during the last 40 years have expressed their concern for me in one way or another. Some have asked if I was ill and on heavy medication at the time of my conversion. Others said I must have been a very poor atheist because good atheists don't believe in God. I was not ill or on medication at the time and people who knew me said I was a "good" atheist. Something happened that led me to look at various arguments for the existence of God, and once I looked I found something I had never seen before.

I was a journalist and radio talk show host in the late 60s and early 70s, so I was used to arguing with people. That's what talk show hosts did then—and still do. I enjoyed talking with people who believed in God because they were usually passionate about their belief. I was passionate in my belief as well, so it made for heated arguments over the airwaves (which was great for ratings!).

One day I interviewed a science professor on my program who presented some arguments that challenged my thinking about the existence of God. I asked a lot of questions and took many mental

notes. I was going to check on what he had to say. I spent several months investigating the “God” claim and finally came to a new conclusion that changed the direction of my life.

One of the reasons I didn’t believe in God at that time was because I couldn’t see Him, hear Him, talk with Him or touch Him. If I couldn’t test something with my physical senses, I seriously questioned its existence.

What I came across in my research brought me to an even more pointed question – “why is there something rather than nothing or something else?” Why is the universe the way it is? Why is it not something else or nothing else?

Cosmological Argument

That’s where the Cosmological Argument came in for me. I can see and hear things in the cosmos. The earth, sea and sky are things I can experience with my physical senses. I get the universe. It’s big, it’s there, and we’re part of it. We can see light waves and hear radio waves. We live on one of the small objects in the universe – the earth. We know the earth exists because we can see it, hear it, touch it, smell it and taste it. We can jump up and down on it. We can run around on it. It’s what’s under our feet. We can run our hands through the dirt and swim in the ocean.

We know meteors, asteroids and comets exist because we can see them in the sky. We can touch pieces of them that fall to the earth. I remember as a child standing on a large meteorite that had landed in a field long ago. We know the moon exists. We can see it from the earth and several members of the human race have actually stood on it and touched it. We know the planet Mars exists because we can see it and objects from earth have landed on Mars and sent back information that we can see and study. We've also sent deep space probes that have sent back pictures and other data to scientists on earth. We know stars exist because we can see them with our eyes and even better with telescopes. Space exploration has opened our understanding of many things about the existence of the universe and our solar system.

Questions I asked decades ago led to answers and some understanding of arguments for the existence of God. As I understand it the Cosmological Argument is basically that everything that had a beginning had a cause. The universe had a beginning, therefore the universe had a cause.

Other ways I've heard it explained are -

- "First, whatever begins to exist has a cause."
- "Everything begun must have an adequate cause. The universe was begun; therefore, the universe must have an adequate cause for its production."
- "Everything which has had a beginning was produced by a

sufficient cause. The Universe has had a beginning, and therefore must have had a cause sufficient to bring it into existence.”

I read that this is an old argument – dating back at least to the time of Plato and Aristotle. Each had his own view about a “first cause.” The argument is made that the existence of the cosmos requires an explanation and creation by a First Cause would explain it. Other philosophers have postulated their own view of the First Cause through the centuries, but I could see at least some logic to the idea based on the law of cause and effect (causality). It would seem that the universe was the “effect” of some “event.” So, what was the event that caused the universe? Could it be “God?”

Another idea I ran into is called the ‘Principle of Sufficient Reason’. I remember reading the various theories of Thales, Anaximenes, Anaximander, Spinoza, Leibniz and others to understand what they viewed as “sufficient reason.” The idea basically states that everything must have a reason or cause. In the cosmological realm it means there’s sufficient reason to accept that something or someone “caused” the cosmos.

The Cosmological Argument deals with both “cause” and “effect.” The cosmos exists, so it makes sense that there is an explanation for its existence. The argument continues that given the immense size and complexity of the cosmos, the “cause” of the cosmos would have to be greater than the cosmos itself.

My early response to the Cosmological Argument was “what caused the cause?” Makes sense. My experience, our experience, is in the physical universe. I did not create myself. I’m not alive today because I made myself a living being. I was conceived because of the biological facts of procreation. I was born and raised because my parents chose to give birth to me and raise me. I have a “cause” that I know well—my parents. The universe is alive and full of life. What was the cause of that life? What are the facts of its procreation, birth and development? Did the universe have a “parent?”

Here’s another question I considered. Could the cosmos create itself? Could something that didn’t exist create itself. It didn’t sound logical to me. How can something that doesn’t exist bring itself into existence? For that to happen the cosmos would have to both exist and not exist at the same time. That’s a contradiction I couldn’t accept as true.

Alright, another question. Could the cosmos be eternal? Many people believed that years ago, but too many scientific discoveries have thrown cold water on the idea—the Second Law of Thermodynamics being one of them. This irrefutable law of physics states that the cosmos, and everything in it, is running out of energy. How could a cosmos that loses energy and is slowly dying be eternal? That theory didn’t work either. If the universe was eternal, it would have lost all its energy in eternity past. That means the universe we think we see no longer exists because it already ran out of energy. If that’s true, then we’re not here. But, we are here, right?

Okay. So, that brings us back to what started the cosmos. What are our best choices? God? Big bang? Causal loops? Infinite causal chains? Something we haven't considered yet — the “unknown known?”

The Cosmological Argument got me started searching for answers to important questions—questions that had life-altering answers.

Questions

Atheists know that “changing sides” is against the code. Not many of us do that – change sides – but I did. Atheists have been asking me for the past 40+ years why I went from atheism to theism. It’s a fair question and why I’m writing this series of articles about what convinced me that God exists. I’m reaching back to those months before May 1971 when I made “the change” to demonstrate that what I did was both “reasonable” and “necessary.”

My belief about the origin of the universe was affected by a variety of theories. As a child of the mid-20th century, I heard about creation at church and about evolution at school. Many churches taught a blend of creationism and evolution (theistic evolution), so it was easy to move between what I was learning at church and learning at school. I don’t remember any conflicts. As a student of martial arts in my early teen years I learned about a variety of origin beliefs from China, Japan and India, but they were obviously mythological. Evolution became the most reasonable explanation to me, especially as atheism became my dominant belief system in my later teens.

I became a radio journalist after college and had the opportunity to have my own talk shows in addition to producing shows for other hosts. My atheistic worldview became an issue with many listeners, which led to some interesting discussions about the origin of the universe and life. I interviewed people from a variety of backgrounds

including atheists, agnostics, communists, witches, warlocks and satanists, but it was my interview with a science professor that led me to search for answers to questions I had not considered before.

