Not: In the beginning, nothing—for the simple reason that from nothing, nothing comes to be (ex nihilo, nihil fit). That Something is, that Isness is a fact, must be admitted by all who are not in a lunatic asylum.

Therefore, “In the beginning, God.” This is the only formula that makes sense. Psa. 14:1—“The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God.” Note the phrase, “in his heart”; “heart” in Scripture designates the interior man, with special emphasis on emotion and will. Atheism is traceable in most instances to an emotional reaction: no man can logically think himself into it.

The Bible presents itself to us as The Book from God communicated by the Holy Spirit (1 Pet. 1:10-12, 2 Pet. 1:21, Heb. 1:1-4, 1 Cor. 2:6-16, 1 Thess. 2:13). What author, in writing a book, prefaces it with an article intended to prove his own existence? Why, then, should the Holy Spirit have prefaced the content of the Bible with a chapter designed to prove the existence of God? To ask this question is to answer it.

The Bible, in explaining the universe, does not indulge specious theories of “the eternity of matter,” of “an undifferentiated ocean of energy,” of “life force,” of “infinite regress,” or anything of the kind. The Bible does not try to account for the Fact of Being by dispensing with a First Cause: it assigns to all things a Sufficient Reason, an Adequate Cause, in God: in the God of the Bible, the theistic God who transcends the cosmos in His Being but is immanent throughout the cosmos in His power. (All power is ultimately of God.)

The existence of God is the First Truth on which all truth depends. He is the all-sufficient First Truth. Accept God’s existence and the rest is not difficult. Deny it, and no foundation is left for life, law, faith, hope, love, truth, justice, freedom, beauty, goodness, holiness, or any other value.
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Whatever begins to exist must have an Adequate Cause. Not, as it is sometimes erroneously stated, that all effects must have their adequate causes, but that whatever begins to exist must have an Adequate Cause. To close one's mind to this principle of Adequate Causality is to shut one's self off from all possibility of comprehensive knowledge of any kind.

One of the most common, and most grievous, errors of modern science is its tendency to ignore the fact of Efficient Causality, which is the very cornerstone of the structure of metaphysics (the science of being-as-such), and indeed of all human knowledge. To understand what is meant by Efficient Causality, we must recall here the Aristotelian doctrine of Four Causes, which is a very helpful concept, one which affords valid clues to the understanding of the world and our life in it.

According to Aristotle, there are four "causes" (explanations, ways of defining) anything; that is, four factors which combine to effectuate the constitution of any created thing. These are as follows: the material cause (the stuff of which a thing is made: the cause of which); the formal cause (that which gives to the matter the precise form or specificity it has, that which puts it into the class to which it belongs: the cause according to which); the efficient cause (that agent or power which unites the form and the matter, to give the object concrete existence: the cause by which); and the final cause (the end or function to be served by the object: the foreseen final cause that precedes all other causes: that which is first in purpose or motive, even though last in realization: the cause for which). Take for example, a statue: the material cause is wood, bronze, stone, marble, etc.; the formal cause is the idea embodied in the matter, a likeness of Washington, or of Lincoln, or of Venus of Milo, or of Athena Parthenos, etc., the efficient cause is the sculptor; and the final cause, ornamentation, commemoration, or it could be simply art for art's sake; in
any case, it is that which motivates the sculptor. For another example, consider a human being: the material cause is the complex of living cells that make up the body; the formal cause is the soul (mind, power of thought, reason, etc.,) which informs the body and thus specifies man as man; the efficient cause is the Creative Intelligence and Power (First Principle, First Cause, God) which gave man concrete existence as homo sapiens, a mind-body unity; and the final cause, the natural and proper intrinsic and extrinsic ends to which man is divinely ordained, as indicated by the impulses of his nature, namely, Perfect Happiness in Union with God, to be achieved by the living of the Spiritual Life. (No human being ever sets out to make himself ultimately and permanently miserable). (Cf. Matt. 22:35-40; Gal. 5:16-25.)

With the foregoing introductory matter to guide us, we shall now look briefly at the various proofs of the existence of God. I use the term "proofs," rather than "arguments," simply from the conviction that necessary truths (that is, propositions, the opposites of which are inconceivable) do constitute proofs in the fullest sense of the term, or, as stated a bit differently, whatever the inflexible formulas of logic and mathematics demand, must have real existence in the structure of Reality. Let us now examine these proofs which support the simple but sententiously sublime declaration of the first verse of Genesis: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

1. The Cosmological Proof

(1) Who has not been overwhelmed at times by the awesome sense of the Mystery of Being-as-such! Such an emotion might take hold of one, for example, at the sight of the ocean for the first time, or when walking down the cathedral aisle of a seemingly ageless forest, or when wandering about in the fairy palaces of the Carlsbad Caverns, or (as Van Loon puts it, Geography, p. 3) when "stunned by the incredible beauty of that silent witness of
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the forces of Eternity,” the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River. (When our God, who is the Author of beauty and majesty, builds a cathedral, He builds one.) Since living in the Southwest, I have often experienced this sense of awe while strolling on a clear night under the scintillating skies of the New Mexico desert where the stars seem close enough to earth to permit one to reach up and pluck them from the heavens. Who, under the spell of such awesome experiences, could be so insensitive to the music and the dream of living as to fail to ask himself, How, and especially why, did all this come to be? No person who thinks can possibly avoid such ultimate questions. (Cf. the experience of Jacob, Gen. 28:16-17.)

(2) To deny that something is would be a mark of insanity or idiocy. There is one thing I know, and know from immediate experience: I know that I am. (Descartes, 1596-1650, it will be recalled, decided to make a fresh start in pursuit of the philosophy of being, by doubting everything provisionally, the testimony of sense-perception, of reason, of external authority of any kind, even of the existence of a God who is goodness and truth and beauty (since it might turn out that a malevolent being has created man for his own sport), etc. Thinking thus, it suddenly dawned on him that he could not doubt the fact of his doubting or the fact of his own existence as the doubter: dubito, ergo sum, “I doubt, therefore I am.” From this point he went on logically to affirm, cogito, ergo sum, “I think, therefore I am.” Obviously, this has to be the taking-off point for all human thought, whether the person realizes it or not. Thought simply does not take place apart from the thinker; hence the first category of all thinking is the category of being, the universal, or of beings, the particulars. I cannot understand why well educated persons are so prone to overlook or to disregard these facts. There simply cannot be love without a lover, law without a lawgiver, behavior apart from a being to behave, adaptation without a being.
to adapt and being to be adapted to. Being, I repeat, is the first category of human thought, whether recognized to be so or not.) I know; therefore, I am. I know that within me there is a world so vast that it staggers my imagination—a world of thoughts, feelings, desires, sentiments, images, memories, etc. I know too that there is a world outside me, a world of something (sense data?) the motions of which produce sensations within me (sights, colors, sounds, smells, tastes, etc.), and thus provide the raw material of my knowledge. (Was it not John Locke who defined “matter” as “permanent possibility of sensation”?) All these things I know.

(3) In a word, I know, we all know, that something is. Hence, the basic question, properly stated, is not, Where did God come from? but, How and why is there something instead of nothing? Moreover, because something is, something must always have been: we must start in our thinking with a Something (the First Principle, or God) that is without beginning or end, or we are driven to the inconceivable postulate that nothing must have produced something. As someone (unidentified) has written in facetious vein:

Once nothing arrived on this earth out of space;
It rode in on nothing; it came from no place;
It landed on nothing—the earth was not here—
It worked hard on nothing for year after year;
It sweat over nothing with mighty resolve—
But just about then things began to evolve:
The heavens appeared, and the sea and the sod;
This Almighty Nothing worked much like a god.
It started unwinding without any plan,
It made every creature and ended with man.
No god here was needed—there was no creation;
Man grew like a mushroom and needs no salvation.
Some savants say this should be called evolution
And that ignorance only rejects that solution.”
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This, to be sure, is nonsense. Even the ancients recognized such a postulate to be inconceivable: said they, *ex nihilo nihil fit*, "from nothing nothing comes to be." "That something must be unbegun follows from the principle *ex nihilo nihil fit*. If there had ever been a state in which there was nothing, then that state would have continued forever. It is impossible for our imagination to grasp unbegun duration, but the failure of our imagination is overcome by the necessity of rational thought. As surely as there is anything now, so surely there must have always been something" (Brightman, PR, 364-365).

(4) That *something* is—that which we call a universe, a world, a cosmos—is undeniable. That the existence of this *something* is unexplainable apart from the operation of a Power sufficient both to produce it and to sustain it, must be evident to all honest and intelligent thinkers. Certainly, no comprehensive, hence no satisfactory, explanation of this world is possible for one who either ignores or denies Efficient Causality. (By Efficient Causality we mean the Creative Intelligence and Power that philosophy designates the First Cause or First Principle, and that theology calls God.) This is the well-known *Cosmological Proof*, reasoning from the existence of the world to the existence of God as its Cause (hence it may be designated the "causal" argument). As first stated by Aristotle (384-322 B.C.), it is necessary reasoning from the facts of motion (change) in the cosmos to the Prime Mover (the unmoved or self-moving, self-existing, and self-determining) First Mover, the only possible alternative being the admission of infinite regress. As revised by Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), the argument consists in necessary reasoning from the experienced fact of motion to the Prime Mover, from secondary efficient causes to the First Efficient Cause, and from contingent (may or may not be) being to the necessary (must be) Being, God. "The cosmological argument is based on the principle of sufficient cause. The world is
an effect; therefore it must have had a cause, outside itself, sufficient to account for its existence. There must be a cause of the series of causes which we experience. Thus we come to a First Cause or to a self-existent Being. The First Cause could not be material, since this would involve the qualitatively less as being able to produce the qualitatively greater—an absurd notion. We are led then to a self-dependent entity or Spirit of God” (Titus, LIP, 403). Or to put it in another form: Change is an incontrovertible fact of human experience. But there must be something permanent—something which persists through all change—otherwise nature would be nothing but a sequence of creations and annihilations (with what in between?). Therefore, we must distinguish between the accidental and the essential features of reality, between the temporary and the permanent in human experience. “Change presupposes a cause, and logically we must go back to an uncaused, self-existent cause or to self-existent Being. God is thus imminent in the universe of which he is the constitutive principle. God is the condition of the orderly development of the universe, as well as its permanent source or ground” (Titus, ibid., 404).

(5) Someone may object as follows: You argue, obviously, from the “principle of sufficient reason,” viz., that for every effect there must be an adequate cause, that the cosmos therefore, considered as an effect, must have its Adequate Cause. But is not this a begging of the question (a petitio principii)? That is to say, are you not assuming as true a priori the very proposition to be established, namely, that the cosmos is an effect? Perhaps the cosmos simply is, and has always been, in some form or other, and that is the end of the matter. To this I reply as follows: Surely it may be taken for granted that certain aspects of the cosmos that are known to us are effects—of something. Take, for example, man himself: man either has existed always or he had a beginning: no third view is conceivable.
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But that he had a beginning no one doubts: surely no scientist would make himself so ridiculous as to contend that man has existed always. Very well, then, if he had a beginning, as is universally admitted, he either created himself or he was the handiwork of an Efficient Causality external to himself. If he made himself, then he existed before he existed—and this would be utter nonsense. It must follow, therefore, that man is the product of an Efficient Causality antedating himself and external to himself. There was a time in the process of Creation when man—homo sapiens, should anyone insist on the strictly scientific designation—did not exist: hence a Cause must have been operating equal to the effect produced, that is, adequate to the creation and preservation of the human species. Moreover, if in thought we move backward in contemplation of the creative process (which, even in the Hebrew cosmogony is pictured as having been a progressive development, extending over at least six "days"), we can conclude only that there must have been a time when life did not exist, at least did not exist on our earth. All texts on historical geology frankly admit that life had a beginning sometime, somewhere, and that the story of that beginning, as far as science can claim to speak, is still enshrouded in mystery. Again, thinking back in terms of regress, let us ask: What existed prior to the appearance of life on the earth? Certainly the earth had to exist as a "home" for living things as we know them, and the sun had to exist to furnish light, and the atmosphere had to exist to sustain life, that is, life as we experience it. These factors are all necessary to the process of photosynthesis—that mysterious process by which plant life converts the sun's energy into stored food energy and which is necessary to the sustenance of animal life in its various forms. Shall we not conclude, then, that "the heavens and the earth," the suns and planets and stars, all the galaxies and universes—in short, our astronomical world—existed prior to the introduction of life?
But what existed prior to these bodies terrestrial and celestial? Probably only molecules and atoms: for are we not in these days reading books with such titles as The Creation of the Universe and Biography of the Earth (by Gamow), Stellar Evolution (by Struve), From Atoms to Stars (by Davidson), and the like—books whose contents are devoted to a theoretical (and basically conjectural) description of the alleged “evolution” of the astronomical bodies of the cosmos, an “evolution” envisioned as having had its inception in the explosion of a primordial atom, or, perhaps, in the “chance” production of hydrogen atoms from some kind of an original Source. (Cf. also The Nature of the Universe, by Fred Hoyle, especially the chapters entitled “The Origin of the Stars” and “The Origin of the Earth and the Planets.”) But what existed prior to the molecules and their atoms, or prior to the atoms themselves? Shall we say protons and electrons, or possibly photons only: the tendency in most recent physics is to look upon radiant energy as an ultimate in the physical world. Or, shall we say that there was a time when only what is now regarded as the elusive absolutely “first particle” (center of force?) of matter existed, which physicists designate the neutrino? (The neutrino has been superseded recently by the Omega Minus.) (These ultimate or first constituents of matter, as matter is interpreted today, are in fact quasi-material rather than material (in the traditional sense of that term), and because man is achieving apprehension of them, not by means of sense-perception, nor even by means of physical sense implemented by mechanical devices, but solely by means of mathematical formulas, present-day physics is all the time becoming more metaphysical than physical. Indeed the line between the material and the immaterial is so closely drawn today that it is scarcely existent.) But we are now ready to ask: What existed prior to the neutrino, prior to photons, electrons, mesons, protons, etc.? The late Dr. Arthur H. Cöpp-
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ton, the distinguished physicist, in an article, “The Case for Hope,” published in the *Saturday Review*, issue of July 18, 1955, states that before the beginning of our universe “it seems that not only were there no stars and atoms, but that time itself was something of only indefinite meaning.” Still and all, we cannot logically carry this method of “infinite regress” (that is, in our thinking) back to nothing: otherwise it would not be infinite regress; that is to say, it would have a terminus or limit, and hence would be finite rather than infinite. Besides, what existed “back there” to see to it (to cause) that these neutrinos, photons, protons, electrons, atoms, etc., would march into being in the form of a cosmos, with its ultimate mysteries of life, consciousness, thought, self-consciousness, sense of values, etc? Whatever that Something—or Someone—was, that is precisely what we mean by Efficient Causality. And so we must admit the existence of the Self-moving Mover, the First Cause, the Self-existent Being, Necessary Being, as the Ground of all contingent being, etc., or we face infinite regress as the only possible alternative. And this infinite regress, moreover, cannot be regress back to nothing or nothingness: it is inconceivable that some “almighty nothing” could have produced something, the world as we know it. (Annihilation, *i.e.*, reduction of the something that is, to sheer nothing, is equally inconceivable.) It is true now and always that, as the ancients put it, *ex nihilo nihil fit.* No person can account for his own thought except on the presupposition that he, the thinker, exists; nor can any thinker (person) account for his own existence except on the ground of the prior existence of the species of which he is a unit; nor can he account for the species of which he is a unit—the human species, *homo sapiens*—except on the ground of an Efficient Causality capable of having brought his own species into actual existence. The theory presupposes the thinker, the person; the person presupposes the human species; and the human species presupposes an
GENESIS

Efficient Causality of all things. These conclusions are inescapable. I repeat that no valid explanation of the totality of being is possible except on the basis of an Adequate Cause. I repeat than one of the obvious evidences of the superficial character of much recent thinking has been its tendency to ignore, even to deny outright, the fact of Efficient Causality.

