Objections

Table of contents

Clarification: Cause-and-Effect and God's Will 3

If a proof for the existence of an Uncaused Cause exists, atheists lack a valid basis to deny the existence of God. While one might reject specific religious interpretations of how God operates in our lives or in the world, the existence of God itself cannot be reasonably dismissed. Let's examine some of the common objections and questions raised by atheists.

> **Note:** Most of the following arguments are not mine and I take no credit for it. The original can be found elsewhere on the Internet and in books. I have tried to present a shorter and simplified version for general consumption.

> **Objection: Belief in the existence of God is a matter of blind faith because God cannot be scientifically proven.**

The claim that "God cannot be scientifically proven" is not a sound argument but rather a reflection of the limitations inherent in our scientific methods. The absence of scientific evidence should not be mistaken for evidence against God's existence. Science, by its nature, operates within a framework of assumptions and principles that themselves cannot be proven.

- For instance, science cannot conclusively prove the existence of other minds or the objective reality of the external world. It's conceivable that everything we perceive might be a projection of our own consciousness, akin to a vivid dream. Alternatively, our reality could be a simulation — an elaborate construct generated by a computer program connected to our minds in some distant extraterrestrial laboratory. These possibilities underscore the inherent limits of our perceptions and scientific understanding.
- Science presumes that the universe operates according to natural laws, but this assumption is not a provable fact. We cannot establish with certainty that the same natural laws applied millions of years ago or that they will continue to hold in the future.
- Moreover, science relies on cause and effect as a foundational principle, but this is derived from observations made with limited senses and tools. Consider the example of cotton igniting in the presence of fire. While we attribute the burning to the fire, what if it is God who causes the cotton to burn each time fire approaches? The observable sequence of events might seem to follow natural laws, but it could also reflect God's continuous intervention in transitioning the world from one state of existence to the next.
- Finally, science depends on logical laws such as the law of identity (for all x, x = x) and the law of non-contradiction (a proposition cannot be both true and false simultaneously). These principles are accepted as self-evident truths but cannot be scientifically validated.

The existence of God has been demonstrated through logical and mathematical reasoning in Part 1, not mere blind faith. Recognizing the limits of scientific methods invites us to consider proofs and arguments beyond empirical evidence.

Claim: Quantum physics shows particles come into existence out of nothingness

This statement misrepresents the essence of scientific understanding. Historically, even great minds like Aristotle suggested that life could arise spontaneously, a belief held by scientists for over two millennia. Similarly, contemporary statements about quantum physics are often misunderstood or oversimplified.

Quantum physics operates on the concept of the quantum field, which undergoes spontaneous fluctuations. However, the root cause of these fluctuations remains unknown. The lack of current understanding does not equate to the absence of an underlying cause. To assert otherwise is to mistake a gap in knowledge for proof of randomness or "nothingness."

Claim: Stephen Hawking once said that because there is a law (such as gravity,) the universe can and will create itself from nothing; spontaneous creation is the reason there is something rather than nothing

While Stephen Hawking proposed that the laws of physics could lead to the spontaneous creation of the universe, this idea requires closer scrutiny. Laws, by definition, describe how entities behave — they do not possess causal power. For instance, the law of gravity describes the attraction between masses but does not cause or generate that attraction.

This perspective also raises deeper questions: What ensures that matter consistently behaves according to these laws? What or who establishes these laws in the first place? Without addressing such fundamental issues, the claim remains incomplete and speculative.

Claim: If the universe is eternal and infinite, there is no reason to have a God

The assertion that "the universe is eternal and infinite" is an unproven assumption. The corresponding claim that "there is no need for God" is not a scientific conclusion but a subjective perspective. Statements beginning with "if" inherently reflect hypothetical scenarios unless substantiated by evidence.

Additionally, the argument overlooks key principles, such as the second law of thermodynamics. This law illustrates that systems naturally progress towards states of higher entropy or disorder. For example, when a cup breaks, the probability of it spontaneously reassembling into its original form is nearly zero. Extending this concept, it is even more improbable for a universe of such immense complexity and harmony to arise spontaneously or exist eternally in its current state.

Despite its remarkable advancements, science remains unable to answer certain fundamental questions:

- Why does matter behave the way it does?
- What gives matter its properties?
- Who or what ensures that the behavior of matter remains consistent throughout the universe?

Natural laws merely describe observed behaviors; they do not explain the underlying causes of those behaviors.

By carefully reviewing the proof provided in Part 1, it becomes evident that the idea of an eternal or infinite existence of conditioned realities (like matter) is logically untenable. These conditioned realities must rely on an Uncaused Cause, usually termed as Yehweh, God, or Allah.

Claim: There is no proof for the existence of God

Contrary to this claim, proof of the One, Indivisible, Uncaused Reality has been provided in Part 1. Belief in the "non-existence" of God or the eternity of matter, however, remains a matter of blind faith. Atheists, who often emphasize rationality, offer no concrete proof for their assertions. Their arguments frequently rely on subjective reasoning or wishful thinking rather than logical and evidence-based conclusions.

Question: Why is there suffering in the world?

The question of suffering is less a challenge to God's existence and more an exploration of observed reality. Without a Divine Being, concepts like suffering, morality, and justice lose their objective meaning. For instance, no scientific law can label the atrocities of the Nazi concentration camps as "wrong." Science operates in the realm of observable phenomena and measurable facts; it does not address emotions, values, or ethics.

A Divine framework is necessary to anchor these concepts. Without it, terms like "right" and "wrong" become arbitrary, defined only by human preference or societal norms.

Clarification: Cause-and-Effect and God's Will

The concepts of natural laws and God's will are not mutually exclusive; rather, they coexist harmoniously. God, through His free will, upholds the natural laws that govern the universe, ensuring their consistency and reliability. While humans are endowed with free will, they remain subject to these immutable laws. For example, a person can choose to place their hand in fire, but they cannot escape the law of burning that governs the fire's behavior.

If God were to constantly alter the behavior of elements like fire, He might be seen as inconsistent or unpredictable. A flawless creation plan does not require adjustments. Consider the analogy of computer applications: human developers must release updates to address unforeseen issues, a reflection of our limited knowledge. By contrast, God's omniscience ensures that His plan is perfect from the start, requiring no modifications. The fixed and unchanging nature of natural laws reflects this perfection.

This consistency in natural law also underscores God's impartiality. Natural laws apply universally, without favoritism. Fire burns both believers and non-believers alike, and gravity affects everyone equally. This universal fairness is a hallmark of God's Kingdom, demonstrating that His justice extends to all, irrespective of their beliefs.