The Cosmological Argument was interesting to me because it dealt with something I could see – the cosmos. I remember reading about many theories concerning the universe (e.g. Eternal Steady State, Big Bang, Static/Expanding, Oscillating). The Static and Steady State theories had been beaten up pretty well by the late 1960s and the Big Bang was growing in appeal. The discovery of Cosmic Microwave Background Radiation in the mid-60s gave support to the theory of an explosive, hot beginning to the universe. The idea of a “beginning” to the universe was sounding more plausible than an eternal cosmos.

However, I had not given serious consideration to a simple question: what existed before the “big bang?” That question bothered me as journalist. How could nothing become something? Especially if there was nothing to cause it to become something?

The science professor talked about how the Laws of Thermodynamics were in opposition to the theory of a “big bang” starting the universe. I looked it up and read about the First Law of Thermodynamics – “energy cannot be created or destroyed.” So, how could nothing (which has no energy) create something with energy? I also learned about the Second Law of Thermodynamics which deals with the efficiency of energy. It states that “the energy available after a chemical reaction is less than at the beginning of the reaction.”

Entropy was another way to understand the Second Law. It's the process of gradual decline from order to disorder. The concept of "heat death" in the universe comes from that Law of Thermodynamics.

I must admit that digging into sciences in 1971 was fascinating, which was interesting given my previous disinterest in science as a youth. Something about what the professor told me drove me to continue looking for answers to questions that seemed to rise continually in my mind.

The question about the beginning of the universe led to more questions — many of them about evolution. Evolution was something I had believed without question for as long as I could remember, but I was starting to have doubts.

I was taught as a child and youth that "science" had proven evolution, but had it really? Evolutionary science sounded good to me until I saw it challenged by "creation science." Some of the arguments led me to question what I had been taught.

Fossils: if evolution was true, where were all of the transitional fossils from millions of years of "evolving" from one species to another? Shouldn't scientists have easily found billions or trillions of "proof" fossils instead of a small number of "questionable" ones? Why so much emphasis on finding "missing links" when tens of millions of

years of living and dying creatures should have produced all the links necessary to prove evolution was true? Where were all the intermediate varieties that should be found everywhere? Shouldn't we find all kinds of fossils showing species in various stages of change? Shouldn't we see through the fossil record proof of every step of the creatures "evolving," especially in light of the length of time for macro-evolution to occur? You would think the earth would be filled with billions of tons of layers of these intermediate fossils that demonstrate gradual changes, but where are they?

Civilization: if evolution was true and humans began showing up in substantial numbers millions of years ago, why didn't civilizations begin much earlier than just thousands of years ago? Where are the "tells" of villages and cities from millions of years ago? Why are the oldest remains of human life and invention measured in thousands of years instead of millions? If evolution was true and humans learned a little more with each generation of gradual change, why don't we have proof of their experiments and knowledge that date hundreds of thousands of years (or millions of years) into the past? Why didn't written communication begin millions of years ago, or at least hundreds of thousands of years ago, instead of just "thousands" of years ago? Where's all the proof that humans evolved slowly and developed human skills over a very long period of time? The proof, as I was beginning to see it, was in favor of a more recent development of civilized skills. Did that also mean a more recent development of the humans who made up civilizations? Could it be that the beginning of the human race was thousands of years instead of millions of

years ago?

Sex: how did asexual organisms develop into sexual organisms? Asexual organisms would seem to have the advantage in an evolutionary world because all of them could reproduce. Sexual organisms would seem to have the disadvantage because only a fraction of them could actually reproduce another of its kind. It would seem that sexual males would be a wasted resource since they cannot birth one of their own. The difference in sex cell division between asexual species (mitosis) and sexual species (meiosis) seemed to also point to the greater efficiency of asexual over sexual. If evolution is the survival of the fittest, why would sexual species win over the asexual species? 100% of the asexual species were able to reproduce another one of their own. It seemed to me that evolution would have naturally selected asexual species as more efficient than sexual. Also, I wondered, where is the evidence of the gradual change from asexual to sexual in the fossil record? Shouldn't we see all of the experimental parts and pieces from the sexual development through the millions of years of evolution?

The science professor I interviewed on my talk show explained that evolution was naturalistic, self-contained, non-purposive, directional, irreversible, universal, and continuing. He said that special creation was different from evolution in that it was supernaturalistic, externally directed, purposive, and completed, but was similar to evolution in that it applies universally and is irreversibly directional. He said that

direction was downward toward lower levels of complexity and that the original creation, though perfect at the beginning, had been running down.

I wondered how creation would hold up under the light of the thermodynamic laws that gave evolution such a hard time. The professor said that creation actually predicted the First and Second Laws of Thermodynamics. He said the First Law proved that the universe did not create itself and that nothing in natural law could account for its own origin. He said the Second Law proved that the universe was moving from order to disorder and its energy was less available now than before. Given enough time, the universe would die a “heat death.” The professor added that the fact that the universe was not already dead was proof that it is not infinitely old.

The professor pointed out some of the major differences between evolution and special creation.

- Evolution – life evolved from non-life ... Creation – life came from life
- Evolution – galaxies changing ... Creation – galaxies constant
- Evolution – stars changing into other types ... Creation – stars unchanged
- Evolution – heavenly bodies building up ... Creation – heavenly bodies breaking down
- Evolution – rock formations different in different ages ... Creation – rock formations similar in all ages

- Evolution – natural selection is the creative process ... Creation – natural selection is the conservative process
- Evolution – mutations in organisms are beneficial ... Creation – mutations in organisms are harmful
- Evolution – new kinds of life appearing ... Creation – no new kinds of life appearing
- Evolution – man came from apes ... Creation – man created as man, no ape to human intermediates

He had my attention. Those are some big differences. However, the idea of the supernatural was not something I could easily accept as an atheist. I needed more proof. What could he and others possibly say that would convince me?

Science

Design

Having been an investigative journalist for many years I highly recommend returning to the beginning of an issue, crime, or whatever is your assignment before reporting about it. If not, you may miss the very thing that will turn your story in the direction of truth, which should be the objective of every journalist.

In that spirit I returned to Charles Darwin's *On The Origin of Species* when a creation scientist challenged evolution on my atheist radio talk show more than 40 years ago. I'm not sure if I had slept through some of the evolution classes in high school and college or just didn't understand what I was hearing, but I learned that Darwin had issues with his own theory.