6) Experience finds nature, both as a whole and in its particulars (objects and events), contingent, that is, such that it might not have been (lacking necessary existence). The mark of contingency is change: that which changes is subject to influences beyond itself. The “bridge” from contingent being to self-existent Being (reality) is found in the principle of Efficient Causality. Contingent (secondary) causes do not explain themselves. Both logic and reality require not only causes in nature but also a Cause of Nature. Obviously the Cause of Nature must be the Existent who is capable of bestowing existence. This must be the self-existent (but not self-caused) Being, God. (It has ever been a matter of amazement to me than intelligent persons should have “fallen for” Hume’s shallow repudiation of causality (i.e., causality in any real sense), his contention that mind reads causality (necessary connection) into what is nothing more than a sequence of events. This notion is contrary to human experience. For example, the fusion of two atoms of hydrogen with one atom of oxygen to form a molecule of water is certainly more than a mere sequence of events: there is motion, change, power, involved in the process. Again, suppose that a man inadvertently takes hold of a highly charged “live” wire—and he dies. There is more involved here than a sequence of events: there is the power of the electric current that causes the man’s death. Moreover, in either case, the same effect necessarily follows the same cause. This is true throughout all nature; otherwise, our so-called laws of nature would be fictions and we would be living in a totally unpredict-
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able world. (The fact is that man could not live in an unpredictable world.) (7) Even the theological doctrine of Creation ex nihilo does not mean, strictly speaking, Creation out of nothing, but rather creation by the Efficient Causality who is essentially Spirit, Mind, Person, etc., that is, non-corporeal, and hence Creation without the use of pre-existing matter. (Cf. Gen. 1:1; Psa. 33:6,9; Psa. 148: 5,6; Heb. 11:3.) As Professor W. E. Hocking states the case: "For the author of Genesis, mentality is original. It does not enter a physical world already running on its own. On the contrary, it is the physical world which enters the realm of mind. It is the Eternal Mind who in the beginning created the raw materials of the world, and whose word evoked order from chaos" ("A World-View," PPT, 436).

(8) That, from the viewpoint of science itself, a creation of matter actually did take place in some sense, contends Fred Hoyle, the astronomer, who writes as follows: "Perhaps you may think that the whole question of the creation of the universe could be avoided in some way. But this is not so. To avoid the issue of creation it would be necessary for all the material of the universe to be infinitely old, and this it cannot be for a very practical reason. For if this were so, there could be no hydrogen left in the universe. . . . Hydrogen is being steadily converted into helium throughout the universe and this conversion is a one-way process—that is to say, hydrogen cannot be produced in any appreciable quantity through the breakdown of the other elements. How comes it then that the universe consists almost entirely of hydrogen? If matter were infinitely old, this would be quite impossible. So we see that the universe being what it is, the creation issue simply cannot be dodged" (NU, 113-114). Contending for his theory of "continuous creation," the same author says: "The most obvious question to ask about continuous creation is this: Where does the created material come from? It does not come from anywhere. Material simply appears—it is cre-
At one time the various atoms composing the material do not exist, and at a later time they do. This may seem a very strange idea and I agree that it is, but in science it does not matter how strange an idea may seem so long as it works—that is to say, so long as the idea can be expressed in a precise form and so long as its consequences are found to be in agreement with observation” (ibid., 112). Cf. Heb. 11:3—“By faith we understand that the worlds [literally, ages] have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which appear.”

(9) It is also interesting to note that these scientists (astronomers, geologists, paleontologists, etc.) all begin with something: Hoyle, with a hydrogen fog; Gamow, with ylem (“primordial mixture of nuclear particles”); Lemaitre et al, with an exploding “primordial atom”; the monoparental theory, with a cooling and contracting hot nebular mass, e.g., the nebular hypothesis of LaPlace; the Chamberlin-Moulton biparental theory, with a sun and passing star, etc. No one presumes to start with nothing and get a universe; or should we not say, universes?

(10) Protagonists of the evolution theories seem not to realize that their theories are, after all, theories of creation. (Biological evolution is simply a theory of the origin of species, based largely on inferences. No theory of evolution purports to explain the origin of life, the life movement itself, the modus operandi of heredity, or that of mutations. As Cassirer writes: “Even in the field of the phenomena of nature we have learned that evolution does not exclude a sort of original creation” (EOM, 49). It will be recalled that even Darwin himself admitted Divine agency as the ultimate source of life, that is, life as implanted in the hypothetical primordial cell.) There is simply no getting around the facts of Creation and Efficient Causality: this is the long of the matter, the short of it, and the all of it. Gen.
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1:1—"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

In several of his writings Bertrand Russell goes to considerable pains to let us know that, as he states it, he gave up the Cosmological Argument early in his life. He seems to think this was a matter of great import to all humanity—a most unwarranted assumption, I should say. In his treatise, Why I Am Not a Christian, p. 7, he writes: "There is no reason to suppose that the world had a beginning at all. The idea that things must have a beginning is really due to the poverty of our imagination." Certainly the cosmos of our time has not been the same cosmos that it is now, throughout all preceding millennia of its history: this fact is explicit in the titles that present-day scientists are using, such as, From Atoms to Stars, etc. Certainly, as stated above, any notion of the "eternity of matter" (or, as Hoyle puts it, that "matter is infinitely old") implies, if traced backward, infinite regression (not regression to nothing), or, if traced forward, infinite progression (but not a progression from nothing). As a matter of fact, the concept of the "eternity" of matter, such as Russell would have us accept, is a concept of timelessness, and affords plenty of room for catastrophism and for the theory of the cyclical movement of cosmic history. Moreover, it is in conflict with the geological theory of uniformitarianism (that now existing processes are sufficient to account for all geological changes): indeed it would seem to necessitate cycles of cosmic history and catastrophism as well, to pave the way for uniformitarianism. To accept Russell's view would require an almost inconceivable measure of imagination, greater in fact than the measure of faith implicit in the acceptance of a transcendent intelligent Creator. Indeed there is no theory that can logically eliminate the operation of an Efficient Causality that, regardless of what it started with, has actualized and continues to support the phenomena characteristic of our present-day cosmos, such phe-
nomina as the atomic processes, the life processes, the thought processes, etc. It is far more reasonable, from the philosophical point of view, to accept the Aristotelian doctrine of the Unmoved Mover as First Cause of all things than the notion of an infinite regress—a process that would go on into infinity without any conceivable stopping-point. That is to say, “In the beginning, God.”

2. The Ontological Proof

This is the proof that is based on the conviction of the existence of Perfect Being, a conviction implicit in every man’s awareness of his own imperfections. The concepts of perfection and imperfection cannot be disassociated.

(1) The Ontological Proof (from the Greek neuter singular to on, “that which is,” or “being” as the universal; plural, ta onta, “the things which exist,” or “beings” as particulars) was first formulated by Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109), but actually derived in principle from Plato’s Theory of Forms (Ideas). According to the Platonic theory, the Forms or Ideas of all classes of things (as known to us in our concepts) are permanent, eternal, and real, and go to make up the world of being, whereas material objects which merely participate in the eternal Forms are ever impermanent and changing, and constitute our world of becoming, the phenomenal world or world of appearance. Hence the more universal the Idea, the greater its reality, its causal efficacy, and its worth. And therefore the Supreme Universal, the Form or Idea of the Good, is the Supreme Good, the Supreme Cause, Perfect Being, etc. On the basis of this principle, Anselm formulated the Ontological Proof substantially as follows: We define God as the Being than which nothing more perfect can be thought. Now there is in the mind the idea of such a Being. But also such a Being must exist outside the mind (objectively); if it did not, it would fail to be the Being than which nothing more perfect can be thought, since a being with the added attribute of existence must be more perfect than
one existing only in idea. Therefore, if we wish to retain the meaning that the word “God” conveys to the human mind, we must affirm that God exists. In a word, the proposition that “the most perfect being that can be thought of, really exists objectively,” is self-evident. (Perfection, from per and facere, “to make thorough” or “complete,” means completeness, wholeness, holiness.)

(2) A modification of the ontological argument occurs in Descartes substantially as follows: There must be in every cause at least as much reality as reveals itself in the effect; otherwise we should have a portion of the effect emanating from nothing. Hence, if there exists in my mind any single idea which is too great to have originated from my own nature, I can be sure that the adequate (commensurate) cause of that idea is to be found outside me. But I discover in myself only one idea which thus evidently requires something outside me as the cause of it, and that is my idea of God as infinite thinking substance, eternal, immutable, independent, omniscient, omnipresent, etc., by which all contingent things have been created. It is inconceivable, and therefore impossible, that the idea of attributes so exalted should have come from the imperfect and finite nature which I know my own nature to be. For the same reason it is impossible for this idea to have derived from my parents or from any other source that falls short of the perfection of the idea itself. Therefore, infinite thinking substance, God, must actually exist to have imparted to me this idea of Perfect Being: in this manner alone can I bridge the gulf that exists between me and eternal reality: God as real Existent must be postulated as the only Existent great enough to account for the presence in me of the idea of God which indubitably exists in my own mind.

(3) It is often objected, of course, that this argument embodies an unwarranted leap from the subjective to the objective, from the idea of God to the actual existence of
God objectively. It is argued that man formulates, for example, ideas of a Centaur, a unicorn, etc., but that such ideas or images in the mind do not constitute proof of the actual existence of the creatures thus imaged or imagined. To these arguments we may reply as follows: (a) that a Centaur or a unicorn is a creation of the human imagination, formed by the mind’s putting together of fragments of different sense-perceptions, whereas the concept of a Perfect Being is not something that can be imaged (imagined), for indeed the mind finds itself incapable of forming a mental image of it—it is, on the contrary, a necessary concept of pure (imageless) thought; (b) that all such concepts of pure thought must point to, or have as their referents, actual existents in the objective world; in a word, that a necessary conclusion, one that is demanded by pure logic or mathematics, must stand for a fact in the structure of external reality. (Just as, for example, the laws of thought—the laws of identity and contradiction, “That which is, is,” and “What is, cannot at the same time and in the same sense be and not be”—are not exclusively laws of thought, but actually laws of things as well. E.g., an oak-tree cannot at the same time and in the same sense be and not be.) No one questions the fact that the laws of thought actually embody the laws of things. E.g., I may not know how many persons will make up the population of El Paso in the year 2000, but I do know that any two of them plus any other two will make four of them. Again, I know that a circle, either as a figure-symbol in geometry textbooks or in actual land measurement, is a figure all the points on the circumference of which are equally distant from the center, and that not by definition alone, but by the very nature of the circle as such. A necessary truth is defined in philosophy as that, the opposite of which is inconceivable. It is inconceivable that nothing should have produced something; therefore it is a necessary truth that Efficient Causality, God, exists without beginning or end.
Moreover, pure logic, in demanding Adequate Causality, Perfect Being, the Highest Good, etc., is referring to that Existent who indubitably exists as the Source and Ground of the whole creation.

Recapitulation: Thomistic Proofs of the Existence of God, those put forward by Thomas Aquinas, in his Summa Theologica: First Proof: From Motion: i.e., the passing from power to act, as it takes place in the universe, implies a first unmoved Mover, who is God; else we should postulate an infinite series of movers, which is inconceivable. Second Proof: From Efficient Causes, i.e., for the same reason efficient causes, as we see them operating in this world, imply the existence of a First Cause that is uncaused: that is, that possesses in itself sufficient reason for its existence: and this is God. Third Proof: From the Contingency of Beings in the World: the fact that contingent beings exist, i.e., beings whose non-existence is recognized as possible, implies the existence of a necessary being, who is God. Fourth Proof: From the Degrees of Perfection in Beings: The graduated perfections of being actually existing in the universe can be understood only by comparison with an absolute standard that is also actual, i.e., an infinitely perfect Being such as God. Fifth Proof: From the Order Prevailing in the Universe: the wonderful order or evidence of intelligent design which the universe exhibits implies the existence of a supra-mundane Designer, who is no other than God Himself. This is commonly called the Teleological Proof, as set forth in some detail in the pages immediately following.

3. The Teleological Proof

(1) Let us now consider the Teleological Proof of the existence of God (from the Greek telos, "consummation," "fulfilment," "end," etc.). It is significant that the Greek word kosmos (translated in Scripture "universe" or "world"), from which we get the English cosmos, means "order." (Chaos in ancient Greek meant "empty space.")
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Thus by the very use of the word *cosmos* we recognize that the framework of nature is one of order; this must be true, otherwise man could never have formulated a science. Man's sciences are simply his accomplishments in discovering, interpreting and describing (by means of "formulas," "theories," "laws," etc.) the order he finds in the various realms of being. Indeed *man could not live in an unpredictable world*.

(2) Take, for example, a great building. In what form did it exist before it became a building? The answer is obvious: it must have existed in the *mind* and *plan* of the person (architect) who conceived and designed it. All human artifacts have existed first in vision, theory, plan, etc., before being brought into existence as the concrete things they are designed to be. This is true of the dress that is worn, of the dinner that is served, of the house that is built, even of the atom bomb that is constructed, etc. A building presupposes a builder, design a designer (just as thought presupposes the thinker, love the lover, law the lawgiver, etc.).

(3) The idea of design includes not only the *structure*, but also the *function* (intended use) of the thing designed. Paley's illustration of a watch and its uses is, though old, simple and sound: the design in a watch is obvious; but before there could have been a watch, there had to be the watch-maker; moreover, the watch-maker must not only have designed the watch, but obviously must also have designed (consciously intended) the arrangements of its parts to serve the purpose for which the watch was brought into being, namely, to provide an accurate measure of time. Design therefore includes both the *structure* and *function* of the thing designed. Furthermore, since it is evident that the watch-maker must antedate the watch, the architect the building, etc., the Supreme Architect must also have antedated His creation. These are simply matters of ordinary common sense. (Cf. Gen. 1:31—"And God saw
everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very
good." That is to say, all created things were at that time
attaining the ends to which they were ordained by Uni-
versal Intelligence; hence there was complete harmony of
the potential and the actual. Disharmony entered the pic-
ture only when man rebelled against the will of God and
so became separated from God by his own sin. Cf. Rom.
8:22—"the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain
together," etc.).

