

APOLOGETICS



Keep The FAith

Episode 11 – Therefore, God did it

Hi guys and welcome back to our exciting apologetics series for this podcast! This week we had our final episode of our current argument, a re-formulation of the old Teleological argument known as the Fine-Tuning argument. Let's look at it to remind ourselves of it:

- P1. The universe is fine-tuned for life
- P2. Fine-tuning can potentially be explained by chance, necessity or design
- P3. It is not due to chance or necessity
- C. Therefore, the fine-tuning of the universe is the result of design

Last week, we were in our third premise, the idea that the universe has really only got 3 possibilities for why it is the way it is, and chance and necessity aren't plausible options. In that episode, I went through the basics of the premise, and then in the companion I gave myself a headache trying to explain quantum theory.

You're welcome, those of you who read it, which is likely you since you're here again. You legend.

In that companion, you'll recall I went through the agonising task of trying to explain how quantum vacuums aren't 'nothing', and things aren't created there 'uncaused', and we don't even have the ability to measure that *entire field of study* given the issues faced by 'superpositions'.

If that all sounded like gobbeldy-gook, then go back and read last week's companion! I know it gave me a headache, but as far as I'm concerned that just means I've had the headache for you now and you can read it without the risk of the headache.

So... go and do that now.

Anyway, the major takeaway from that episode was that there are three options for the universe's fine-tuning, and two of them don't cut the mustard!

In this week's episode, we dealt with our conclusion – “therefore, the fine-tuning of the universe is the result of design.”

I definitely had the same issue here as we had in premise 2 – it's a properly simple statement that has already been verified in the previous statement. There's not a lot that goes into these conclusions, unless we restate the issues, rebuttals and rejections again, which could be quite dull (and redundant).

In the podcast, I chose to go through some stuff we haven't necessarily looked at yet that I have dealt with in the past when going through this argument.

I recalled a time when I was telling the youth group about the fine-tuning argument and one lad, from a visiting church, told me he didn't think design is a good option! I asked him why and he replied “it's too wasteful! We have billions of stars and planets, and only this one has life on it? That's such a *waste*, no one would design so much waste”.

My question to you guys was this – is that a good rebuttal of the argument from design? I suppose the argument goes along the lines of ‘waste is a bad thing, God is all-powerful and perfect and can make any world He pleases, therefore He could make a universe that isn't wasteful. The fact that this world does seem wasteful means that either God is a poor designer or it wasn't designed’. Or:

P1. Waste is morally reprehensible

P2. If God exists, He is all-powerful and morally-perfect

P3. If God exists, He would hate waste and would design a universe without it

P4. Waste exists in the universe

C. Therefore, God does not exist OR Therefore, God is a poor designer

Something along those lines, anyway. This isn't a good formulation, I'm just trying to get it down in a more sequential mode for you.

What do we think of this?

Let's consider each point – firstly, that waste is a bad thing.

Well, says who? By what standard? If you're trying to remove God as a hypothesis, you can't appeal to something that disappears if God does not exist, AKA objective morality. Things are only ‘wrong’ or ‘right’ if God exists, because otherwise we have no standard to which to appeal. I'll have to explain this in a later series of the podcast, because the moral argument for God's existence is quite an in-depth argument which is worth us reviewing, but the fact remains that, on atheism, there is no standard to turn to or appeal to when stating something is morally wrong.

If you want to know more about this, here's a video!



The next idea is that God is so powerful and perfect He can create any world, any universe He likes. Is that true?

Well, we discussed this at length in our problem of suffering and evil series – see [here](#) for those notes.

God can't do literally anything, He can do anything which is logically possible. He can create a universe with married people in it, and bachelors in it, but He can't create a world in which there are married bachelors, because that's illogical. In the same way, God does not know literally everything, He only knows all true propositions – He knows that the Battle of Hastings happened in 1066, He *doesn't* know the Battle of Hastings happened in 1966, because that isn't a true proposition, and He was busy watching the World Cup (come on, England). He also doesn't know what it feels like to be me, because God isn't me, He's Him. All that is to say that the idea God can create any world He wants, it's just not quite accurate.

Secondly, to that point, this implies that God wouldn't want to be wasteful – but why should we assume this?

Let's ask ourselves a question – what does it mean to be wasteful? It means to incorrectly use the resources you have available to you and cause them to be unusable, thus further limiting the resources you have remaining.

Does God have a limit on the resources He has available?

No! He made everything from nothing! *Ex nihilo*! He doesn't have a limit on His resources, therefore He can't be wasteful.

Well, perhaps, you might say that the waste is the time that had to elapse to even get any life to occur, but... God is timeless – He doesn't struggle for time. In fact, He created time, so He has as much or as little as He pleases.