"Long before the reader has arrived at this part of my work, a crowd of difficulties will have occurred to him. Some of them are so serious that to this day I can hardly reflect on them without being in some degree staggered; but, to the best of my judgment, the greater number are only apparent, and those that are real are not, I think, fatal to the theory." (On The Origin of Species, Chapter 6, Charles Darwin, 1859)

As I continued reading I was surprised to see that Darwin had struggled more than a century earlier with some of the same things I was struggling with at the beginning of the 1970s.

“These difficulties and objections may be classed under the following heads: First, why, if species have descended from other species by fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all nature in confusion, instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined?” (On The Origin of Species, Chapter 6, Charles Darwin, 1859)

An excellent question, Mr. Darwin. “Why is not all nature in confusion, instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined?” Darwin admitted that what he saw in the nature of species was “well defined.” As I learned more about the theory of Creation I heard about an argument that dealt with the subject of divine design called the Teleological Argument, the “argument from design.”

The concept of intelligent design and an intelligent designer is an ancient idea. The Sumerians had the four creator gods, Enki, Ninhursag, An, and Enlil. The Babylonians had Apsu, Tiamat, Mummu, and Marduk. The Egyptians had Atum, Khepri, Ptah, and Amun. The Hebrews had Yahweh. The Chinese had Pan Gu and Nu Wa. The Greeks had Chaos, Uranos, Gaia, and Erebus.

Greek philosophers like Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero debated the issue of design more than 2,000 years ago. Early Christian writers like the Apostle Paul, Augustine, and Thomas Aquinas also argued for intelligent design. So, what is intelligent design?

Plato wrote this about what leads men to believe “in the Gods.”

“One is the argument about the soul, which has been already mentioned—that it is the eldest, and most divine of all things, to which motion attaining generation gives perpetual existence; the other was an argument from the order of the motion of the stars, and of all things under the dominion of the mind which ordered the universe.” (Laws, Book 12, Plato, 360 BC, Benjamin Jowett, Translator)

In Plato’s “Timaeus,” Socrates asks Timaeus about “calling upon the Gods.” In his answer, Timaeus says this about the Creator:

“Now everything that becomes or is created must of necessity be created by some cause, for without a cause nothing can be created. The work of the creator, whenever he looks to the unchangeable and fashions the form and nature of his work after an unchangeable pattern, must necessarily be made fair and perfect; but when he looks to the created only, and uses a

created pattern, it is not fair or perfect. Was the heaven then or the world, whether called by this or by any other more appropriate name-assuming the name, I am asking a question which has to be asked at the beginning of an enquiry about anything-was the world, I say, always in existence and without beginning? or created, and had it a beginning? Created, I reply, being visible and tangible and having a body, and therefore sensible; and all sensible things are apprehended by opinion and sense and are in a process of creation and created. Now that which is created must, as we affirm, of necessity be created by a cause. But the father and maker of all this universe is past finding out; and even if we found him, to tell of him to all men would be impossible.” (Timaeus, Plato, 360 BC, Benjamin Jowett, Translator)

Johannes Kepler, sometimes referred to as “the first theoretical astrophysicist,” was a leading mathematician and astronomer in the late 16th and early 17th centuries in Germany. He was well known for his laws of planetary motion. This is how he viewed the science of astronomy.

“I was merely thinking God’s thoughts after him. Since we astronomers are priests of the highest God in regard to the book of nature, it benefits us to be thoughtful, not of the glory of our minds, but rather, above all else, of the glory of God.” (Johannes Kepler, 1571-1630)

Sir Isaac Newton, Professor of Mathematics at Cambridge University and famous for making many scientific discoveries during the 17th and 18th centuries, wrote this about the origin of the universe.

“This most beautiful system of the sun, planets, and comets could only proceed from the counsel and dominion of an intelligent and powerful Being. And if the fixed stars are the centers of other like systems, these, being formed by the like wise counsel, must be all subject to the dominion of One, especially since the light of the fixed stars is of the same nature with the light of the sun and from every system light passes into all the other systems; and lest the systems of the fixed stars should, by their gravity, fall on each other mutually, he hath placed those systems at immense distances from one another.”
(General Scholium to the Principia. Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy, Sir Isaac Newton, 1713)

Another explanation of intelligent design came from **William Paley** in the early 19th Century in answer to Scottish philosopher David Hume. Paley wrote this in his *Natural Theology*.

“In crossing a heath, suppose I pitched my foot against a stone, and were asked how the stone came to be there; I might possibly answer, that, for anything I knew to the contrary, it had lain there forever: nor would it perhaps be very easy to show

*the absurdity of this answer. But suppose I had found a watch upon the ground, and it should be inquired how the watch happened to be in that place; I should hardly think of the answer I had before given, that for anything I knew, the watch might have always been there. (...) There must have existed, at some time, and at some place or other, an artificer or artificers, who formed [the watch] for the purpose which we find it actually to answer; who comprehended its construction, and designed its use. (...) Every indication of contrivance, every manifestation of design, which existed in the watch, exists in the works of nature; with the difference, on the side of nature, of being greater or more, and that in a degree which exceeds all computation.” (William Paley, *Natural Theology*, 1802)*

An atheist astronomer and mathematician from England was one of the first people to give the Intelligent Design theory its name. **Fred Hoyle** gave the Omni Lecture at London's Royal Institution in 1982 and titled it *Evolution from Space*. It was later published as a book with the same title. Here's a portion from the book where Hoyle addresses "intelligent design."

“... The difference between an intelligent ordering, whether of words, fruit boxes, amino acids, or the Rubik cube, and merely random shufflings can be fantastically large, even as large as a number that would fill the whole volume of Shakespeare's plays with its zeros. So if one proceeds directly and straightforwardly

in this matter, without being deflected by a fear of incurring the wrath of scientific opinion, one arrives at the conclusion that biomaterials with their amazing measure or order must be the outcome of intelligent design. No other possibility I have been able to think of in pondering this issue over quite a long time seems to me to have anything like as high a possibility of being true.” (Evolution from Space (The Omni Lecture), pg. 28, Fred Hoyle, Enslow Publishers, 1982).

Even though I was not familiar with the term “intelligent design” in 1971, the **Teleological Argument** was well known. Webster’s Dictionary defined *teleology* as “the study of evidences of design in nature.” That intrigued me – the study of “evidences of design” in nature. What were the evidences of design in nature? One of them is called “Cosmic Fine-Tuning” and we’ll look at that in detail next time.