(4) A convincing proof of the order which character-
izes the cosmic processes is their basically mathematical
structure. Examples: (a) The mathematical precision of
celestial movements, not only of the bodies which compose
our own solar system, but of the galaxies as well which go
to make up the cosmos as a whole: this preciseness is such
that for purposes of dating, any one of these heavenly
bodies may be taken as the mathematical center (frame
of reference); such that the movements of all of them (as,
e.g., eclipses, comets, etc.) can be accurately dated as far
back in the past or as far forward in the future as the
human mind may care to reach in its computations. (b)
The differentiation of the physical elements on the basis
of the number of protons in their respective atomic nuclei
and corresponding number of electrons in their respective
orbits (from one proton and one electron in the hydrogen
atom up to 92 protons and 92 electrons in the uranium
atom); hence the periodic table of the elements. (c) The
differentiation of minerals according to their respective
basic geometrical patterns (crystal forms) such that the
plane surfaces become the external expression of the defi-
nite internal structure in each case; hence the science of
crystallography. (d) The varying arrangements of atoms
and molecules in space, in such a manner as to make pos-
sible identification and classification of both molecules and
compounds, as depicted in stereotypic chemistry. (e) The
differentiation of living species generally according to the
number of chromosomes in the reproductive cells of the male and female (in the human species, 23 in the male sperm and 23 in the female ovum): the process by which the mystery of heredity is effectuated. (f) The now known possibility of the actual reduction of certain sensations, such as color and sound, usually described as qualitative, to mathematical quantities. Color sensations are known to be produced by the impingement of refracted light waves of specified different lengths upon the retina of the eye; sensations of sound, by the impingement upon the ear of auditory stimuli in the form of sound waves traveling at various vibration rates by way of a medium, usually the air. Music has its basis, of course, in the mathematics of sound, a fact discovered by Pythagoras in the long, long ago (6th century B.C.). (Pythagoras is traditionally credited with having coined the phrase, “the music of the spheres.”) To sum up: The mathematical structure of our world points directly to a Universal Intelligence (Mind, Spirit, Reason, Logos) as its source and ground. Cf. Galileo: “Nature’s great book is written in mathematical symbols.” Einstein: “How can it be that mathematics, being after all a product of human thought independent of experience, is so admirably adapted to the objects of reality?” Pythagoras: “Number rules the universe.” Plato: “God ever geometrizes.” (See E. T. Bell, Men of Mathematics.) Cf. also Sir James Jeans (NBS, 158): “Today there is widespread measure of agreement which on the physical side approaches almost to unanimity, that the stream of knowledge is heading toward a non-mechanical reality; the universe begins to look more like a great thought than like a great machine.” Jeans (TMU, 168): “If the ‘true essence of substances’ is for ever unknowable... then the universe can best be pictured, although still very imperfectly and inadequately, as consisting of pure thought, the thought of what, for want of a wider word, we must describe as a mathematical thinker.” Jeans (ibid., 175): “We may think
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of the laws to which phenomena conform in our waking hours, the laws of nature, as the laws of thought, of a universal mind. The uniformity of nature proclaims the self-consistency of this mind." Jeans (ibid., 181, 182): "If the universe is a universe of thought, then its creation must have been an act of thought . . . And yet, so little do we understand time that perhaps we ought to compare the whole of time to the act of creation, the materialization of the thought." (Cf. Plato, 427-347 B.C., in the Timaeus, 38c—"Time, then, and the heaven came into being at the same instant in order that, having been created together, if ever there was to be a dissolution of time, they might be dissolved together . . . Such was the mind and thought of God in the creation of time." Plato describes time as "the moving image of eternity." Cf. also Augustine, A.D. 354-430, in De Genesi ad Litteram, "On the Literal Meaning of Genesis," Book V, ch. 5—"The course of time began with the motions of creation, wherefore it is idle to ask about time before creation, which were to ask for time before time. For were there no motion of any creature, spiritual or corporeal, whereby the future might through the present succeed to the past, there would be no time. But the creature could have no motion unless it existed. Time, therefore, rather hath its commencement from the creation, than creation from time, but both from God."). Cf. finally Jeans (TMU, 165): "The Great Architect of the Universe now begins to appear as a pure mathematician."

(5) A second proof of cosmic order is the principle of adaptation of means to ends which characterizes our world throughout (the inorganic to the organic, the organic to the conscious, the conscious to the self-conscious, the self-conscious or personal to the moral and spiritual, etc.). Consider in this connection the following obviously necessary relations which prevail in the cosmos: that of radiant energy, to the other forms of energy; that of the inter-relationships (possible transmutations) of all forms of
GENESIS

energy (lose mass and gain energy, lose energy and gain mass); that of light and atmosphere to plant photosynthesis and animal life (plant life is dependent on carbon dioxide, animal life on oxygen); that of photosynthesis to all higher organic life (all higher physical life is dependent on plant photosynthesis; cf. Gen. 1:30—"to every beast of the earth, and to every bird of the heavens, and to everything that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for food," etc.); and that of the physiological and psychological processes in man (as he is presently constituted), etc.

(6) A third evidence of cosmic order is the fact of the adaptation of nature to man and his needs. The distinguished scientist, A. Cressy Morrison, makes this fact the thesis of his excellent little book, Man Does Not Stand Alone (written in reply to the book by Julian Huxley, Man Stands Alone). Throughout the last century, he contends, we have thought so generally in terms of the visible adapting of man to nature that we have been inclined to overlook the less visible but no less obvious and amazing adaptation of nature to man. Morrison's thesis is, in general, that the wonders of nature and man, and the existence of life itself, can be shown by calculation (the statistics of probability and chance) to be impossible without a Supreme Intelligence and a definite purpose, that purpose being ultimately the preparation of the human soul for immortality. He writes (MDNSA, 99-100): "My purpose in this discussion of chance is to bring forcefully to the attention of the reader the fact that . . . all the nearly exact requirements of life could not be brought about on one planet at one time by chance. The size of the earth, the distance from the sun, the temperature, and the life-giving rays of the sun, the thickness of the earth's crust, the quantity of water, the amount of carbon dioxide, the volume of nitrogen, the emergence of man and his survival—all point to order out of chaos, to design and purpose, and
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to the fact that, according to the inexorable laws of mathematics, all these could not occur by chance simultaneously on one planet once in a billion times.” Again (ibid., 87): “The advance of man beyond the necessities of existence to a comprehension of time lifts him out of the limits apparently set by physical evolution as a thing apart. As he approaches a complete understanding of time, he also approaches an understanding of some of the eternal laws of the universe and an apprehension of the Supreme Intelligence.” Again (ibid., 100): “We have found that there are 999,999,999 chances to one against a belief that all things happen by chance.” Cf. Titus (LIP, 405): “Take, for example, the long process of development leading to the human brain and the mind of man. The process has produced minds which begin to understand the world, and it has produced thought and understanding. This is unintelligible unless the course of evolution is directed. The term emergence by itself is a good description but is no adequate explanation.” (It is my conviction—permit me to say, parenthetically—that the word “evolution” is one of the most overworked words in our human vocabulary; moreover, that the biological theory itself rests by and large upon inference; whether the inference is necessary inference or not is the crux of the whole problem. However, two facts stand out clearly, namely, that if any kind of evolution did take place, on any level of being, it must have taken the form of a progressive development or emergence of species, as indeed the word “evolution” itself implies; and that this forward movement, always toward the more neurally complex, is evidence per se of conscious direction, that is, direction by Mind or Logos. As someone has rightly said, evolution necessarily means new increments of power plus continuity of plan—and plan presupposes the Planner.) To recapitulate, then, if man has the right to his present “natural” life, surely he has the right to the natural means necessary to sustain that form
of life; and those necessary means have been provided for him in the subhuman orders of being—the mineral, vegetable, and animal orders. (Cf. Gen. 1:27-31, 8:15-17; Ps. 104:14, 136:25, etc.) Apart from man as lord tenant of the earth (God's steward) there would be no earthly reason for the existence of any of the subpersonal species.

(7) A fourth evidence of cosmic order is that of the marvelous design of the human organism as a mind-body (psychosomatic) unity. The body is built up hierarchically, that is, in an ascending order of complexity, from cells into tissues, from tissues into organs, from organs into systems, and from systems into the organism. Personality, in like manner, is a hierarchical structure, again in an ascending order of complexity, of reflexes, habits, dispositions, traits, and finally the self. (Incidentally, there is no alchemy of wishful thinking by which psychology can be reduced wholly to physiology, that is, the higher thought processes to sheer neurosensory arcs, etc.) To think for one moment that “nature” could have produced this living and thinking (personal) being mechanically (whatever that word may mean) by chance operation of “resident” forces alone is, to say the least, absurd. The body is but the “tabernacle” in which the real person (the self, the ego, the I) dwells. (Cf. Gen. 1:27, 2:7; 1 Cor. 6:19, 15:35-49; 2 Cor. 5:1.) However, the human being as presently constituted is a mind-body unity; interaction of the physical and mental is constantly taking place; we know this to be true, even though the mode of this interaction remains inscrutable. Ps. 139:14—“I am fearfully and wonderfully made.” (Cf. the quip of the “man of medicine,” so often recurrent in literature, the boast that if he had had the task of creating the human body he could have done a better job than, in his opinion, was done. As a matter of fact, no human being as yet has succeeded in creating a living cell, much less an entire body vitalized with life. Nor has any man ever been able to synthesize a living cell in the laboratory, and
even if man should succeed in doing this some day, even
that would leave unanswered the question as to what or
who created the first living cell, an event which must have
long antedated man's appearance on earth. Any purveyor
of the above-mentioned bit of smart-Aleckism would show
about as much consistency as the chap (whom H. L.
Mencken tells about) who burst forth on occasion exclaim-
ing, "I am an atheist—thank God!"

(8) A fifth evidence of cosmic order is the fact of the
Will to Live which permeates the whole animate creation:
the natural tendency of all living creatures to resist extinc-
tion. The bird, for example, wounded by the hunter's shot,
will have its wings spread to take refuge in flight the
moment it reaches the ground. (Someone has said that
the fear of death is in fact the lust for life.) (a) Instinct,
which has been called "the Great Sphinx of nature," is
that power in the subhuman organism by which nature's
God ensures the perpetuation of the species. (Intelligence
in man, on the other hand, enables him to grow in knowl-
dge by the process of trial and error; if he were confined
to grooves of instinct, he could never attain any measure
of control of his environment. The much-touted conditioned reflex explains only the extension of the range of
stimuli which will elicit a single response. Man's develop-
ment potential, however, lies in his ability to consciously
vary his responses to the same stimulus.) (b) Cosmic
conation (striving of species and individuals toward nat-
ural ends, toward the actualization of their natural poten-
cies) characterizes all orders of the living world within
us and around us. Consider, in this connection, the
rhythmicity which pervades the cosmos: the alternation of
day and night, of seedtime and harvest, of spring and
summer and fall and winter (Gen. 8:22); the varying life
cycles of natural species—of the human being, childhood,
youth, maturity, senescence, and finally the "eventide";
the play of opposites, especially of life and death, etc.
GENESIS

(Cf. the Pythagorean Table of Opposites, as given us by Aristotle: limit-unlimited; odd-even; unity-plurality (the one and the many); right-left; male-female; rest-motion; straight-crooked; light-darkness; good-evil; square-oblong. Cf. also the Chinese doctrine of yang and yin.) (c) It will be recalled that one of the Platonic (Socratic) arguments for survival is that which is based on the alternation of opposites: contrary states, argued Socrates; pass into each other, and therefore death must pass into its contrary, life. (See Plato, Phaedo, 70-71; cf. also Paul, in 1 Cor. 15:35-49, with reference to the immortality of the saints.) No doubt this ineradicable Will to Live is one of the factors which has prompted the race as a whole to persist in believing that the person cannot perish; because man believes himself to be of a higher order than the brute, he repudiates the notion that his ultimate end can be six feet of earth and nothing more. (d) The Will to Live is evident in every aspect of the upward surge of life, from the process of segmentation ("protoplasmic irritability") in the lowliest cell up to the multiplex psychosomatic entity known as man. Theories of evolution may presume to account for the origin of species, but no such theory accounts for the life movement itself; they all simply accept that movement as a fact (hence a postulate). (Freud's libido is, after all, nothing in the world but this venerable Will to Live. See Plato, Symposium, for a discussion of the Earthly and Heavenly Eros (Love); also G. B. Shaw's preface to his play, Back to Methuselah.) (e) Individual conscious conation is characteristic only of the person: psychologists are unanimous in saying that any person who has come to feel that he has nothing to live for, is on the verge of a mental crack-up. Any measure of fulness of life must include a self to live with, a creed (faith) to live by, and a goal (hope) to live for.

(9) Throughout the entire cosmos there is cause and effect, and design. (Even the "abnormalities" of nature,
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such as cyclones, earthquakes, pestilences, etc., all have their respective causes.) No honestly intelligent person can think for a moment that all this order is the product of chance. Besides—what is chance? Some have suggested that “chance” is perhaps just another term for our human ignorance. It has even been said that what we call “chance” might turn out to be the free will of God. Ordinarily, however, when we use the word “chance,” we mean just the opposite of purpose and design—we mean purposelessness. (We are reminded here of the bombastic claim put forward in all seriousness in the heydey of what was called “naturalism,” that if a monkey were stationed at the keys of a typewriter, given sufficient time it would pound out by chance, letter by letter, one of Plato’s dialogues. Actually there are men who can countenance such drivel, who at the same time refuse to believe that there is a God. Such is the capacity for credulity of the will to disbelieve. One is reminded here of the well-known lines—

“There was an ape in days that were earlier;
Centuries passed, and his hair became curlier;
Centuries more, and his thumb gave a twist,—
And he was a man, and a Positivist.”

The “useful collocation” (to use a phrase coined by Dr. A. H. Strong) characteristic of all parts of our world simply forbids the notion that all this has come about and is perpetuated by mere chance. If man ever were to discover that, beyond any possible doubt, the cosmos is simply a “fortuitous” thing, a product of blind “chance” alone, hence completely meaningless—something that might as well not be as be—that would be a tragic day indeed in the history of the race. To requote the astronomer, Dr. Dan Schilt of Columbia (as originally quoted in Collier’s, August 11, 1951, in reply to the reporter’s question, Why is the universe as it is and what it is?): “The hope and faith of astronomers is that eventually we shall find that it is so because it couldn’t be otherwise. The greatest shock would
be to find that it all just happened by chance.” Dr. Einstein is quoted (Barnett, UDE, 29) as saying: “I cannot believe that God plays dice with the world.” As Fred Emerson Brooke has written in “The Grave Digger,”—
“If chance could fashion but one little flower,
With perfume for each tiny thief,
And furnish it with sunshine and with shower—
Then chance would be Creator, with the power
To build a world for unbelief.”

(10) Dr. Hocking (PPT, 431) sees three pervasive types of order in the cosmos, as follows: “First, the order of classes, which we meet in observing that all things come in kinds. Second, the order of causality, which we notice in the form of force and law as factors of change. Third, the order of purpose, which is always present in the activity of mind.”

(11) Order is nature’s first law. Dr. A. H. Strong points out (ST, 77) that it is “a working-principle of all science . . . that all things have their uses, that order pervades the universe, and that the methods of nature are rational methods.” He adds: “Evidences of this appear in the correlation of the chemical elements to each other; in the fitness of the inanimate world to be the basis and support of life; in the typical forms and unity of plan apparent in the organic creation; in the existence and cooperation of natural laws; in cosmical order and compensations.” Brightman (PR, 379) summarizes the evidence for teleology as follows: “It consists of all personal experience of purpose, end, or plan; the signs of purpose or conation in subpersonal selves; the adaptation of means to ends (of inorganic to organic, of organic to conscious) in nature, and hence ‘the fitness of the environment’; the arrival of the fit, the beauty of nature; the harmony and interaction of mind and body; and, we may add, the spiritual life—the striving for ideal values—that arises wherever man develops the possibilities of his consciousness, whether in
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China or Japan, India or Babylonia, Greece or Israel, Egypt or Rome, among Teutons or among Incas.” Why should men say, The more law, the less God? Is it not more reasonable to say, The more law, the greater the evidence of God. As Henry Ward Beecher once put it, “Design by wholesale is greater than design by retail.” How account for the singular fact that whenever we find out how a thing is done, our first conclusion seems to be that God had nothing to do with it. Are not the “laws of nature” the laws of God? Hath He not “established them for ever and ever”? Hath He not “made a decree which shall not pass away”? (Psa. 148:6). We accept the universality of design (as described by our humanly discovered and formulated “laws”) as positive proof of the immanence of God.

(12) We conclude that before this world could have existed in fact it must have been planned, designed and created by the Supreme Architect whom we know as God. His handiwork is evident everywhere in it; His footprints are everywhere upon it; His Spirit is the inexhaustible source of every form of power by which it is conserved. Even Herbert Spencer admitted that “one truth must ever grow clearer—the truth that there is an inscrutable existence everywhere manifested, to which we can neither find nor conceive beginning or end—the one absolute certainty that we are ever in the presence of an infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed.” Shelley wrote his name in the visitors’ book at the inn at Montanvert, and added, “Democrat, philanthropist, atheist.” But he also wrote (Adonais): “The One remains, the many change and pass; Heaven’s light forever shines, Earth’s shadows fly.” And Darwin wrote (Life, 1, 274): “In my most extreme fluctuations, I have never been an atheist, in the sense of denying the existence of a God.” (See Strong, ST, 57.) No one can intelligently and profoundly contemplate the mysteries of the world around him and within him without admitting the fact of God. (Gen. 1:1; Heb. 1:10, 11:3; 159
God has piled so high around us and within us the proofs of His existence that wayfaring men, though fools, need not err therein (Isa. 35:8).

4. The Anthropological Proof

Let us consider next what is called the Anthropological Proof of the existence of God (from the Greek anthropos, "man," and logos, "account" or "study," "science," etc.). It is in a sense an application of both the cosmological and teleological arguments to the human being.