So, the idea that God can't exist on the basis of wastefulness doesn't really work as a rejection, but what about the idea that it just makes Him a poor designer?

Well, not to get too theological about this, but how do we know this wasn't the correct way to go about doing this? How do we know, with our limited knowledge and small scope of understanding, that there was any other feasible way to create the universe?

We already know, from our discussion last week and the week before, that there were other ways the universes that could have been created, with infinitesimally small changes one way or the other, but these all ended in ultimate disaster and no life. Perhaps the way the universe is was the only way it could be made to work?

I personally am reminded of the metaphor in the Bible of the clay and the potter in Romans 9:20-23 –

“But who are you, O man, to answer back to God? Will what is molded say to its molder, “Why have you made me like this?” 21 Has the potter no right over the clay, to make out of the same lump one vessel for honorable use and another for dishonorable use? 22 What if God, desiring to show his wrath and to make known his power, has endured with much patience vessels of wrath prepared for destruction, 23 in order to make known the riches of his glory for vessels of mercy, which he has prepared beforehand for glory”

Sometimes, we have to just be quiet and say “it was God's right and will to do it this way and, whilst we may have questions and rightly so, we have to accept there are some things we may not know until we get up there and ask Him”.

Who are we, the created beings, to raise our fist and demand an answer of the creator?

It was His right to make and mold how He saw fit, and He knows better than us, so we can just trust He was right.

Even if a conversation about the philosophy of waste and other worlds is quite cool. Well, not cool, decidedly un-cool, but still cool.

Let's recap.

In these 5 episodes, we have learned about the argument from fine-tuning.

Here is the argument again:

P1. The universe is fine-tuned for life

P2. Fine-tuning can potentially be explained by chance, necessity or design

P3. It is not due to chance or necessity

C. Therefore, the fine-tuning of the universe is the result of design

So, we know that, thanks to things like the cosmological constants and quantities, the universe is virtually-unanimously considered by scientists and philosophers alike to be finely-tuned to permit life.

We are now aware that there are really only 3 *possible* options to explain this – chance, necessity and design.

We also know that the universe is not philosophically necessary, as it could have been different, and it couldn't have been this way due to chance as the odds are too astronomical to be beaten.

This leaves us with the single option of design.

This argument does not, however, state that God exists.

The inference has to come after the final conclusion when the question is asked – what is big enough, powerful enough, majestic enough, personal enough, and free enough to create an entire universe with very strict laws.

We discussed and defeated the idea of a multiverse (literally no evidence) or a universe generator (who made the generator?), and are left with only one option – God.

Pair this with the Kalam argument, and you begin to have a very compelling argument, based squarely on the most up-to-date and compelling secular science evidence, that a timeless, spaceless, omnipotent, omniscient, personal entity has created the universe.

The only good option for that entity is God.

It is up to us then, as good little theologians, to make the claim for the *Christian* God, and that requires us to stand on the cross of Jesus Christ, the God man who lived and died on a cross, then rose from the dead, conquering sin and death, and make sound arguments to defeat those that are brought against us.

Our scripture this week is Romans 1:20!

“For his invisible attributes, namely, his eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly perceived, ever since the creation of the world, in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse.”

So, why is this the scripture of the week?

We have here Paul talking in Romans, to the church in Rome, telling them people have no excuse not to believe in God.

I get asked this a lot when I do apologetics – what about people who have never heard the gospel or of Jesus? Are they just left and ignored by God?

Paul would say this – God's nature and existence has been there for all to see since the creation of the universe! The universe exists when there could more easily have been

nothing. There is something rather than nothing. God is showing His attributes in the existence of something, and His character in the existence of the things within the universe (His love in the people He created, His beauty in the sweeping landscape He created, etc.) and it's plain to see.

This is something called general revelation, and it's the way people can know God exists without ever reading the Bible or hearing a preach.

Jesus and the Bible are special revelation, which are more direct and, well, special.

But general revelation is available to everyone, you just have to look out the window at a sunset, or up to the stars in the evening, and know that He is there.

As God would say, "I AM".

No question of the week this week.

I really hope you enjoyed this 2nd season of Keep the Faith! We're going to have a break again from apologetics and, since Halloween is coming, we will be talking about Spiritual Warfare! Hope that gets you excited. We will then most likely go back to our What in the World?! series before we land back in apologetics.

That's all for this week, guys!

As always, don't be afraid to get into the youth whatsapp chat and let us know how you are, what you're up to and what you're thinking. Get your prayer requests ready for Thursday and get involved in our Bible study! And you can grab us on Instagram @chawnyouth.

Speak to you in the next one!