Fine-Tuning

I was comfortable as an atheist. I could do anything I wanted to do (or could get away with) and laugh at the masses of people stuck in the merry-go-round of belief in a “higher power.” I laughed at them privately, with friends, and publicly on my radio talk show. So, it came as quite a surprise when I heard that **science might support creation** of the heavens and the earth by “God.” That was stuff of my childhood, certainly nothing to concern myself as an informed adult, but there it was staring me in the face – creation science.

In the early 1970s people like Dr. John Meyer of the University of Louisville (Physiology and Biophysics), Dr. Malcolm Cutchins of Auburn University (Aerospace Engineering), Dr. Kenneth Cummings with the U.S. Consultants Fisheries Service in LaCrosse, Wisconsin (Research Biologist), Dr. Thomas Barnes of the University of Texas, El Paso (Physics), Dr. David Boylan of Iowa State University (Dean, College of Engineering), Dr. Arthur Wilder-Smith of the University of Illinois Medical School Center, University of Geneva School of Medicine, and University of Bergen School of Medicine (Doctorates in Physical Organic Chemistry and Pharmacological Sciences), and Dr. Edward Blick of the University of Oklahoma (Aerospace, Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering) were supporting creationism using science as evidence. I found that very interesting since my observation of Christians at the time was they were not educated nor informed in the “sciences.”

The man who introduced me to the fact that many scientists believed in creation had been a professor of Civil Engineering at Rice University in the 1940s and had received his Ph.D. in Hydraulic Engineering at the University of Minnesota. Dr. Henry Morris taught at several universities during the 1950s and 60s and helped start the Creation Research Society in the early 60s. He co-wrote *The Genesis Flood* with Dr. John Whitcomb, which included his belief in the literal interpretation of the world-wide cataclysmic flood that killed all life on earth except for those who rode out the flood in the Ark built by Noah and his sons. Thus, the reason for Dr. Morris' visit to Florida as he prepared to search for the Ark on Mt. Ararat. All of this seemed ridiculous to me, so I invited Dr. Morris to appear on my radio show in a special two-hour edition where we would dig into the claims of a creator God who destroyed most life on the planet with water.

One of Dr. Morris' evidences about creationism was the "fine-tuning" of the universe. By that he meant the earth was the only physical place in the universe capable of sustaining higher forms of life. Dr. Morris pointed to the earth's unique hydrosphere, atmosphere, and lithosphere as some of the evidence for that, along with the position of the earth in its distance from the sun and how the earth's moon and other planets and moons in our solar system orbited the sun in a way that benefited life on earth and served as a protective shield to most of the damaging elements hurtling through space.

One of the evidences presented by scientists who believe in creation is known as “fine-tuning.” Dr. Lawrence Henderson of Harvard College and Harvard Medical School wrote about the concept of fine-tuning a century ago in his book *The Fitness of the Environment* (1913). Other scientists who made scientific discoveries used in the development of the theory of fine-tuning (prior to 1971) included Dr. Hermann Weyl of ETH Zurich (where he was a colleague of Albert Einstein) and Princeton University (Mathematical Physics), Sir Arthur Eddington of the University of Cambridge (Astrophysics), Nobel Prize winner (Physics) Dr. Paul Dirac of the University of Cambridge, University of Miami, and Florida State University, Dr. Carl Brans of Princeton University and Loyola University (Mathematical Physics), and Dr. Robert Dicke of Princeton University (Physics, Astrophysics, Atomic Physics).

The idea of fine-tuning, as was explained to me, is that of the universe being fine-tuned for life. Could the universe be so highly tuned for life that the earth was the only place in the universe that could support life? What had we learned from our exploration of the universe through powerful telescopes straining to see as far as many miles and light years as possible? Did we see other planets supporting life? NASA had launched many rockets into space by 1971 looking for signs of life. Did we have “proof of life” in another part of our galaxy or the universe? Not to say that space exploration wouldn't find life out there somewhere, someday, but it seemed at the time as if we were alone in the universe.

Some of the “large number coincidences” (also known as large numbers hypothesis) were extraordinary in the study of the universe. I traced it back to the early part of the 20th century to something Dr. Hermann Weyl wrote – “the ratio of the electron radius to the electron’s gravitational radius is of the order of 10^{40} . The ratio of the electron radius to the world radius may be of similar proportions” (H. Weyl. 1919. *Ann. der Physik* S9129). Eddington, Dirac, and Dicke built on Weyl’s idea of coincidences between extremely large numbers from different origins. Were those coincidences because of the slow change of evolution or something more purposeful?

As an atheist who gladly accepted evolution as the “truth,” I did not believe there was any purpose to life. Why would there be any purpose to billions of years of evolution with its slow process of “natural” selection? There wasn’t. I had no purpose. People I knew had no purpose. The world I lived in had no purpose. I was the product of a more highly evolved life form and could use lower life forms to my advantage. I could also take advantage of similar life forms, but at a certain risk of other life forms taking advantage of me. It was a bit tricky, but I was figuring it out as I went along.

But what if there was a life form that was much higher than humans? What if that higher life form existed in another dimension than the one we experienced? What if that higher life form made demands on humans even as humans made demands on lower life forms? What if that higher life form had created lower life forms for a purpose? If so, what was the purpose? Was it to take advantage of us in the

same way we took advantage of other life forms? Or something else?

I had never looked at life in that way before. Things were so simple in my world. Eat, grow, dominate, reproduce, lose strength and ability to dominate, die. Things only became difficult if something or someone tried to keep me from eating, growing, dominating, and reproducing. Get in my way and I'll shut you down. That was my basic belief about life at the time. The possibility of something greater than the human race making demands on us got my attention in a big way.

The process of researching something in 1971 was different than today. There was no publicly-accessible Internet, no cable TV with hundreds of channels filled with information, no smart phones and tablets with apps, no personal computers with quick and easy access to the vast online libraries of the world, and no email. If you wanted to research something you spent hours at a library, or purchased books and other materials at bookstores or ordered them through catalogs. I spent a lot of time at libraries.

The more I read, the more I wondered if I had missed something – something big. What if I was wrong? What if the universe was so finely tuned that evolution could not have done it? What if a “higher life form” had designed and created the universe with a purpose? If so, how could I know the purpose? It was an important time in my life. I sensed I was at a crossroads. I didn't know what it would mean for my life, but I needed to know the truth. Something was pulling me to

figure it out.