(1) The human being is the most complex whole known to us by any process of sense-perception, and is properly designated a person. According to the classic definition proposed by Boethius (A.D. 480-524), a person is "an individual substance of a rational nature." Personality cannot be dissociated, of course, from the person; hence, we may define the person as the "carrier" of the elements of personality. Personality undergoes modification constantly, but through all such changes there is an essential "core," so to speak, which remains permanent: this "substance" we may rightly call the person. Hence personal identity remains intact from the cradle to the grave; nor is there any valid reason for assuming that it will be affected even by the "death" of the body. Personality is a structure built on the prior structures of matter, life, and mind.

(2) The essential properties of a person are self-consciousness and self-determination. By self-consciousness is meant precisely what the term signifies: awareness of the self. An animal is conscious, but a person is self-conscious: I am not only aware of the desk at which I am writing, but I am also aware that I am aware of it. Memory is significant, as William James has said, not because it dates events in the past, but because it dates
events in my past: hence it is charged with the feeling of familiarity. **Self-determination** is the power of the self to determine its own ends: in every choice, factors of heredity and factors of environment play their respective roles, but the ultimate choice (determination) is that of the personal reaction to given alternatives, the reaction of the "I." The stronger motive always wins, true; but the stronger motive is stronger because it is the one most in harmony with the self, the ME.

(3) Goldenweiser, the anthropologist, writes (*Anthropology*, 32): "All the fundamental traits of the psychic make-up of man anywhere are present everywhere." That is, **homo sapiens** is **homo sapiens** wherever and whenever he is found to exist: he is an intellectual, moral and volitional being. As such he had a beginning on this planet—he was the product of an Efficient Causality which antedated him, a Source and Ground of being, adequate to account for his **unique** powers as well as for those which he shares with the lower orders. Material, unconscious forces (atoms, protons, electrons, etc.) do not provide a sufficient cause for man's powers of reason, conscience, and free will; the more complex and mysterious phenomena, those of life, consciousness, thought, self-consciousness, abstract and creative thought, the sense of values, etc., do not yield to interpretation solely in terms of physical and chemical forces. The gap between a sensation, which is an event in the nervous system, and the consciousness of that sensation (which includes the word-symbol by which the sensation is identified *plus* the meaning which this symbol has in terms of individual memory and experience) is the abyss which cannot be bridged by any physiochemical theory. (Some forty years ago John Dewey wrote a book entitled, *How We Think*. This book became a "must" in a great many of our colleges. I had to use it as a college textbook myself. But I discovered that, after reading it, I had learned much about neurosensory arcs,
receptors, effectors, synapses, and the like, but very little, after all, about how we think. As man is now constituted, thought may be, and probably is, correlated with neural energy of some kind; but this does not mean that neural processes and the thought processes are identical, not by any manner of means.) The meaning of meaning lies outside the realm of either the physical or the chemical, or even the biological. Psychology cannot be reduced to sheer physiology.

(4) In the light of the vastness of the cosmos as it is now apprehended under the telescope, the individual man seems to be reduced to an infinitesimal fragment of the whole. Eddington tells us (NPW, 1-3) that “the atom is as porous as the solar system.” He adds: “If we eliminated all the unfilled space in a man’s body and collected his protons and electrons in one mass, the man would be reduced to a speck just visible with a magnifying glass.” Speaking in dimensional terms, then, man is indeed insignificant. Man, however, is not to be evaluated in terms of body, that is, of three-dimensional being; man is to be interpreted, rather, in terms of the fourth dimension—that of mind or soul. The tendency has been in recent years to belittle the doctrine of anthropocentrism as an evidence of human vanity; as someone remarked, on occasion, “Astronomically speaking, man is insignificant.” To which the pointed reply was made, “Yes, but astronomically speaking, man is the astronomer.” The world is, and always will be, anthropocentric, that is, in the sense that every person is inevitably the center of his own experienced world: this is a fact which no amount or kind of human theorizing will change. Nature is individualistic: we come into the world one by one, and we go out of it one by one, and every person, while in it, is unique—he is an other to every other person. There is no alchemy by which the elements of my personality—my thoughts, memories, experiences, etc—can become the constituent factors of any
other person’s personality. Nor is it vanity for man to think that he is the consciously intended end-product of the whole creative process, of the plan of the universe: it is simply a fact that if the world with its systems and galaxies is not here for man’s contemplation, use and benefit (to provide for him not only physical sustenance, but also the truth, beauty and goodness (order) which in his innermost being he craves), then the whole subpersonal realm is without meaning—neither the cosmos itself nor any man’s life in it has any significance whatever. (A colleague once remarked to me that he simply could not believe that a certain grasshopper was begotten and born to furnish breakfast for a certain turkey gobbler. Probably not—it is doubtful that anyone would carry teleology to such an extreme as this. But the fact remains that unless food of some kind were provided for turkey gobblers, they could not exist; and unless turkey gobblers existed in their turn, we as human beings could never enjoy a Thanksgiving dinner of turkey and the “trimmings.” The world we live in is a world of ends and means, and by the grace of God man is appointed to be the lord tenant of it (Gen. 1:27-30, 9:1-7; Ps. 8:3-6).

(5) The vastness of space is indeed overwhelming, and even only a partial apprehension of this vastness by a human mind engenders profound awe: as Pascal has put it, “The eternal silence of infinite space is terrifying.” Such vast distances seem to us so impersonal, as someone has said, “so unconcerned with human life and destiny.” Indeed this must have been the feeling of the Psalmist when he cried out (Ps. 8:3, 4):

“When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers,
The moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained;
What is man, that thou art mindful of him?
And the son of man, that thou visitest him?”

The plain fact is that “if there is no friendly Spirit behind it all and through it all—no infinite concern of God for
man—man is utterly lost.” This is true beyond all gain-saying. Man needs, therefore, an object of affection above and beyond his own kind: One who can call forth his highest efforts, One who can lure him on to the realization of his noblest potentialities. Matt. 5:48—“Ye therefore shall be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect.” Only the Being of infinite wisdom, power, goodness and holiness can meet the needs and aspirations of the human soul. This Being must exist. Otherwise man’s greatest need would be forever unsatisfied, and his whole existence would be but a synonym for complete frustration. As Chesterton has put it: “Man is either the image of God or a disease of the dust.” Ps. 42:7—“Deep calleth unto deep at the noise of thy waterfalls.” Or in the memorable words of Augustine: “Thou awakkest us to delight in Thy praise; for Thou madest us for Thyself, and our heart is restless, until it repose in Thee.”

(6) The normal person knows himself to be an in-scrutable synthesis of thought, feeling, desire and will. Because of this knowledge of his own being, he persists in acknowledging and seeking the God who is in some measure congenial to him through the possession of like powers. This is the reason why the religious consciousness of man will never be satisfied with the cold-blooded, mechanistic, Spinozistic god of the pantheist. Man is compelled to think of God in terms of his own experience: he cannot do otherwise. Every power that is specifically characteristic of man (i.e., characteristic of man as man) points directly to the God of the Bible, the God who is essentially Spirit (John 4:24), the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (Gen. 1:27; Job 33:4; Ps. 42:2, etc.).

5. The Moral Proof

Let us now look at the Moral Proof of the existence of God, namely, that the fact of the existence of values in our world, both subjectively and objectively, points directly
IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .
to the Summum Bonum (God) as the Beginning and End of all values.

(1) By subjectively we mean, existing in the mind of the subject, the person. By objectively we mean, existing in the structure of the cosmos or of the totality of being. By the Summum Bonum we mean the Highest Good, i.e., Wholeness, Holiness or Perfection. This is variously called the moral, ethical, "valuational," or axiological argument (from the Greek axios, meaning "worthy of," "deserving," "having value," etc.). Obviously there is some overlapping of this and the other arguments cited, particularly the Argument from the Fact of Personality.

(2) From time immemorial men have puzzled over the problem of evil, the problem of "justifying the ways of God to men" (the motif of all epic poetry: cf. Milton, Paradise Lost, I, 26). Some have tried to "explain away" evil as an "illusion of mortal mind," but of course they do not tell us how "mortal mind" came to be possessed (or obsessed) by such an "illusion." As a rule, the race has been so concerned with the problem of evil that it has been prone to overlook the fact of the good. But anthropology, archaeology, and history all agree to the fact that there has been just as much good as evil, just as much cooperation as conflict, in the story of man, even from the very beginning of his life upon this earth. As a matter of fact, if the good had not outweighed the evil in his life, personal and social, man probably would have destroyed himself long ago. (Tomes have been written about prehistoric man, a great deal of which is sheer fantasy. As Chesterton says (EM, 26, 27, 28): "People have been interested in everything about the cave-man except what he did in the cave." He adds: "Now there does happen to be some real evidence of what he did in the cave . . . What was found in the cave was not the club, the horrible gory club notched with the number of women it had knocked on the head. The cave was not a Bluebeard's
Chamber filled with the skeletons of slaughtered wives; it was not filled with female skulls all arranged in rows and all cracked like eggs." What was found there? "Drawings or paintings of animals; and they were drawn or painted not only by a man but by an artist... They showed the experimental and adventurous spirit of the artist." Breasted, the Egyptologist, tells us (DC) that such words as "righteousness," "truth," "justice," and the like are to be found in the Egyptian fragments as early as the fourth millennium before Christ. The same is true of the evidence of the Mesopotamian fragments.) Man, as far back as he is known historically, aboriginally, and prehistorically, has ever exhibited by his activities the fourfold quest for truth, beauty, goodness (order) and wholeness.

(3) *Man is a creature of moral law.* As Rollo May writes (MSH, 174): "Man is the 'ethical animal'—ethical in potentiality even if, unfortunately, not in actuality. His capacity for ethical judgment—like freedom, reason and the other unique characteristics of the human being—is based upon his consciousness of himself." The human being has never been known, even in the most primitive state, to be without conscience, without a sense of values, without a sense of obligation or duty. If man were merely an aspect of "nature" (a very ambiguous term, one which certainly needs to be defined prior to any intelligent discussion which may involve its use), then any injunction to obey the ways ("laws") of nature or to depart from them would be meaningless. But it is well known that the sense of duty may impel men at times to act in direct opposition to the will to live. In the recent World War, for example, heroes of the Resistance, men without belief in eternal values, in fact without belief in anything except perhaps the pleasure of the moment, nevertheless gave themselves up to torture and death rather than to betray their fellows to the Nazis; and the same has happened recently in outbreaks against the Soviet tyrants. Surely this sense of duty
IN THE BEGINNING GOD . . .

in man implies God as the Source of it and the Guarantor of its integrity. (Cf. Wordsworth, "Ode to Duty":

"Stern Daughter of the Voice of God!"

O Duty! if that name thou love
Who art a light to guide, a rod
To check the erring, and reprove;
Thou, who art victory and law
When empty terrors overawe;
From vain temptations dost set free;
And calm'st the weary strife of frail humanity!")

Cf. Heb. 11:6—"He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarer of them that seek after him." This, basically, was the argument of the German philosopher, Kant (1724-1804). We cannot prove God, said he, by pointing to the starry heavens above, awesome as they may be; rather, it is the moral law within which convinces us that God actually exists. This moral law within is an unconditional mandate (categorical imperative) to heed the call of duty. Conscience, which is the internal apprehension of this moral law, assumes that moral ideals can be and ought to be realized. But they can be realized only if there is a Sovereign Moral Will, God, as their Source and Guarantor; only God can achieve that proper balance between rewards and punishments which is the essence of perfect justice. Thus the moral law per se demands that God exist. It demands, moreover, a future life ("immortality") for the actualization of this reign of perfect justice, that is, for the balancing of accounts; it is only by postulating God, freedom, and immortality, that man can hope to achieve ultimate unity and coherence of his actions.

(4) Man is a creature of conscience: by nature he is a moral being; inevitably and inescapably he has what is properly called a "moral experience." Brosnahan (PE, 3, 4): "In our moral experience one fact stands out pre-eminently, primary, universal, and specific. Every man who
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has attained the use of reason is aware of a magisterial power incorporated in his being, that watches over his conduct, hales him before its tribunal, and judges him impartially and without appeal . . . This indwelling power has been variously designated. For the present we shall call it conscience. The functions of conscience are three-fold: it judges, condemning, commending, or exculpating the past act; it witnesses, accusing, justifying, or defending the present act; it dictates, commanding, permitting, or forbidding the future act.” All men judge that there is a difference between right and wrong, good and bad, in man’s free activity; as a consequence, therefore, they judge that there are some free human acts which the person ought not to elicit, and some which he ought to elicit: the universality of this judgment is what Scholastic philosophers have designated the Ethical Fact. Codes of morality may vary with time and place, as a result of social conditioning, economic pressure, diverse traditions, and other variable factors. But the fundamental categories of right and wrong are inherent in human nature; moreover, there is an undercurrent of unanimity as to basic ethical principles throughout all human thought. (The recognition of the fundamental right to life, for example, and the law against the taking of human life on one’s own authority (murder) are characteristic of all cultures throughout the story of man’s existence upon earth.) Aristotle held, and many thinkers after him, that the sense of justice is innate in man. Conscience in the person is defined as the voice of practical reason; it follows, therefore, that where man with reason has existed (and without the power of reason he could not be called homo sapiens) there man with conscience has existed: reason and conscience are inseparable. Again, it must be obvious that the very fact of conscience demands the Sovereign Good as its Guarantor.

(5) Man is specified as man, among other things, by a sense of values. Cassirer points out (EM, 79-86) that man
is to be distinguished from the brute by his power to think and act in terms of the possible as distinguished from the actual, in terms of the ideal as distinguished from the "real." (Sociology, for example, is the study of human behavior as it apparently is; ethics, on the other hand, is the study of human conduct, i.e., human behavior as it ought to be. (MacIver, the sociologist, says (STS, 520): "To live is to act, and to act is to choose, and to choose is to evaluate." As human beings we are making choices constantly every day of our lives, and choice is a personal selection of that which is desired, in preference to something else, because it is more valued. Persons would never be involved in disagreements, would never quarrel, if there were not at the root of differences a question of value. The world in which man really lives is a world of values rather than the world of things: things have meaning for him only in terms of their value. Hence, history testifies eloquently to the fact that the life of man is a story of his

"Straining forever to the light
That flows from regions out of sight."

Moreover, because man lives in a world of values, he has never been known to be without some form of law, either customary (existing as handed down by tradition) or statutory (existing in stereotyped form: on stone tablets, on parchment or papyrus, or in the form of the written or printed word). What is human (positive) law in essence but the amplification and clarification of the natural law (the law which is incorporated in human nature and in human natural relationships), and what is it as to function but man's efforts at conserving those ideals and practices which his reason (aided by revelation, of course, in our culture in which we are privileged to have the Bible) tells him to be of value to him as an individual and as a society? Law, however, is the expression of the will of the lawgiver; hence, natural laws of any kind—even those of physics and chemistry—must be regarded as the expression of the Will
of the Divine Lawgiver, God, whose Will is the constitution of the universe, both physical and moral. Truly, a lawless world would be a godless world, and vice versa. (Cf. Gen. 1:3, 6, 9, 11, etc.; Ps. 33:6, 9; Ps. 148:1-6; John 1:1-3, 14; Col. 1:15-17; Heb. 1:1-3, 11:3, etc.).

(6) In any reasonable and just world, it would seem that goodness and happiness should be linked together: that is, that the morally good man should be happy and the wicked man unhappy. But, obviously, such is not always the case: as far as our present world is concerned, the righteous often suffer while the wicked prosper, a Judas gets along about as well as a Socrates, and a Nero about as well as a Paul. But man refuses to believe that this is the final word on the subject. There must be an ultimate Good, a Sovereign Will, who will see to it that justice (the proper relation of goodness and happiness) shall eventually reign, in the day of the “restoration of all things” (Acts 3:21). There must be the Holy and Righteous One who will, in the day of reckoning, render to every man according to his deeds, whether they be good or bad. If justice is anything more than a fiction, there must eventually be a judgment, an accounting. There is no point in calling this “wishful thinking”—it is the spontaneous outcry of the human soul for the Ultimate Right, the Highest Good. (Cf. Psa. 89:14, Acts 17:31, Rom. 2:5-6, 2 Cor. 11:15, Heb. 10:27, John 5:29; Matt. 16:27, 25:31-46, 13:24-30; 2 Pet. 2:4-9, 3:8-13; Rev. 20:11-15.)