Would the argument of a finely-tuned universe be enough to change my mind about the existence of God? If that was the only evidence for the existence of God, it might not have been enough. However, there were many more arguments to come. More about those next time.

Causality

I've already shared how the **Cosmological** and **Teleological** arguments affected my thinking as an atheist, but they weren't enough on their own to convince me there's a God. God knew that and had more strong arguments to come. One of them is known as the **Law of Causality**.

- Causality is the relationship between an event (the cause) and a second event (the effect), where the second event is understood as a consequence of the first.
- The law of causality states that every material effect must have an adequate antecedent cause.
- If every material effect has an adequate antecedent cause, and if the Universe is a material effect, then the Universe had a cause.

As it was explained to me the Law of Causality is a fundamental principle of science. Science is a search for causes. That's what scientists do; they search for causes. In the Science of Physics this search for causes is known as Causality – describing the relationship between cause and effect. We see this law all around us – gravity, for instance. Gravity is a force that attracts objects toward the earth. Gravity is the cause – force and weight are effects of the cause. If I jump out of a tree and there is nothing between the tree limb and the

ground, we all know what will happen. I will hit the ground at a force determined by mathematics and physics. If I am standing on the ground and step onto a scale, gravity will act upon my body in such a way as to reflect a certain weight on the scale. If I am standing on the moon, the gravitational force on the earth has little effect on me. Instead, the gravitational force on the moon will determine my weight – which will be substantially less.

The Law of Causality is also a fundamental principle of journalism. When something happens, whether good or bad, journalists ask several basic questions which are based on the law of cause and effect: who, what, where, when, why and how. Journalists ask those questions because that process leads to answers to fundamental questions of interest. Who shot the sheriff? Who died in the fire? Who won the spelling bee? Who did people elect to be our next mayor?

The Law of Causality – relationship between an event (cause) and a second event (the effect), where the second event is understood as a consequence of the first.

- We know someone shot the sheriff because the sheriff was shot.
- We know someone died in a fire because there was a fire, a body was found in the fire, and the medical examiner determined that the fire was the cause of death.
- We know someone won the spelling bee because a spelling bee was held and there was a winner.
- We know someone will be our next mayor because an election for

mayor was held, voters cast their ballots, and one of the candidates won the election.

Simple, but profound. Most of us know things happened because something “caused” them to happen. It’s logical. It makes sense. That’s the Law of Causality.

The Bible is filled with examples of the Law of Causality – the science of cause and effect. Take Hebrews 3 for example -

“Therefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, Christ Jesus, who was faithful to Him who appointed Him, as Moses also was faithful in all His house. For this One has been counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as He who built the house has more honor than the house. For every house is built by someone, but He who built all things is God. And Moses indeed was faithful in all His house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which would be spoken afterward, but Christ as a Son over His own house, whose house we are if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm to the end.” Hebrews 3:1-6

The Law of Causality – “For every house is built by someone.” When I drive through a neighborhood and see house after house after house in row after row after row on street after street after street, I know that somebody built those houses. I don’t wonder how those houses got there. It’s not a mystery to me. I know someone built them because they were built.

The Law of Causality – “but He who built all things is God.” When I look at the earth and the sea and the sky and the moon and the sun and the stars, I know that someone built them. I don’t wonder how the earth and sea and sky and moon and sun and stars got there. I know Someone built them because they were built. I believe that Someone is the Creator God. The Apostle Paul said it so well – “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.” (Romans 1:20) Paul made a statement of logical cause and effect. Another way I’ve seen it explained is –

- Since the Universe exhibits design, it must have had a Designer
- Since it exhibits intelligence, the Designer must have been intelligent
- Since it exhibits life, the Designer must have been living
- Since it exhibits morality, the Designer must have been moral.

But, atheists will argue, what does the Law of Causality have to do with proving the existence of God? Go back to the first step in the **Cosmological Argument** - "First, whatever begins to exist has a cause." Atheists will use the Law of Causality to argue that God cannot exist because He would have to have a cause. But read it again – "every material effect must have an adequate antecedent cause." Two things – 1. God does not need a cause because He did not have a beginning, 2. God does not have to have an adequate antecedent cause because He is not material. The existence of God cannot be explained away by any true law of science because God established all scientific laws. And because God established all scientific laws when He "built all things," He will be found in those laws by those who do not suppress the truth of those laws.

Thermodynamics

I used to trust in science for answers to my questions about the universe, the earth, and life. That's what I learned in school and it seemed to be a solid way of thinking and living. However, even though I trusted science for information about life, I knew little about science. So, when I heard that science might support belief in the existence of God I wanted to know more. Even though I was an atheist, I was a journalist and searching out the truth is what a journalist does – wherever truth takes them.

Dr. Morris spoke about the **Laws of Thermodynamics** and its importance to understanding origins. Thermodynamics is the “physics that deals with the mechanical action or relations of heat” (*Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary*, 1991).

The history of Thermodynamics as a scientific discipline goes back to the 17th century, but took off in the 19th century with scientists like Sadi Carnot, William Rankine, Rudolf Clausius, Emile Clapeyron, and William Thomson.

I learned that there are four basic laws or principles for Thermodynamics – starting with Zeroth and moving to the First, Second and Third Laws. What I remember learning was that the total amount of energy in the universe is constant and though it can change from one form to another, it cannot be created or destroyed. Dr. Morris called it the “principle of conservation.”

What I found most interesting was the **Second Law of Thermodynamics** which states that disorder increases (also known as the Law of Increased Entropy). Dr. Morris called it the “principle of disintegration.” While the quantity of energy remains the same (First Law), the quality of energy deteriorates gradually over time (Second Law). Entropy increases as usable energy decreases and unusable energy increases. That leads to an increase in disorganization, randomness and chaos. Dr. Morris believed the Second Law of Thermodynamics disproved “evolution.”

“The very terms themselves express contradictory concepts. The word “evolution” is of course derived from a Latin word meaning “out-rolling”. The picture is of an outward-progressing spiral, an unrolling from an infinitesimal beginning through ever broadening circles, until finally all reality is embraced within. “Entropy,” on the other hand, means literally “in-turning.” It is derived from the two Greek words en (meaning “in”) and trope (meaning “turning”). The concept is of something spiraling inward upon itself, exactly the opposite concept to “evolution.” Evolution is change outward and upward, entropy is change inward and downward.” (Evolution, Thermodynamics, and Entropy, by Henry Morris, Ph.D., icr.org)

So, what does this have to do with proving the existence of God? I was taught in high school and college that the universe is eternal and infinite. However, I learned from a study of the Second Law of

Thermodynamics that energy deteriorates over time. If the universe was truly eternal, it would have already run out of energy and we would not exist. Since the universe is running out of energy every second but still has energy left for heat and work in our universe, it goes to prove that it had a beginning.