(7) Man and his values are a part of the structure of the totality of being. The superficial distinction too often made between “facts” and values is an arbitrary one: values are facts of the world we live in. Ultimate truth, both physical and moral, is in the very structure of being-as-such. The “laws” of physics and chemistry, for example, are simply descriptions of processes which man discovers in the world around him. Lightning, for instance, was a form of electricity long before Ben Franklin flew his kite.
and discovered it to be such. King Tut might easily have had a radio or television set to provide him with entertainment on his journey to the land of Osiris, had his contemporaries only had the know-how in the field of electronics. Rome could easily have dropped a hydrogen bomb on Carthage if her engineers had known how to harness the power of the atom. All that was lacking in any case was the knowledge on man's part: all the ingredients and the processes involved have been part of the cosmic order from the dawn of creation. *In the physical world, truth is one, and man only discovers it.* (For a simple illustration, let us suppose that Smith and Jones have a mutual friend, Brown. Smith meets Jones on the street one day and says to him, "I saw Brown a few minutes ago and he was wearing a lovely brand new overcoat, one that reached to his ankles and had five buttons on the front." Jones replies, "I saw him too, new overcoat and all. But you are mistaken about the number of buttons--it had only three buttons in front spaced widely apart." Smith re-affirms, "No, the overcoat had five buttons. You are the one who is mistaken." And so the argument waxes warm. Until Smith declares, "Five buttons is right and true for me." Jones hotly replies, "Three buttons is the truth for me." Obviously, the phrase, "for me," is utterly irrelevant, insofar as the actual truth is concerned. Smith and Jones hunt up Brown and take a look at the overcoat. The truth turns out to be that the actual number of buttons on the overcoat is four. What Smith and Jones thought about it had no bearing on the facts in the case. And so it is always with respect to the cosmos around us: it is what it is. Truth is in the objective order; it is one; and it is discovered, not formulated, by man. *The same is true with respect to truth in the moral realm: ultimate moral truth is incorporated in the structure of human nature and human natural relationships.* This is what is meant in our Western tradition by the phrase, "natural moral law," or just the "moral
law,” or, as it is sometimes designated, “the law of human nature.” Aristotle: “The law is reason unaffected by desire.” Cicero: “The law is not in opinion but in nature.” As Dorothy L. Sayers has written (MM, 24, 26): “There is a universal moral law, as distinct from a moral code, which consists of certain statements of fact about the nature of man; and by behaving in conformity with which, man enjoys his true freedom . . . The universal law (or natural law of humanity) is discoverable, like any other law of nature, by experience. It cannot be promulgated, it can only be ascertained, because it is a question not of opinion but of fact. When it has been ascertained, a moral code can be drawn up to direct human behavior and prevent men, as far as possible, from doing violence to their own nature . . . Defy the commandments of the natural law, and the race will perish in a few generations; cooperate with them, and the race will flourish for ages to come. This is the fact; whether we like it or not, the universe is made that way.” Moral law has its foundation in human nature and human natural relationships. Man’s external relationships are three in number, namely, (a) that of dependence upon “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” (to borrow the appropriate phrase from the Declaration of Independence), the natural relationship which is the source of all religious rights and duties; (b) that of equality with his fellows, the relationship which is the source of all social and civil rights and duties; and (c) that of trusteeship or proprietorship over the subhuman orders, the relationship from which all property rights originate. (All human beings are equal in the sight of the Creator in the sense that they have all been created persons; and this equality is confirmed by the fact that Christ died for all men alike. See Mal. 2:10; Acts 17:26; Rom. 5:6-8; 1 Cor. 15:3; 2 Cor. 5:14, 15; 1 Thess. 5:9, 10; 1 Tim. 2:5, 6; Heb. 10:10, etc.). It should be noted, moreover, that these relationships inhere in the nature of things;
they are the “givens”; man does not create them, nor can he change them in any way; he finds them here on his arrival in the world; and from them all his rights and obligations derive. Therefore, we may rightly define the Natural Moral Law (the Moral Law) as that law which is the promulgation in man of the Eternal Law, the Will of God, the Law by which the human being is constituted a person and by which, therefore, human nature and human natural relationships are ordained to be precisely what they are. The primary principles of the Moral Law are set forth in the two Great Commandments (Matt. 22:35-40; Deut. 6:5; Lev. 19:18). The secondary principles of the Moral Law are incorporated in the broad general norms of the Decalogue (Exo. 20:1-17). These moral norms were indeed known to man from the beginning, embedded in his conscience and handed down by tradition, but because of the growing wickedness of the race it became necessary for them to be codified (in order to be preserved) through the mediatorship of Moses. Gal. 3:19—“the law was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come.” Each of these secondary principles must be applied, of course, to the concrete life situation. (Think of the many different kinds of homicide, of disrespect for parents, of theft, of lying, of false witness, of contract-breaking, of covetousness, etc.) The tertiary principles of the Moral Law are set forth in human customary or statutory law: all human law is just to the extent only that it amplifies and clarifies the natural moral law. (Traffic regulations, for example, are for the ultimate end of protecting man’s most fundamental right, namely, the right to life.) The basic principles of the moral law are amenable to human apprehension (even to reason unaided by special revelation) by means of the principle of universalization; that is to say, the determination of the goodness or badness of an act on the ground of what the result would be if the act were universalized, that is, if everybody did it.
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It would have to be agreed, I am sure, that the universal practice of murder, theft, adultery, lying, perjury, covenant-breaking, disrespect for parents, etc., or indeed of any one of these, would destroy social order and in all probability would bring about the destruction of the race.

(8) Legality, then, if it has any real basis, must have it in morality, and morality has its basis in human nature and in human natural relationships; that is, in the Moral Law promulgated in the person as such, the law which is in turn the promulgation of the Eternal Law, the expression of the Sovereign Will. This Will is the ultimate norm by which the person is constituted a person with all the rights and duties that attach to him solely and simply because he is a person. As Nathaniel Micklem of Mansfield College, Oxford, writes (TP, 60): "The Source of our being and the Artificer of our nature is God Himself. That 'law of nature' which, as the Apostle held, is written on the hearts even of the heathen (Rom. 2: 14-16), is an expression of the Reason which of itself is a reflection of the wisdom and 'eternal law' of God; second, as reflecting it, the 'law of nature,' and third, the customary and statute law of men, which has no validity except as an approximation to the 'law of nature.'" Moral obligation is not physical compulsion; nor is it mere custom or convention; nor is it mere advantage or expediency: it is the obligation placed upon the human will, proximately by the positive law insofar as that law reflects the natural moral law, mediatelty by the natural moral law, and ultimately by the Eternal Law, the Will of God. Hence morals are not to be identified with mores, nor is morality to be identified in all respects with legality: doing right is of a higher order than being careful or keeping out of the penitentiary. This is a lesson which our age needs to learn. Moreover, the morale of a nation inescapably is dependent on its morality.

(9) Even the ethical relativist, the man who would insist that morality is nothing but the fashion of a particular
time and place, finds himself obliged, if he has a single drop of the milk of human kindness in his veins, to accept at least the human being himself as the norm of moral action. Dr. Robert Ulich, Professor of Education at Harvard tells (HC, 149-150) of a scientist (the man was a physician and also a social psychologist) who, in the course of a scholarly discussion, affirmed his espousal theoretically of the relativist position for the scientist. Whereupon one of the discussants present asked him if it would be possible to work out the variables essential to a valid scientific experiment designed to work over into criminals a group of normal children. The speaker replied that he thought it could be done. The discussant then asked him if he did not think it in the interest of the science of criminology that such an experiment should be made. The scientist answered that in his opinion such an experiment would indeed prove enlightening. He was then asked point-blank why he had never undertaken such an experiment. His reply was that children could not be found for such an experiment for the simple reason that parents could not be found who would be willing for their children to be subjected like human guinea pigs to such a test. Then the final question was put to him: “But, sir, if the children, and consenting parents, could be found, would you be willing to make the proposed experiment?” The scientist replied, with an oath, “Do you think I am one of those Nazi war crime doctors who tortured human beings for so-called scientific experiments? Who would wilfully turn a child into a criminal?” Dr. Ulich adds: “What was happening in this discussion was the denial of relativism by its defender. Unconsciously, he had always made his scientific system relative to something he apparently considered absolute, namely the human being. This human being was to him not another piece of flesh or another species of animals (with which he constantly experimented). Rather it was sacred, belonging, if one wants
to say so, to a system superior to all other systems. Making a criminal out of a man by scientific means would have meant to him not only degradation of the value and dignity of humanity, but also of science itself.”

(10) Legal positivism is the denial of natural law and natural right and obligation altogether. The legal positivist admits no more ultimate source of law and right than the law of the tribe or state of which the person happens to be a unit. Yet the legal positivist cannot, any more than the ethical relativist, eliminate the human being as such as the natural norm. (The Bible makes it crystal clear that even all divinely revealed law is for man’s benefit. Cf. the penalty pronounced on mankind, Gen. 3:17—“cursed is the ground for thy sake,” etc. Also the words of Jesus, Mark 2:27—“The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath.”) Even the late Justice Holmes, who certainly was inclined to the positivist view, felt obliged to admit (see Max Lerner, MFJH, 396) that certain necessary elements would have to characterize a society “which would seem to us to be civilized,” namely, “some form of permanent association between the sexes, some residue of property individually owned, some mode of binding oneself to specified future conduct, and at the bottom of all, some protection for the person.” (But why “some protection for the person”? Obviously and solely because of the person’s dignity and worth as a person. And what is the basis of man’s dignity and worth as a person? Could it be anything else than the fact that he is created in the image of God, Gen. 1:26, 27?) The simple fact of the matter is that if the will of one man, or of a group of men, or even of a majority of men, is that which constitutes law and right, then the right of individual conscience, or the right of the minority, does not actually exist. Manifestly, there must be a law somewhere that is of higher obligatory power than the law of the tribe or state: a law superior to the will of one man or that of a few men or even that of a
majority. There must be a law somewhere that is binding alike on the ruler and on the ruled; otherwise the ruler could never do wrong, the majority could never enact an unjust law, and such rights as the right of individual conscience and the right of the minority would become mere fictions or at most only gratuities bestowed by a ruling regime. If there is no law anywhere superior to the civil authority, to the will of the ruling regime, then the will of that ruling regime, backed as it always is by physical force, becomes the absolute source of law and right from which there is no appeal. This is simply the world-old doctrine that Might makes Right. Hence, the enlightened conscience of man has ever held that there is a Moral Law, the expression of the Eternal Law, the Will of the Creator, which is superior to, and the ground of, all just civil authority and civil law. To abandon this credo is to turn man over to the whims of tyrants and totalitarian regimes. As William Penn once put it, If men are not willing to be governed by God, they will be governed by tyrants.

(11) Will legal positivism stand up, under either logical or empirical scrutiny, or even under the scrutiny of common sense? I think not. For example, is an enactment of a state legislature or national congress necessary to create the division of sex into male and female, the division which lies at the root of all forms of society and upon which the continuity of the race depends? Of course not. This is a provision of "the laws of Nature and of Nature's God." Again, is an enactment by any human legislative body necessary to ordain that parents shall have children, and shall provide for and protect their children, or that children shall respect their parents? I think not. Such obligations inhere in the very nature of the world and of man, and indeed were more scrupulously observed in primitive society than in modern society. Again, is a legislative enactment necessary to establish the Golden Rule as a principle of human conduct—the principle that every man
should do unto others as he would have others do unto him? I think not. This principle (of reciprocity) is as old as antiquity itself and indeed, in all probability, co-temporaneous with *homo sapiens*. Still again, two years ago the faculty and staff of Columbia University celebrated that institution’s Bicentennial. The theme of the various sessions was “the right to knowledge.” I therefore ask: Must man have a legislative enactment to give him the right to knowledge? I think not. Does not his natural capacity for knowledge—by virtue of his having been created or constituted a *person*—give him the natural right to knowledge? Is not the natural right to knowledge the necessary means to the right to life in its growing fulness—the necessary means to personal self-realization and to social adjustment as well? This brings us, of course, to the ultimate question: Does man simply *live*, or does he have the *right* to life? Is man simply to accept himself as a person without giving any thought to the rights and duties of personality? Must we stop thinking in terms of ultimates and simply adopt Popeye’s philosophy (which is, incidentally, that of Positivism), “I yam what I yam”? In short, Has man been constituted a person by any act of a human legislature? The question is absurd, of course, on the face of it. Man is a person, with the *right to personality*, by virtue of having been *created* a person, and that by the Efficient Causality, God, who is the Source and Ground of His being. Concerning this right to personality, Cassirer gives us, I think, “the conclusion of the whole matter,” as follows (MS, 219): “There is at least one right which cannot be ceded or abandoned: the right to personality... If a man could give up his personality he would cease being a moral being. He would become a lifeless thing—and how could such a thing obligate itself—how could it make a promise to enter into a social contract? This fundamental right, the right to personality, includes in a sense all the others. To maintain and to
develop his personality is a universal right. It is not subject to the freaks and fancies of single individuals and cannot, therefore, be transferred from one individual to another. The contract of rulership which is the legal basis of all civil power has, therefore, its inherent limits. There is no *pactum subjectionis*, no act of submission by which man can give up the state of a free agent and enslave himself. For by such an act of renunciation he would give up that very character which constitutes his nature and essence: he would lose his humanity.” (Thus we see what is meant by the phrase, “unalienable rights.”)

(12) *Natural law* and *natural right* and *obligation* are terms which have no meaning whatever apart from the Sovereign Will of God as the obligating norm of moral action. Hence the profound affirmations of our Declaration of Independence, that all men are *created* equal; that they are endowed *by their Creator* (not by any man or group of men, not even by a majority vote of men) with certain *unalienable rights*; that among such rights are the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and that *to secure these rights*, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from *the consent of the governed*. That is to say, all men have these specified unalienable rights by creation, by virtue of having been created persons; hence, the proper function of government is that of protecting these rights (of making them secure). Obviously, no human government can grant rights and impose duties which inhere in all men by virtue of their having been created persons. Moreover, these are said to be *unalienable* rights, that is, rights which cannot be alienated from the person as such. They attach to the person simply and solely because he is a person: he can neither give them away nor can they be taken from him by another. There is a subtle distinction to be made here between the right itself and the exercise of the right. True it is that a man may be called on to jeopardize the exercise
of his right to life in the interest of the common good; or he may be unjustly deprived of the exercise of the rights to life and liberty by the act of a tyrannical government. But under any and all conditions, the rights themselves remain unimpaired; they can no more be alienated from the person than his memories, thoughts, and experiences can be alienated from him: these rights inhere in personality itself and remain forever unimpaired both in this world and in the world to come. (The same is true of man's natural obligations; one of which is to render to God the internal and external worship that is due Him.) (Note, too, that the idea of personal survival (i.e., beyond the death of the body) is implicit in this doctrine of unalienable rights.) (For a thoroughgoing presentation of this doctrine of the Moral Law, see Corwin, The "Higher Law" Background of American Constitutional Law, a Great Seal Book, published by the Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York.)

(13) Natural moral law, natural right, and natural obligation, all belong, of course, in the realm of those facts which usually are categorized as values. Hence, like all values, they are not amenable to observation, measurement, or "proof," in a laboratory of science. But certainly it has been proved again and again, from laboratory of human history, that the moment a nation or an individual abandons or ignores these values, that nation or that individual is on the way to every form of injustice and cruelty imaginable.

(14) All good, all right, all law, all values, all rights, etc., have their ultimate Source in the Sovereign Will of God if they have any binding force whatever, that is, any binding force that is moral rather than physical (sheer might). To illustrate, I am reminded of the story of two salesmen who, in the days when travel was chiefly by train, boarded a passenger coach standing in the railroad yards, disposed themselves and their bags as comfortably
as possible, and leaned back to enjoy an hour or more of relaxation. Not long afterward the brakeman thrust his head in at the front door and asked, "What are you fellows doing in here?" "What do you think we're doing?" answered one of the salesmen, rather sarcastically, and added: "We're going over to the county seat, of course." "Not in this coach," declared the brakeman. The salesmen, exasperated, shouted, almost in unison, "Why not in this coach?" "Because," answered the brakeman, "if you'd used your eyes, you'd know why. You could 'a' seen that this coach ain't coupled onto anything that'll take you anywhere." Laws, goods, values, rights, etc., that are not "coupled" onto the Sovereign Will of God as the Guarantor of their integrity are not sufficient to take any human being anywhere either in this world or in the next. Denial of natural law and natural right is the final proof of the shallowness which has characterized recent ethical and political thought.

(15) The clearest and simplest presentation of the ethical or valuational argument for the existence of God, of which I have any knowledge, is that from the pen of C. S. Lewis, in his excellent little book (which certainly every Christian should read) entitled, The Case for Christianity (published by Macmillan, New York, 1943). His presentation may be summarized briefly as follows: There is in every accountable person the concept of a Law of Right and Wrong (whether it be called a Law or Rule of Fair Play, of Decent Behavior, or what not), that is to say, a Law of Human Nature; otherwise, there would not be repeated differences, even quarrels, about the significance of human acts. "Quarreling means trying to show that the other man's in the wrong" (p. 4). Two facts stand out in all human experience: "First, that human beings, all over the earth, have this curious idea that they ought to behave in a certain way and can't really get rid of it. Secondly, that they don't in fact behave that way. They know the
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Law of Nature; they break it. These two facts are the foundation of all clear thinking about ourselves and the universe we live in" (p. 7). This twofold intuition is proof of the fact that men do believe in a real Right and Wrong, no matter how variously they may interpret the modus operandi thereof. The ordinary "laws of nature," describing "what Nature in fact does," do not give us the whole story. The Law of Human Nature tells us what we as persons "ought to do, and don't." "Progress means not just changing, but changing for the better. If no set of moral ideas were truer or better than any other there would be no sense in preferring civilized morality to savage morality, or Christian morality to Nazi morality. In fact, of course, we all do believe that some moralities are better than others" (p. 11). Yet comparisons of better or worse do, in themselves, point to an ultimate (absolute) Morality or Good Will. Life is made up of the facts (how men do behave) plus something else (how they ought to behave), and these "oughts" are also facts, facts which cannot be accounted for by any impersonal Life-Force, Creative-Evolution or Emergent-Evolution philosophy. There is a Moral Law in us declaring that men ought to be fair, that they ought to be unselfish. But men are not always fair, not always unselfish, and they know they are not. This Moral Law points definitely to a Something or Somebody from above and beyond the material universe who "is actually getting at us." We have two bits of conclusive evidence about this Somebody: namely, the universe which He has made, and the Moral Law which He has put into our minds (p. 25). It is at this point that Christianity comes into the picture, as the only system which resolves our basic human problems. This it does by dealing with man realistically: it tells him that he is not just an imperfect creature who is in need of improvement, one who can lift himself up to perfection simply by tugging at his own bootstraps; that, rather, he is a rebel who must lay down his
arms and accept the Remedy which God has provided for him. That Remedy is the Supreme Sacrifice on the Cross (supreme, because it was not made by man for man, but made by God Himself for man, and made out of His love for fallen man; hence, the Atonement). "The central Christian belief is that Christ's death has somehow put us right with God and given us a fresh start" (p. 46). 2 Cor. 5:19—"God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." Christianity proves its divine origin by its realism: it finds man in precisely the fallen and helpless state morally in which his conscience testifies that he is (if, of course, he will only be honest with himself; cf. Luke 8:15); and it does even more: it offers the remedy, it provides the way out—the way to forgiveness, restoration and life everlasting. It presents the living and true God, who is not only Sovereign Righteous Will, but who is also the Forgiving Father who, by the offering of His Son, has made it possible for Eternal Justice "himself to be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 3:26).

(16) God is Truth, Beauty, Goodness, all these and more: He is Wholeness or Holiness (John 17:11, Isa. 6:3, Rev. 4:8). Worship (praise, adoration, commemoration, meditation, prayer, service, etc.) is man's acknowledgement of the worth-ship of God. (Rudolph Otto, in his book The Idea of the Holy, proposes the view that religious value is characterized by a single unique quality which he designates the numinous, a quality totally different from any profane or secular experience, the quality of mysterious and fascinating awe. The "holy" in God is the "awesome-ness" of God. Cf. Gen. 28:17—Jacob's experience at Bethel: "And he was afraid, and said, How dreadful is this place! This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven." Deut. 4:24—"Jehovah thy God is a devouring fire." Heb. 10:31—"It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.")

(17) Dr. Samuel M. Thompson writes (MPR, 197):
"Men pass judgment upon themselves. They are aware of their failure to fulfil the obligations they accept. They judge themselves, what they are, in the light of a conception of what they ought to be... A man is, and so is a fact; but he demands of himself that he be what he ought to be, and he judges himself by that standard. By virtue of his moral nature he denies his complete submergence in natural fact. He is fact, it is true; but he sees himself also as under a moral necessity to make fact, and to make it in accordance with models which are not themselves mere facts of nature. Human nature contains within itself the power to act for the sake of what it understands its own end to be. This is will; it is genuine action, not merely reaction... Man has ideas of what he should be and he acknowledges his obligation to act in accordance with those ideas. But on what does this obligation rest? What justifies the judgment he passes upon himself when he fails to do what he thinks he should do? That is, what does it mean in relation to the Reality of the cosmic structure that some of its inhabitants have a "moral experience" which is qualitatively different from every other class of phenomena in the world and is not reasonably to be accounted for by the operation of the physical and chemical, or even vital, forces? Both common sense and Scripture give only one satisfactory answer to these questions: that answer is—God. The fact of values in man and his world is proof that God exists as the Summum Bonum, the Beginning and the End of all true value. A world without the cardinal virtues or values (prudence, fortitude, temperance, and justice), and especially one without the theological virtues or values (faith, hope, and love) would be a lawless world and a godless world: it would be a world without any meaning whatsoever. Only a world with values inherent in it can have meaning, and these values can derive their integrity only from the Sovereign Good Will. Again quoting Thompson (MPR, 432): "How is man to
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find real value, and to distinguish it from the appearance of value? There is only one way, and that is to find absolute value embodied in real existence. This is the answer of religion, and it is an answer most explicit in the Christian religion. When absolute good comes to man through the channel of his own nature alone its image is so twisted and distorted by the medium through which it passes that he cannot see it as good.” Again (ibid., 529-530): “Theism, as a philosophy, begins and ends with a sense of our own finiteness. The nineteenth century positivist, on the contrary, was sure of everything. What he knew was certain, and what he did not know he was sure could not be known. Such cocky arrogance was made possible only by his ability to ignore the difficulties involved in any ultimate questioning. It never occurred to Mill or Comte, nor has it occurred to their twentieth century offspring, ever to stare at such a problem as that raised by Leibniz’s question: Why is there something rather than nothing?” Again (ibid., 15): “Any conception of God, whatever else it may include, must regard God as really existing. A non-existing God is a contradiction in terms. A conception of God must consider God to be the primary or ultimate existent; that is to say we cannot apply the word God to anything which depends on something else for its existence. Finally, we mean by God the source of the good and the final reality of value.” The following excerpt from a radio address by Karl Stern, M.D., July 17, 1955, entitled “Psychiatry and Religion,” is especially pertinent here, in conclusion. Dr. Stern calls attention to “the general positivistic atmosphere of our time,” “the belief that science is the only fountain of truth and that revelation is bunk,” the view that “has pervaded large sectors of our culture.” He goes on to say: “In the time of the Renaissance, philosophers butted into the realm of the scientists. They wanted to disprove discoveries about the movements of stars on the basis of what Aristotle or Aquinas had to say. Now the tables are turned.
Now some of our scientists want to apply the scientific method to problems which lie in the realm of philosophy. And the result would be quite unimaginable. There are two basic and entirely different modes of human insight—science and wisdom. Wisdom can tell us nothing about the chemical composition of proteins. And science can tell us nothing about the moral values of Man. At a religious soap box meeting at Hyde Park Corner an atheist heckler once remarked, concerning the creation: ‘If I had made a universe I certainly would do a better job than God,’ whereupon the speaker remarked: ‘I don’t want to challenge you on this, but would you mind, for the time being, making a rabbit, just to establish confidence?’ The world of spiritual values is also a universe, and no matter how many new things we discover in the science concerning Man, we won’t be able to do the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount over. None of us would be able to improve on them.”

N. B.—No doubt the student has taken note of the unusual length of this Lesson. I have gone to this length in order to make clear the theological foundation of democracy. It is my belief that there can be only one real foundation for respect for self or respect for others, and that is the deep conviction that every person has been created in the image of God. The close correlation between Biblical teaching and social and political democracy is undeniable, and this is a fact which every citizen of the United States of America should clearly understand and never forget.—C.C.C.

6. The Aesthetic Proof

This is the Proof based on the Fact of Beauty throughout the cosmos. Man’s history down through the ages has ever been characterized by his recognition and contemplation of the various aspects of cosmic beauty. This is evident from the fact that from his most primitive state down to the present, he has invariably left behind his works of
art. As G. K. Chesterton has written about the art which the cave-man left on the cave walls of Western Europe (EM, pp. 1-44): “They were drawings or paintings of animals; and they were drawn or painted not only by a man but by an artist . . . They showed the experimental and adventurous spirit of the artist . . . it would seem that he was not only an artist but a naturalist; the sort of naturalist who is really natural.” He goes on to say that there is no evidence whatever that this was the end-product of a long prior artistic development: “For in the plain matter like the pictures there is in fact not a trace of any such development or degree. Monkeys did not begin pictures and men finish them; Pithecanthropus did not draw a reindeer badly and Homo Sapiens draw it well. The higher animals did not draw better and better portraits; the dog did not paint better in his best period than in his early bad manner as a jackal; the wild horse was not an Impressionist and the race-horse a Post-Impressionist.” These artistic productions on the cave walls, Chesterton says, testify “to something that is absolute and unique; that belongs to man and to nothing else except man; that is a difference of kind and not a difference of degree. A monkey does not draw clumsily and a man cleverly; a monkey does not begin the art of representation and a man carry it to perfection. A monkey does not do it at all; he does not begin to do it at all; he does not begin to begin to do it at all. A line of some kind is crossed [from brute to man] before the first faint line [of art] can begin.” And finally: “It is the simple truth that man does differ from the brutes in kind and not in degree; and that the proof of it is here; that it sounds like a truism to say that the most primitive man drew a picture of a monkey and that it sounds like a joke to say that the most intelligent monkey drew a picture of a man. Something of division and of disproportion has appeared; and it is unique. Art
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is the signature of man.

Of course, art is not to be confused with utility. As Trueblood writes, "Truth always requires corroboration, but beauty, wherever we find it, is self-justifying." The beautiful, he adds, "is not primarily something which we seek, but something, rather, which claims us" (PR, 121). As Cassirer has written (EM, 143-145), art is also to be distinguished from science, because art is the "intensification" of reality, whereas science is the "impoverishment" of reality (that is, in the form of symbols, formulas, laws, etc.).

That beauty is not merely subjective is evident from the fact that persons argue about aesthetic judgments, and the subjectivists argue as much as other persons do. Moreover, the sense of Beauty, as of a landscape, for instance, is publicly shared, and this could not be true if beauty were merely subjective. This public sharing of the appreciation of "all things bright and beautiful" is what Kant has called "aesthetic universality." Hence, to say that a thing is "beautiful for me" has no relevance. This means that there is such a thing as natural beauty objectively: the beauty of the restless ocean, of the wind-swept prairie, of the starry heavens above, of the cathedral aisles of the Rockies and the pine-clad mountain slopes of the Alleghenies. Is there not, then, an Artist who is responsible for all this natural beauty? We must conclude with Dr. Trueblood (PR, 130): "If the world is the creation of Infinite Mind, the prodigious beauty of the world makes sense. In short, if theism is true, the esthetic experience of natural beauty is what we should expect to find."

7. The Intuitional Proof

(1) Man is universally endowed with religious intuitions and aspirations, all of which point unmistakably to the Supreme Being who alone is able to supply his needs. Every human being enjoys salvation from physical death daily and hourly through the beneficence of a kind Provi-
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dence. Man has always been profoundly conscious of his creaturehood, of the brevity and incompleteness of his temporal life: "the tragic sense of life" has borne down heavily upon his consciousness in all ages. (See Homer, Iliad, VI, 145-149: the words of Glaukos to Diomedes on the battlefield before Troy: "Why dost thou inquire of my generation? Even as are the generations of leaves so likewise are those of men: the leaves that be, the wind scattereth upon the earth, and the forest buddeth and putteth forth more leaves again, when the season of spring is at hand; so of the generations of men one putteth forth and another ceaseth to be." Cf. also Psa. 115:15-16, 90:5-6; Job 14:1-2; Isa. 40:6-8; Jas. 1:10; 1 Pet. 1:23-25.) M. M. Davis, How To Be Saved, p. 20: "However fallen and degraded, there is something within man that reaches after God, and a piteous voice that cries to the unseen for help." All attempts by political cultists to brainwash man's consciousness of his need of God, as the Rock of his salvation and his refuge and strength in time of trouble, out of his thoughts and his life, are doomed from the outset: their very unnaturalness consigns them to ultimate destruction. All people have their belief in some kind of God (or gods) no matter how depraved their concepts of His nature and character. Those who reject the living and true God will, in order to fill the vacuum thus created in their lives, heap to themselves false "gods" in the form of a Fuehrer, a Party, a Cause, etc., to which they give fanatical monolithic devotion, and in this manner make a "religion" of irreligion. (2) The Vedas declare: "There is but one Being—no second." The creed of Judaism was, and is, "Jehovah our God is one Jehovah" (Deut. 6:4, 4:35,39). The cry of a united Mohammedanism has always been: "Allah is God, and Mohammed is his prophet." Even Brahma, Tao, The One, Unity, etc., of the philosophical mysticisms are designations for what is popularly designated "God." The late Dr. Einstein is quoted by Lincoln Barnett (UDE, 106) as
follows: "My religion consists of a humble admiration of the illimitable, superior spirit who reveals himself in the slight details we are able to perceive with our frail and feeble minds. That deeply emotional conviction of the presence of a superior reasoning power, which is revealed in the incomprehensible universe, forms my idea of God." This, of course, is the pantheistic god of Spinoza, not the God of the Bible at all; still, it is a concept of God. Strong (ST, 56): "The lowest tribes have conscience, fear death, believe in witches, propitiate or frighten away evil fates. Even the fetish-worshiper, who calls the stone or tree a god, shows that he has already the idea of a God." It is most interesting to note, too, that back of the mythological (and grossly anthropomorphic) pantheons of the early historic nations; as their foundation and support, was the belief in an "All-Father" or "Great Spirit."

(3) Dr. Reiser of the University of Pittsburgh has written recently (NMG) of "customs and impulses which cannot be uprooted from a humanity in whom the instinct to survive, the instinct to reproduce, and the instinct to worship the unknown source of all life, are of equal strength and validity." It should be noted also that the former outspoken pessimist and agnostic, Aldous Huxley, not so long ago turned to mysticism: see his book, The Perennial Philosophy. The late C. E. M. Joad, of the University of London, professor of philosophy and well-known author, also lived to experience a change of heart from agnosticism. Note also Walter Lippmann's emphasis on the natural moral law, in his latest work, The Public Philosophy; and Joseph Wood Krutch, the critic, calls man back to a sense of his responsibility for making "independent choices and value judgements," in a recent book, The Measure of Man. The fact that our contemporary literateurs are showing evidences of renewed sanity in their thinking may indeed be a hopeful sign.