Evolutionists were not sitting idly by as the Laws of Thermodynamics were being discussed by theists as proof for God's existence. For example, biologist Harold Blum wrote in the early 1950's about reconciling the Second Law of Thermodynamics with organic evolution (*Time's Arrow and Evolution*, Princeton University Press, 1951). Even earlier than Blum was Dr. Alfred Lotka, who wrote *Elements of Physical Biology* in 1924 dealing with **evolutionary thermodynamics**. The 1965 article by Jack Kirkaldy, *Thermodynamics of Terrestrial Evolution*, is also good to read for background.

Other arguments I remember that opposed the idea of the Second Law of Thermodynamics disproving evolution were:

- Exceptions to the Second Law are possible because it's only a statistical statement
- Second Law doesn't apply to living systems
- Second Law doesn't apply to open systems
- Second Law doesn't apply to other parts of the universe

The Laws of Thermodynamics did not prove to me that God exists, but were a strong argument that the universe had a beginning. Interestingly, the Bible starts with that very point – “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” (Genesis 1:1) Dr. Morris and other scientists who believed in God used the Laws of Thermodynamics as part of their argument for the existence of God. If God did not Create the heavens and the earth, what did? What started everything? I was pointed to these words from the ancient Bible to answer that question - “By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen were not made of things which are visible.” (Hebrews 11:3)

Morality

As an atheist I cared little for “morality.” In fact, how others saw morality was often something I had to overcome to get what I wanted out of life. So, when Christians who talked with me about the existence of God brought up the “law of morality,” it wasn’t something I was interested in discussing – at first.

I later learned that the moral argument for the existence of God is based on generally accepted points of morality within societies. It is based on the premise of moral normativity – the awareness of civilized human beings that some actions are right while others are wrong. Here are three ways I’ve heard to state the Moral Argument:

- Some aspect of Morality is observed
 - Belief in God provides a better explanation of this feature than various alternatives
 - Therefore, to the extent that (1) is accepted, belief in God is preferable to these alternatives
-
- If God does not exist, objective moral values do not exist
 - Objective moral values do exist
 - Therefore, God exists

- Every law has a law giver
- There is a Moral Law
- Therefore, there is a Moral Law Giver

Why do people have moral conflicts if morality does not exist? If people have moral conflicts, then morality exists. Without morality, there is no moral conflict. People do have moral conflicts, so morality exists. The word “morality” comes from the Latin *moralitas* (“manner, character, proper behavior”) and is concerned with the principles of right and wrong behavior and the goodness or badness of human character.

Moral codes have existed for thousands of years – Adamic Code ... Noahic Code ... Egyptian Code of Ma’at ... Babylonian Code of Hammurabi ... Hebrew Law of Moses ... Greek Moral Code ... Chinese Code of Confucius ... Roman Code of Morality ... Christ’s Sermon on the Mount. The long history of moral codes demonstrates that people and societies are aware and sufficiently concerned about morality to define and codify it for the good of the social majority. These and other codes of morality have governed the populations of numerous civilizations as far back as evidence of the written word to explain them.

I was a child in the late 1940s and '50s and teenager and young adult in the '60s. The changes in morality during those years were amazing. How did we go from the strong moral values following World War II to the relativism of the 1960s? What was absolutely true in 1948 was not necessarily true in 1968. How can that happen in just 20 years? Doesn't it take generations before morality shifts?

Atheism has been around for a long time, but it came of age during the 20th century. I wrote in another article about the impact the writings of [Bertrand Russell](#) had on me as a teenager and young man. Another influence was Joseph Fletcher. Fletcher was an ordained Episcopal priest who taught Christian Ethics at Episcopal Divinity School and Harvard Divinity School – and Medical Ethics at the University of Virginia. He later said he was an atheist. Fletcher wrote a book called *“Situation Ethics: The New Morality”* in 1966. I was in college at the time and was already attracted to atheism. Fletcher's book and its presentation about morals and values supported what I was thinking and practicing.

Situation ethics attempts to remove the concept of absolutes in the areas of morals and values. Instead of following the directives of an absolute moral law, situation ethics determines morality and value based on the “situation.” Situation ethics said that moral principles can sometimes be cast aside if love is best served to do so in certain situations. Fletcher believed that the only law that was absolute was *agape* love and that all other laws could and should be set aside to achieve the greatest amount of that love.

As a budding atheist I liked some aspects of Fletcher's situation ethics. It fit very well with my desire to do whatever I thought was right for me. I became the definer of right and wrong for my own life. I determined what love was and did as I pleased. Situation ethics is very appealing to the sin nature. I had been raised in churches where moral law was taught continually. My desire to sin free of guilt and consequence responded to Fletcher's view of no absolutes in life – no absolute truth, no absolute right or wrong, no absolute values, no absolute standards – everything is relative – or so they say.

The fact is people like Fletcher do believe in absolute truth, values and standards – theirs. They believe they are absolutely right and anyone who disagrees is absolutely wrong. I know that from my own pre-Christian thinking. I didn't want anyone stepping on my rights, but I didn't mind stepping on theirs because they didn't have any rights – or so I thought.

Ask an atheist what they think about someone killing a member of their family. Since they believe everything is relative and situational, shouldn't they embrace other people's right to kill, maim, kidnap, rob and rape if they believe the attackers have a right to do what's right for them? If someone who espouses situation ethics had a loved one or best friend on one of the planes that Muslim extremists flew into the Twin Towers in New York City, or the Pentagon, or the field in Pennsylvania, do you think they would say what the extremists did was fine since they (the extremists) did what they believed was the

right thing for them to do? Since there are no absolute truths or right or wrong or values or standards – since everything is relative and based on the situation from the perspective of each individual – what the Muslim extremists did was good for them and their cause and therefore okay to do. Right? Of course not – and I dare say it would be difficult to find atheists who would embrace people who murdered, maimed or raped their loved ones.

There is something inside of most people that tells them violence against humanity is wrong. As an atheist I would talk a good talk about situational ethics and amorality, but I would defend friends and family against anyone who attempted to harm them. I viewed defending people I cared about as a duty, even though I didn't want anyone to stop me from doing what I wanted to do – even if they thought what I was doing was wrong.