(4) According to the anthropologist, Sir James Frazer,
primitive magic must not be confused with religion; its real affinity, he contends, is with science rather than with religion. The shaman or medicine man, he says, presumes to control the higher powers by means of the appropriate ritual or incantation, just as the scientist claims the know-how to control, by formulas and rules, the forces of nature. Their approach is the same, even though magic is superstition, whereas science is usually what it claims to be, — science. Religion, on the other hand, is anything but presumption to control: it is essentially humility, trust, faith, love, and prayer or petition to the superhuman Power or Powers. The very heart of religion is expressed in the well-known words, “Not as I will, but as thou wilt” (Matt. 26:39-42). Hangovers of primitive magic may be seen today in the antics of religious racketeers who presume to put God on the spot by demanding that He work a miracle at the time and place set by them, when as a matter of fact God causes miracles to occur at times and places set by Him and for His own ends: e.g., those persons who make a practice of showing off their alleged high standing with the Almighty by deliberately handling poisonous snakes, or those who demand repeated miracles of healing or other kinds of “signs,” as evidence of God’s approbation of them personally or of His fellowship with them. There is still too much barter, even in Christianity, too much saying to God, “If you’ll scratch my back, then I’ll scratch yours.” Pure love for God makes no such propositions, does not seek a “sign” (Matt. 16:1-4); in perfect trust it says always and only, “Thy will be done” (Matt. 6:10). I am reminded here of the incident which occurred in the nineteen-twenties (the decade which Frederick Lewis Allen, in his book, Only Yesterday, dubs “the Great Age of Whoopie and Ballyhoo”), in which the novelist, Sinclair Lewis, standing in the pulpit of an influential church in Kansas City, took advantage of the opportunity to prove, as he thought, that there is no God. Lewis had previously
declared publicly that he did not believe in God, and, like most of his kind, evidently he thought that his disbelief was a matter of some consequence to the public; so, in the role of a clergyman, he stood in the pulpit, struck a defiant attitude, and with a sweeping gesture publicly defied Divine Power to strike him dead on the spot. With utter lack of good taste, he shouted, “If there be a God, I defy him to strike me down in the next ten minutes.” Dramatically, he pulled out his watch—and waited. Of course, nothing happened, and thus Mr. Lewis proved to his own satisfaction that there was no God. The columnist, Arthur Brisbane, commenting on the incident afterward, had this to say: “Mr. Storey of the Santa Fe Railroad manages railroads from Chicago to the Pacific. The trains pass over hundreds of railroad ties, and between the ties there are thousands of tiny ants, everywhere busy making a living. One ant says to another, ‘They tell me that a mysterious W. B. Storey runs this railroad. I don’t believe that there is a W. B. Storey, and just to prove it, I defy him, if he does exist, to come down here in the next ten minutes and step on me and kill me.’” “At the end of ten minutes,” wrote Mr. Brisbane, “that ant would feel as proud as Sinclair Lewis. But that would not mean that Storey could not step on the ant and kill it, if he wanted to; nor that the Ruler of the universe could not strike Lewis dead, if it were worth while. The point is that it isn’t worth while.”

Some fifty years prior to this incident in Kansas City, Mrs. Annie Besant, who was then engaged in inflicting on the gullible the hocus-pocus known as “theosophy,” while addressing an audience of working-men in the Hall of Science, a slum auditorium in Old Street, London, struck a defiant pose, and, taking her watch in her hand, shouted dramatically, “If there be a God in heaven, I give Him five minutes in which to strike me dead.” There was complete silence as the minutes ticked slowly away and nothing happened. At the end of the allotted time, she turned to
the audience and cried: "Where is your God?" This occurred on a Sunday evening. The following Sunday morning, Joseph Parker, the renowned minister of the City Temple, referred to Mrs. Besant's challenge. He said: "If on your return home this morning, your little boy, just learning to talk, were to surprise you by lifting his head up from the pillow to say, 'You say you are my father. I don't believe you. If you are my father, I give you just five minutes to prove it by crushing the life out of me,' what would you do? Would you prove yourself the great being that you are and take your child by the throat and strangle him to death? No, you would press the little fellow's head back on the pillow, rock the cradle a while, and say, "Sleep, sleep, little one. Some day when you have grown bigger and learned a few things, you will know that I am your father.'” Then, in a whisper that could be heard throughout that vast auditorium, Joseph Parker said, “There is your God!”

(5) We can neither assume nor recognize the finite as finite except by comparison with the Infinite. As Victor Hugo once said: “Some men deny the sun: they are the blind.” Even the atheists and ethical nihilists, whose first tenet is that God and duty are bugbears to be abolished, assume that God and duty exist somehow, and that they are impelled by a sense of duty to abolish them. The fanatical Marxist-Leninist, even though clinging to the silly notion that religion is the opium of the people, will resort to lies, treachery, torture, and even murder en masse, to bring in those values which he envisions as inherent in what he calls a “classless society.” (Let us not forget that the word utopia, which is derived from the Greek negative prefix, ou, and the Greek topos, “place,” means literally “no place.”) In modern times, the woods are full of these pseudo-religions, such as National Socialism, Fascism, Communism (falsely so-called), Humanism, etc., so-called “religious substitutes” for true religion. All of which goes
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to show that, as it has often been said, man is incurably religious. Or, as Toynbee has put it: “Religion is manifestly one of the essential faculties of human nature. No individual human being and no human community is ever without a religion of some kind; and, when people are starved of religion, the desperate spiritual straits to which they are reduced by being deprived of this necessity of life can fire them to extract grains of religious consolation out of the most unpromising ores.”

(6) “Blind unbelief is sure to err,” wrote Cowper. Of course. It errs, because it is blind: cf. Matt. 15:14. In all ages, of course, there have been individuals and groups who have indulged in the sport of throwing spitballs at the Almighty. Even in ordinary swearing, men seem to be unable to find any Names worthy of being invoked in oaths except those of God and Jesus Christ: unwittingly they are paying compliments, albeit left-handed ones, to the God of the Bible. Cf. Psa. 2:1-4: What does God think about all this human presumption and vanity? Verse 4 answers the question: “He that sitteth in the heavens will laugh: the Lord will have them in derision.” I have the feeling that the Almighty’s sense of humor is being aroused in our day by the antics of ignorant mobs, rioting, vandalizing, destroying, and shouting their loyalties to self-appointed tyrants whose number at present seems to be Legion. I have the feeling also that the Laughter of God is something inexpressibly awesome, something to be dreaded. I for one pray God that I may never have to hear it.

(7) Practically all peoples have their conceptions of a future life. Archaeological discoveries have shown that the Cult of the Dead flourished among all prehistoric peoples of whom we have any records whatever. (See Sir James Frazer’s three-volume work, Belief in Immortality Among Primitives.) To the Greeks the future heavenly world was known as Elysium (with Hades as the Underworld, and Tartarus (cf. 2 Pet. 2:4) as the place of eternal punishment
of all great sinners). Among the Germanic tribes, future bliss was to be enjoyed in Valhalla; among the American Indians, in the Happy Hunting Ground. Among the Hebrew people of old, the glories of the heavenly state were designated by such names as Paradise or Abraham's Bosom. (The Hebrew Underworld, corresponding to the Greek Hades, was known as Sheol. However, Hades and Sheol were regarded simply as abodes of the dead "shades" without reference to their happiness or the opposite.) (Cf. Luke 23:43, 16:22; Gen. 37-35, 42:38; 1 Sam. 2:6; Job 14:13; Psa. 16:10, 139:8; Matt. 16:18; Acts 2:31; 1 Cor. 15:55; Rev. 20:13.) Among Christians, the Life Everlasting, Union with God, is Heaven, the "Home Over There," and the state of eternal loss of God and all Good is Hell (2 Thess. 1:7-10; Matt. 5:22,29,30; Luke 12:5; Mark 9:47). Have these intuitions of the future life with God and Christ and the Holy Spirit been implanted in us merely that we may, at the end, be disillusioned and mocked? Is a man no better than a brute, only to lie down and die, and cease to be? Does a cruel Satirist sit on the Throne of the Universe and play with us as with puppets? A thousand times—No!

(8) We can arrive, therefore, at but one valid conclusion, namely, that the intuition of the Supreme Being, upon whom men everywhere more or less conceive themselves to be dependent, is so universal that it can be accounted for only on the ground that it was originally implanted in the very nature of man by the Creator Himself, that is, by the act described in Scripture as a Divine inbreathing (Gen. 2:7). To quote Christlieb (MDCB, 141): "Cicero's question (De Natura Deorum, 1,16) still holds good—'What people is there, or what race of men, which has not, even without traditional teaching, some presentiment of the existence of Gods?' Does not this indicate that the belief in some higher and more powerful Being by which he is conditioned, is both a logical and a moral necessity for
man? Or must not that in which not merely many (which would prove nothing) but all agree, be grounded in the nature and essence of man himself? Yes, human thought must recognize God just as certainly as itself and the world.” Man simply can not in any way rid himself of the idea of God.

8. The Experiential Proof

This is the Proof deriving from the testimony of righteous persons who declare themselves to have personally experienced fellowship with God in this present life and to have actually tasted of the benefits and blessings of His grace.

(1) Faith, which is based on testimony (revelation) gives us at least partial understanding of those realities which are not accessible to sense alone, namely, God’s existence, His attributes, His Creatorship, and His relations with His creation, etc. Faith has been called, therefore, the highest form of knowledge. (We recall here Thompson’s definition of knowledge as “all that we believe as a result of sound evidence and logical thinking.”) Perhaps it would be more correct to say that faith leads to the highest form of knowledge, namely, that form of knowledge which stems from love. For the person who believes that God is at once the Creator and Preserver of nature and also the Revealer of the Mysteries (Rom. 16:25-26; Eph. 1:9; 3:3, 6:19; 1 Tim. 3:9, 16; Heb. 11:6), there can be no contradictions between the knowledge of nature through science and the knowledge of the spiritual mysteries through Biblically-produced faith (Rom. 10:14-17). One who is steeped in the language, lore, and spirit of the Bible knows that revelation complements reason, that faith, far from being a limitation on knowledge, is an enhancement of it. He knows that faith fertilizes the mind and heart: as many of the Church Fathers put it: Credo ut intellegam, “I believe in order to understand.” Belief in an object gives one understanding of that object: hence
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faith has been rightly called the insight of the two eyes of the heart—understanding and love. Pascal: “We know truth, not only by reason, but by the heart . . . The heart has its reasons which the reason knows nothing of.” Emerson: “Belief consists in accepting the affirmations of the soul; unbelief, in rejecting them.” (Heb. 11:3, 2 Tim. 1:12, 1 John 3:2).

(2) 1 Cor. 13:13. Faith based on testimony (revelation) can give us partial understanding of God and His ways, but only love can give the fuller knowledge. Love is attraction to, and union with (en-rapport-ness) its object. As Erich Fromm writes (art., “Man Is Not a Thing,” Saturday Review, March 16, 1957): “The only way to full knowledge lies in the act of love; this act transcends thought, it transcends words.” The act of love (John 3:16, 1 John 4:7-11) was God’s only way to the understanding of man (Phil. 2:5-8; Heb. 2:5-18, 4:14-16; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 5:25; 1 Tim. 2:6; Tit. 2:14); likewise, pure love for God is man’s only means to his own fuller knowledge of God (John 17:3, 1 John 4:7-8). As the late Henri Bergson, the French philosopher, has written (TSMR, 240, 246): “God is love, and the object of love; herein lies the whole contribution of mysticism.” Again, “The mystics have blazed the trail along which other men may pass. They have, by this very act, shown to the philosopher the whence and whither of life.” Nor should it ever be overlooked that love seeks oneness with its object in submission and in service (John 8:31-32, 15:10, 14:15, 7:17; Matt. 7:24-27). It is only by love that the believer is brought into true fellowship (eternal life) with God (Rom. 13:10).

(3) The errors of the intellectualist are errors of defective vision: intellect has been arbitrarily divorced from a right disposition, right affections, right motives, right directionality of life; that is, from what Jesus calls “an honest and good heart” (Luke 8:15). The intellect will say, “I cannot know God,” and the intellect is right: what intellect
says, Scripture also says (Job 11:7; Rom. 11:34; 1 Cor. 2:14). Cf. especially 1 Cor. 1:21-24: to the soul steeped in literal-minded traditionalism (as represented here by "Jews"), the idea of a crucified Savior (the doctrine of Atonement) has ever been a stumblingblock; to the speculative, intellectualistic type of mind (as represented here by "Greeks"), the idea has ever been utter foolishness (Acts 17:21-23). This is just as true today as it ever was. The good seed of the Kingdom (the spiritual seed, the Word of God) can be expected to fructify only in an "honest and good heart" (Luke 8:15, 1 Pet. 1:22-25). Men can know the truth only in proportion to their willingness to do the truth; in like manner, only love can understand love, only holiness can understand, and therefore appreciate, holiness. (Surely the devil would be unspeakably miserable if he should ever find himself in Heaven.) (Psa. 34:8; John 3:21, 7:17, 8:31-32). Secular scientists have always been prone to turn theologians and to break into print on matters concerning which they show that they know little or nothing. I think it was Will Rogers who once remarked that the man who is highly specialized in some particular field is apt to be completely ignorant outside the field in which he is specialized. How true this is! In my earlier days, for example, I believed practically anything the first Henry Ford had to say about the manufacture and marketing of automobiles, and I was justified in so doing; he was an authority in that particular field. But I believed little or nothing that he had to say on political and religious subjects: every time he broke into print on these subjects he showed that he knew practically nothing about either. Yet because of our subservience to a great name, the newspapers would print anything that Ford had to say on any subject, whether what he said was worth anything or not. (In logic, this is known as the argumentum ad verecundiam, that is, the fallacy of appealing to the authority of a famous name.) The same can be said of such
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men as Edison, Burbank, Einstein, Darrow, and many others: their name is Legion: men who demonstrated every time their comments on religion appeared in print, that they had no conception whatever of the Bible and its teaching. (Cf. also the tomes of pseudo-intellectual insipidity that have been published recently under the title, This I Believe.) Just how much are the opinions of such persons on religious matters actually worth?

den which Habakkuk the prophet did see” (1:1).

(5) We must remember that where the Word of God is, there the Spirit of God is, for the Spirit is the Reveal of the Word (Isa. 59:21); hence the prophets of old, from Samuel down to John the Baptizer were in a special sense ‘men of the Spirit” (2 Pet. 1:21, 1 Pet. 1:10-12). Jesus is said to have possessed the powers (gifts) of the Spirit without limitation (John 3:34-35, 4:14, 7:37-39; Matt. 12:28, Luke 11:20), and the Apostles were men who were guided into all the truth by the same Holy Spirit (John 14:16-17, 14:25-26, 15:26-27, 16:7-15, 20:21-23; Acts 1:1-8, 2:1-4; 1 Cor. 2:9-16). (The Bible, from beginning to end, presents itself to us as the work of Spirit-filled men.) Consider also the experiences of the saints of all ages, men and women who have testified that they cried out unto God and found Him—found Him perhaps not in the wind, nor in the earthquake, nor in fire, but in “a still small voice” (1 Ki. 19:9-18): men and women who have testified that their prayers were heard and answered by our God, that their spiritual aspirations were realized, and their spiritual needs satisfied, through repentance, prayer, meditation, worship, Bible study, and sacrificial service. How many thousands of saints have found God to be their Refuge and Strength at all times! (Deut. 33:27; Psa. 46:1, 62:7, 94:22, 18:2, 31:3, 71:3, 91:2, 144:2; Jer. 16:19; 2 Sam. 22:2-3; 2 Tim. 1:12; 4:7-8, etc.) Are these testimonies to be passed up lightly as mere “superstitions” or as, at most, only “wishful thinking”? Are they not just as valid experientially as that of the physical scientist who may look at the “craters” on the moon through a telescope, or watch a cell divide under the microscope, or witness the terrific effects of the phenomenon of atomic fission? Does not the average scientist exclude himself from apprehension of ultimate truth by his own arbitrary assumption (presupposition) that “knowledge” is limited strictly to observable and measurable “facts”? Besides, what is a “fact”? 200
A word of caution here: There is no evidence that the mystic experience occurs in our Dispensation for the purpose of fresh disclosures of moral and spiritual truth to man. Indeed we are told that with the compiling of the New Testament Scriptures, all things pertaining to life and godliness were given (2 Pet. 1:3), that the Christian System is the Faith “which was once for all delivered unto the saints” (Jude 3), that the Scriptures themselves are sufficient to furnish the man of God “completely unto every good work” (2 Tim. 3:16-17). Hence, all alleged special revelations, since the completion of the Canon, must be rejected summarily on two grounds: first, that not any one of them (nor all of them together) has added, or can add, one iota of moral and spiritual truth to that which is given us in the Bible; and second, that these alleged revelations cancel one another out by their diverse and even contradictory contents. God, we are told, is “not a God of confusion, but of peace” (1 Cor. 14:33). The Spirit of God is the Spirit of truth (John 14:16-17, 15:26-27); hence it is inconceivable that the Spirit should have been the source of all these diverse cults built up on post-canonical alleged “visions” and “revelations.” Truth, in any area, does not contradict itself. For these reasons we must reject so-called mystic experiences purporting to disclose fresh spiritual truth, outside the Judeo-Christian revelation as given us in the Bible. Mystic experiences may be considered valid, however, which serve to confirm the saints, individually and experientially, in the grace and in the knowledge of God and the Lord Jesus Christ (2 Pet. 3:18).