The journey from **atheism** to **theism** is different for each person who makes it. My journey began with science, then made a turn onto the path of ethics and morality. Webster's Dictionary defines **ethics** as "the discipline dealing with what is good and bad and with moral duty and obligation." Webster's defines **morality** as "a moral discourse, statement, or lesson, a doctrine or system of moral conduct." Webster's Learner's Dictionary defines morality as "beliefs about what is right behavior and what is wrong behavior, the degree to which something is right and good, the moral goodness or badness of something."

As an atheist I would have argued that I was an ethical person. For example, I believed strongly in journalistic ethics and in ethical behavior as it impacted news coverage and the First Amendment. But what was the source of my ethics and ethical behavior? Did that source of ethics affect my personal life? No. I bent personal ethics to suit my selfish interests. What was the source of that behavior? same source? different source? no source?

Was it ethical to lie, cheat, steal, murder? Maybe, I thought, depending on the “situation.” **Situation ethics** became a mantra for me as an atheist. It fit my belief system well and allowed me to do whatever I wanted to do, without a sense of guilt. I didn’t believe in an absolute moral law or a moral law “giver,” so there was no penalty unless someone imposed their morality on me through some system of penalties that were too big for me to overcome (e.g. traffic laws, state and federal laws).

Having been an atheist and knowing many atheists through the years, I recognize that all atheists are not alike – even as all theists are not alike. I’ve known atheists who were more ethical in their thinking and behavior than I was and some who were less ethical. The issue is not quantity, but quality. What is the quality or source of one’s morality? Is it objective or subjective? situational? relational? revelational? Is there a “right” and “wrong” in every situation in life?

any situation? If so, is it an absolute? a law that must be followed? If so, who says? or can it be different from one person to another, one couple to another, one family to another, one tribe to another, one nation to another? Can we differ in our definition of what is moral and immoral? right and wrong? Is what is right for you necessarily right for me? Should I have to bow to your ethical will? or am I free to determine my own moral course and follow that path to its eventual end?

I was not comfortable discussing morality with Christians. I didn't like their brand of ethics. I liked mine much better. Christian ethics with their absolutism of "God's Law" did not fit my lifestyle nor way of thinking. My "wanter" wanted to do whatever I wanted to do. I didn't want to check my desires at anybody's door. I was an atheist, a free thinker, a free man – or so I thought.

I was a moral relativist – all truth was relative. Ethical subjectivism best described my beliefs and lifestyle. There were no objective moral truths or values. Morality changed based on my interests, needs and circumstances. I didn't want anyone questioning me about my morals. Nobody had the right to judge me. I could think what I wanted to think, believe what I wanted to believe, and do what I wanted to do.

However, a couple of Christians I got to know challenged my thinking about moral relativism by saying it was "self-defeating" (self-refuting). I said that all truth was relative, but they asked me if that was true. I said it was, but they then asked me how I could make a true

statement if all truth was relative. How could I know truth if everyone had their own truth and those 'truths' differed in content and scope? What if my truth was not THE truth? What if I was wrong? What if my belief system was really false? They pointed out that my belief system about truth and morality was flawed by its inconsistency.

My new Christian friends had the ability to challenge my thinking without challenging me as a person. Instead of making me defensive, their friendly challenges got me thinking. How could I make the absolute claim that all truth is relative if I didn't believe in absolutes? Good question. If there is no truth, how can I know if what I believe is true? What is truth?

People often don't think much about what they think. I was like that. I thought right and wrong were what I said they were, but how could that be true if millions of other people thought the opposite was true? Who gets to choose what's right or wrong? Is anybody right or does "might" make right? Is it the strongest person, group of people or military power that wins the right to decide what's right until a stronger opponent rips that right away from them? How does that make anything right? If there is no right, then what right do we have to demand any rights?

Civilized people are thought to be civilized because they advance in areas of social development. That includes believing in the rights of a people to have rights. But if there is no absolute right or wrong, how

can we know if we're civilized? Is civilization even possible if nothing is right or wrong? good or evil? moral or immoral? Situational ethics quickly becomes a slippery slope.

Children don't need to be taught that they have rights. That seems to be inborn. Wanting what we want when we want it is a natural response to our environment. What seems to be unnatural (i.e. against our nature) is bowing to the rights of others (e.g. sharing). If you have children or are around children, you understand how that works. Children want what they have and they want what you or another child has. They will scream and cry if someone takes away what they believe is theirs, but have no problem taking what another child believes is theirs. If you tell them to stop, they go. If you tell them to go, they stop. If you tell them to come, they leave. If you tell them not to touch something, they touch it. We are born with a selfish nature. If there are no absolutes, no moral law, how does a family work? If everyone is selfish and does what is right in their own eyes, how can any group of people be civilized?

Parents are the first moral law children face in their lives. Parents teach their boys and girls the rules of the household. If a child breaks house rules, they learn something about penalties for breaking the law. My generation remembers spankings and loss of privileges. Though spankings have gone out of style for many modern parents, moms and dads are still finding ways to impose their will on their little ones. Most parents believe it's important for their children to learn how to follow a system of social rules. What those rules are can vary

from family to family, but most still see the need for rules – especially when multiple children are in a family. Rules can protect life and limb of younger siblings.

Understanding how a family works, or should work, gives us some insight into how a society works. We don't want our children purposely hurting other members of the family. We don't want our neighbors purposely hurting us. We don't want our children stealing from each other. We don't want our neighbors stealing from us. Our desire for personal safety becomes a desire for family safety when we marry and have children. Our desire for family safety becomes a desire for societal safety as we understand that families are members of a larger community. If I want to be safe and secure in my life and the life of my family, I need to support laws of behavior that bring safety and security to the community. Over time that desire translates into laws for regions, states and nations.

I viewed morality as someone's opinion. You have an opinion and so do I. I have as much right to my opinion as you do to your opinion. If our opinions disagree, well, that's your opinion.

My new friends shared a different view of morality. They believed that morals are not personal opinions, but behavior responding to objective truth. We talked about that for hours, day after day, week after week. I did not move from subjective morality to objective morality quickly or easily, but I did move.

I began to see that my core belief was based on objective morality and that I could not hold to relativism as a viable way of living. Relativism, whether played out culturally or conventionally, or as I did subjectively, could not work in the real world. If everyone did whatever they wanted to do based on their definition of right or wrong, it would lead to chaos. In fact, relativism had already accomplished that throughout the history of the world.

The big question then became “who” would decide objective morality? Who? If God did not exist, then who would decide the difference between right and wrong? We’ll look into that question in the next part of this story about how and why an atheist became a theist.

If you asked me when I was an atheist what I thought about serial killers, I would have said they were terrible people. If you asked me what I thought about child abusers, same answer – terrible people. If you asked me what I thought about my doing whatever I wanted to do even if other people thought it was wrong, different answer. What I did was my business. However, that came with a built-in problem.

One of the Christians I was talking with at the time called my thinking “every man doing whatever is right in his own eyes.” That sounded good to me on the surface, but he asked me what I thought about a man doing whatever was right in his own eyes if doing that meant

hurting me or someone I loved? I didn't like that, but how could I argue against it if the other person had the same attitude I did about right and wrong? What happens when what's right for me bumps into what's right for you?

As an atheist I was beginning to see a problem with "my way" morality. I wanted what I wanted, but so did most everyone else. What if other people wanted something I didn't want and what they wanted affected me negatively? I didn't care that what I wanted affected them negatively, but I did care about what they did to me and mine. That's a problem if morality is "relative." What I believe is right for me may be wrong for someone else and what they believe is right for them may be wrong for me. So, who wins that argument?

Back to serial killers and child abusers ... if someone asked me as an atheist why I thought they were terrible people, how would I answer and what would be the basis of my answer? If morality is subjective and relative, who's to say that killing lots of people is a bad thing to do or that abusing children is wrong? Good question. But what's the answer?

I knew some things were wrong and some things were right without even thinking about it. It was right to help someone in need. It was wrong to take advantage of someone in need. Where did that come from? As a journalist I knew that someone convicted of murder should receive an appropriate sentence, but why did I think that? Was

it just because I had grown up in a culture that believed murder was wrong and that murderers should be punished? If I had been raised in another culture that believed murder was right and that murderers should be rewarded, would I have thought differently?

Some people would say, yes, morality is **cultural**. But how does that work if someone murders me? Should they be rewarded for doing that? Is that right? What happens when cultures clash? One culture believes murder is wrong and the other culture believes murder is right. Which culture is right and which is wrong? Or can there be a “right” and “wrong” in a culturally “relative” world? Relativism believes that cultures/societies decide what’s right and wrong within their culture. There is no such thing as a “universal” truth. Everything is relative. So, how does that work for everyone?

What about sub-cultures? I covered gangs as a reporter and some gang cultures believe that murder is honorable. Some even include murder as part of initiation rights to become a member of the gang. Since their culture believes murder is right, are they wrong to kill someone from another gang sub-culture that believes it’s wrong for anyone to kill them? Which sub-culture is right? What happens when gang sub-cultures collide within a larger, general culture that believes gang sub-cultures are wrong? Is the general culture wrong to force their morality on the sub-culture?

I began to see a crack in relativism because of its perspective of **ethical subjectivism**; where morality was nothing more than personal opinion. Cultural relativism leads to sub-cultural relativism and finally individual relativism. Where does that end? **Nihilism?**

Another problem was with **moral neutrality**; the belief that no one should force anyone to believe any particular thing. Everyone has the right to do what's right in their own eyes. I still didn't believe in God, but I could see that the relativism I held so dear was a two-edged sword and could easily turn on me.

The Christians I was talking with presented morality as **objective**. They believed morality was universal and came from an authority greater than human opinions and personal and cultural desires. They believed true morality came from a moral authority greater than any human mechanism. They believed that authority could only be **God**; a Being with perfect knowledge and wisdom about the human condition who could determine the best way for people to live successfully. They also believed that the best way God could impact the human race for morality was with commandments rather than suggestions, because humanity would choose poorly unless directed by God's wisdom because of their tendency toward doing what they wanted (selfishness) rather than what was right.

They went on to explain that when God created humans He placed in their hearts and minds a knowledge of His law so that even their conscience was a witness to what was right and wrong. They said that even people who had never heard about God had this moral sense within them; thus making morality **universal**. They also said that because of humanity's tendency toward sinning, God's ultimate answer to our problem was to send His Son, Jesus Christ, to die for our sins and to be raised for our "justification" (being placed in a right relationship with a merciful and forgiving God).

All of that had the sound of "religion" to me, so I needed to back away and think about it for awhile. I could see their point about moral relativism being "self-defeating." Moral relativists, like myself, said there was no absolute or objective moral truth. However, that statement was a "truth" statement which was not necessarily true if there was no absolute truth. So, what was true? Objective morality or subjective morality? How could we ever know truth if truth is relative? I began to see problems with that method of thinking. I was a journalist and believed in "finding the truth" in every story, but if there was no absolute truth how could I report "the truth?"

Where do you go with that kind of thinking? The more I thought about it, the worse it got. What do you do when that happens? Stop thinking about it? But the problem for me was that for some reason I believed truth existed. Somewhere deep inside me I believed there were things that were true and things that were false – things that were right and things that were wrong. That collided with my desire to live

my life any way I wanted to live it.

What if the way I was living my life was wrong? What if there was a right way to live and I wasn't living that way? What if these Christians were right and what I was feeling inside was a universal sense of morality put there by a Being who was older, bigger and wiser than humans? What if that Being expected me to live my life according to a particular moral command?

If I really believed in moral relativism, that there is no objective morality, why did I hide some of my actions from people in my life? Why should it matter what someone thought if there were no absolutes? Where did my feelings of guilt come from? Atheists weren't supposed to feel guilty about anything, so why was I having those feelings? Was it because of what these Christians were saying or because what they were saying was stirring up something real inside of me?

I had lots of questions and concerns about these issues of morality, a moral law and a moral lawgiver. These were questions and concerns I had not experienced before as an atheist. I was definitely uncomfortable talking about morality because I was seeing major flaws in relativism. Self-defeating, circular thinking, a system that didn't work in a real world of real people with real differences of opinion and beliefs. I had a lot more thinking to do about the question of morality.

What came next was a big surprise because I had no idea that scientific investigation supported many things revealed in the Bible. We'll look at important insights from **archaeology** in the second part of *Convince Me There's A God*.

Copyright© 1990 – 2015, Mark A McGee, GraceLife Ministries™

“Scripture taken from the New King James Version. Copyright © 1982 by Thomas Nelson, Inc. Used by permission. All rights reserved.”