Man does not create his physical thirst for water—it is born in him: it is an organic tension demanding satisfaction if he is to live in this present world. In like manner, thirst for God is inborn: it is a spiritual tension, so to speak, which can be satisfied only in fellowship with Him. If this thirst for God were not founded in Reality, it would have
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died out long ago. It is of the essence of religion to have the object of devotion outside the self. Man can no more get along without “living water” (Psa. 23:2, John 4:13-14, 7:37-39) to quench his spiritual thirst than he can get along without natural drinking water to quench his physical thirst (Psa. 63:1, 42:1-2, 143:6). The vitality of the religious consciousness of man is evident from the fact that it survives all the attacks of its enemies—atheists, agnostics, naturalists, positivists, humanists, and all their ilk; just as it will survive the Marxist-Leninist brainwashing of our time. The Church, like the burning bush of old, has ever burned (with the fires of heresy, apostasy, sectarianism, hypocrisy, formalism, clerical jealousy, ecclesiastical pretension, poor business management, and what not) but remains unconsumed. Man simply refuses to give up God, for he comes to realize sooner or later that in doing so he gives up everything—he has nothing left. (This was the experience of Job: catastrophically denuded of his herds, and then of his own offspring, afflicted with a loathsome disease, and, as the crowning indignity, scornfully urged by his wife to “renounce God and die,” Job replied, “Thou speakest as one of the foolish women speaketh” (Job 2:10). Job realized that if he should “let go” of God, then indeed he would have nothing left.) The simple fact of the matter is that if my life is to have meaning, I must believe in myself, in my fellow-men, and in my God.

(8) Do you live in personal intimacy with God? Do you “pray without ceasing” and “in everything give thanks” (1 Thess. 5:17,18)? Do you give thanks at the table? Do you know that God answers prayer? Even when as a child you lisped, “Now I lay me down to sleep,” you prayed to Someone—to One who can hear and understand and respond—did you not? Let us never forget that we can come to God anywhere, at any time, if we come to him in Jesus’ name
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(Matt. 18:20; John 14:13,14; John 15:16; Col. 3:17), for He is ever

"Nearer to us than breathing,
Closer than hands and feet."

9. The Biblical Proof

The Bible bears on its own pages the imprimatur of the Spirit of God, that is, self-evident proof that it is The Book from God.

(1) The Bible is a fact—a fact to be accounted for. In the past one hundred and fifty years, all Bible Societies, we are told, have handled some two trillion copies of the Bible either as a whole or in part. According to the report of the American Bible Society, the Bible as a whole or in part has been translated into more than twelve hundred languages. It is the most up-to-date book in the world. As Clayton Potter has written, in the Front Rank, June 10, 1956: "Man's hopes and despairs, sins and virtues, guilts and aspirations, loves and hates, tendency to doubt and capacity for faith, the causes of his evil and the means of his redemption, were all noted long ago. The Bible is as up-to-date as the latest textbook. Its words must be revised from time to time, for language changes with the years, but its ideas are permanent and its insights forever fresh." Is it any wonder that the demand for the Bible, the world over, grows greater with the passing of every year?

(2) As stated heretofore, no author in presenting his book to the public thinks of prefacing it with the proofs of his own existence: his name on the backbone and on the title page is considered sufficient evidence of his existence and authorship. So it is with the Bible. It does not attempt to prove that God is: it simply presents itself to us as God's Book, the revelation of His Will and Plan for our redemption. Hence it opens with the sublime affirmation, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." It takes it for granted that men cannot be so foolish
as to deny that God is, or that He, by the agency of the Spirit, is the Author of this Book of all books. Let me testify here that the person who feeds upon the spiritual content (food) of the Bible, who assimilates it into the very essence of his interior being, who lives its teaching from day to day to the best of his human ability, can, and does, appreciate both its simplicity and its depth of meaning, and is bound to accept it wholeheartedly as what it claims to be. Rejection of this claim can be attributed only to ignorance or to a perverted will. (3) The Bible is preeminently the Book of the Spirit. (Cf. 2 Pet. 1:21; 1 Pet. 1:10-12; John 3:34, 14:16,17; John 12:26, 15:26-27, 16:7-13, 20:21-23; Heb. 1:1-2; Acts 1:8, 2:1-4; 1 Cor. 2:6-16; Eph. 1:13-14, 3:1-13, etc.). As Canon Robinson writes (CEHS, 5): “On its first page there is painted the impressive picture of chaos, when darkness was upon the face of the deep; but the Spirit of God was brooding, like a mother-bird, upon the face of the waters. From the last page there rings out the evangelical challenge of the Church to the world, ‘The Spirit and the bride say, Come.’ Between them there is the story of a divine evolution, which is from God’s side, revelation, and from man’s side, discovery.” The language of the Bible is the language of the Spirit (1 Cor. 2:6-14). One who has made his mind a storehouse of this language of the Spirit has an almost impregnable defense against every form of materialism and secularism. (It will be noted that Jesus resisted Satan by quoting Scripture: “it is written,” said He, in meeting each of the three Satanic appeals: Matt. 4:4,7,10.) Moreover, only the person who is familiar with the thought and language of the Bible can discern the mediocrity of such other “religious” writings as the Vedas, the Avesta, the Upanishads, the Koran, the Book of Mormon, Science and Health, etc., mediocrity in all those characteristics in which the Bible is unapproachable.
(4) Those characteristics of the Bible which give it the imprimatur of Divine origin are the following: (a) its unity (though made up of sixty-six books, written by many different authors, in all ages of human history from about 1500 B.C. to A.D. 100, yet it is one book with just one theme, redemption through the person and work of Messiah, from beginning to end); (b) Its realism (it presents life just as men lived it and as they live it today, both in its beauty and in its ugliness: it finds man in sin, as indeed every honest man knows that he is, and it shows him the way out); (c) its sublime themes (God, the Son of God, the Spirit of God, grace, sin, faith, hope, love, justification, redemption, sanctification, the Spiritual Life, heaven, hell, immortality, etc.—no other "religious" writing even pretends to deal with all these facts of human life and experience); (d) its literary excellence (it contains the most exquisite examples of every form of the literary art: note especially the unparalleled beauty of the imagery of the apocalyptic books, Daniel, and Revelation; the great epic poem, the Book of Job; the gorgeous hymnody of the Psalms; the idyllic (pastoral) beauty of the Book of Ruth; the books of law, history, prophecy, biography; the parables of Jesus, etc.); (e) its artistic excellence (fine art being the fusion of thought (forty per cent) and feeling (sixty per cent): cf. Job 14:1-15, 19:23-29; 1 Cor. 15:1-28 and 15:35-58; 1 Cor. 13:1-13; Rom. 8:18-37, 11:25-36, etc.); (f) its idealism (it presents the only perfect code of morals (values) that has ever been given to man: cf. the Decalogue (Exo. 20), the Sermon on the Mount (Matt., chs. 5,6,7), the Two Great Commandments (Matt. 22:34-40), the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22-25), the Christian excellences (2 Pet. 1:5-9, etc.); (g) its finality (not one iota of moral and spiritual truth can be added to that which is given us in the Bible: its finality is in its completeness); (h) its central Figure, Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God (John 20:30-31, 3:16; Matt. 16:16;
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(5) It is significant, too, indeed most significant, that no book of religion in the entire gamut of world literature has ever been so thoroughly dissected by critics, so smirked at by convictionless "liberals," so ridiculed by sceptics and so viciously attacked by evil men, as the Bible has been, down through the ages. The Vedas, the Avesta, the Upanishads, the Koran, the Book of Mormon, Science and Health, etc.—not one of these books has ever received the critical analysis, the prejudiced, at times vicious, treatment that has been heaped upon the Bible by its enemies.

An excellent example of the business of critical dissection occurs in the treatment of the life of Jesus which was presented to the public in the December 25, 1964 issue of Life magazine. However, there is one simple refutation of this "demythologizing" process, namely, that we have the books of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John before our very eyes—their content cannot be denied because we have it in black and white. We know these biographies were written in the first century, whether or not by the writers to whom they have always been attributed. Hence, as someone has said, If the transcendent Personage whose biography we have in these four books never lived on this earth, the men who wrote the books would have to be regarded as great as He, by virtue of their ability to conceive such a Character and such a Teaching. Or, as the late S. Parkes Cadman once said, in substance, This demythologizing business has itself produced only a myth.

The vicious methodology of these self-appointed critics ("debunkers") of assuming a priori (1) that any event described in Scripture as a miracle must be regarded as unhistorical and hence must be "explained away" (when the fact is that the Bible does not purport to be a general history, but only the history of the Messianic Line), (2)
that the narration by different writers of different aspects of the same event constitutes discrepancy or even outright contradiction, when as a matter of fact the various narratives complement one another and are designed to be put together to give us the complete story of the particular episode, and (3) that the doctrine of inspiration must be disregarded, completely ignored, as if there were no Holy Spirit; this has done irreparable injury to the souls of multiplied thousands of mankind, whose sane judgments are distorted by the "scholarly" aura which hovers over these speculative critics and "theologians." Why do these discrepancy hunters and pickers persist in never looking, or even trying to look, for harmony in the Scriptures? They could find it easily if they were to turn their talents to efforts to build faith rather than to destroy it.

(6) God is really to be found throughout the pages of the Bible, and especially in its revelation of the person and work of Christ. Multiplied thousands today are trying to find God, but they are either looking for the wrong kind of God or looking for the living and true God in the wrong places. The living God is not to be found adequately in the things of this world, nor in the laboratory of science, nor in the traditions of men, nor in the speculations of philosophy. God is to be adequately apprehended only from the pages of the Bible, and especially in the central Figure of the Bible, God's Only Begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, whose mission it was to reveal Him (John 1:14,18; John 14:9; Heb. 1:1-3). The following excerpt (source unidentified) is especially to the point here: "The assurance that the Bible is a unique and indispensable witness to God does not come upon men as a reality because someone else has said so, no matter how authoritative. It comes only by experience with the Bible. If our generation and the generations to follow are to find in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ the one Being worthy of absolute loyalty; if we are to lean our whole
weight on Him for the saving that we and the world so desperately need, the only place we and the world can find Him is in the Bible, and the one thing we need to do with the Bible is to read it—and read it and read it. Courage to stand off other preoccupations, faith that here is the supreme hope for us, patience with what we may never understand, and willingness to do God's will—this and reading are all that we really need. That is the Bible's way of bringing us into the presence of God.” In the characteristic simplicity of the hymnology of Isaac Watts—

“The stars that in their courses roll
Have much instruction given;
But Thy good Word informs my soul
How I may climb to Heaven.”

(Note well, however, that the lore of the Bible is accessible only to those who “hunger and thirst after righteousness” (Matt. 5:6), i.e., after God’s way of doing things (Matt. 6:33, 3:15), and hence are unremitting in their effort to gain the knowledge of the truth. He who does not seek cannot expect to find.) (Matt. 7:7-8; Phil. 2:5; 1 Cor. 2:16.)

10. The Ultimate Proof

The ultimate Proof of the existence of God is Christ Himself, the central Figure of the Bible, the Son of the living God. The living and true God is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (John 20:30-31; Acts 2:36, 11:17; Rom. 5:1; 1 Cor. 1:3, Eph. 1:3, etc.). The New Testament writings confirm the Messiahship (Christhood) and Sonship of the Lord Jesus by numerous texts which affirm His pre-existence, His condescension and humiliation (as the Word who became flesh and dwelt among us), His exaltation and coronation, and His present universal Sovereignty. These Divine relationships are further validated by the Scriptures setting forth the nobility of His teaching, the faultlessness of His character and life, the supernaturalness of His claims, the fulfilment of Hebrew prophecy in Him,
the greatness and variety of His miracles, the grandeur of the names ascribed to Him, and indeed by many infallible proofs (Acts 1:3). God has piled the evidence so high throughout the ages, as recorded in Scripture by the inspiration of the Spirit, to authenticate the Messiahship and Sonship of Jesus, that he who fails to read and to heed this testimony will find himself without excuse in the great and notable Day of the Lord, the Day of the Last Judgment (Acts 2:20, 17:30-31; Heb. 12:23; Rev. 3:5, 21:7, 22:4).

Thus Jesus Himself leaves us no middle ground to take between complete acceptance and complete rejection of His Messiahship and Sonship. This is pointed up so sharply by C. S. Lewis (MC, 40, 41). The strange and significant thing about Jesus, says Lewis, is that “even His enemies, when they read the Gospels, do not usually get the impression of silliness and conceit. Still less do unprejudiced readers. Christ says that He is ‘humble and meek’ and we believe Him; not noticing that, if He were merely a man, humility and meekness are the very last characteristics we could attribute to some of his sayings.” Lewis continues: “I am trying here to prevent anyone saying the really foolish thing that people often say about Him: ‘I’m ready to accept Jesus as a great moral teacher, but I don’t accept His claim to be God.’ That is the one thing we must not say. A man who was merely a man and said the sort of things Jesus said would not be a great moral teacher. He would either be a lunatic—on a level with the man who says he is a poached egg—or else he would be the Devil of Hell. You must make your choice. Either this man was, and is, the Son of God: or else a madman or something worse. You can shut Him up for a fool, you can spit at Him and kill Him as a demon; or you can fall at His feet and call Him Lord and God. But let us not come with any patronizing nonsense about His being a great human teacher. He has not left that open to us. He did not intend to.” Jesus of Nazareth is either everything that He claimed to
be and everything that the Spirit claimed about Him and for Him (John 16:13-15)—or He is the runkest impostor who ever appeared in the world. He is either all that He claimed to be—or He was not even a good man! There is no halfway house for us to hide in, with respect to Him.

Moreover, the absolutely ultimate Proof of the existence of God is the Resurrection of Christ. Why so? Because it was God the Father who, through the agency of the Spirit (Rom. 8:11) raised Him from the dead, and “made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places”, etc. (Eph. 1:20-23; cf. Acts 2:32, Phil. 2:9-11, 1 Cor. 15:20-28, 1 Pet. 3:18-22, Heb. 1:1-4, 2:14-15). Thus was this Jesus “declared to be the Son of God with power . . . by the resurrection from the dead—even Jesus Christ our Lord” (Rom. 1:4). Thus the Resurrection was the crowning proof of the Messiahship and Sonship of Jesus, and the proof of the Sonship of Jesus at the same time is the proof of the existence of God the Father who raised Him from the dead. (For detailed studies of the Deity of Jesus and the Historicity of His Resurrection, see my Survey Course in Christian Doctrine, Vols. III-IV, published by the College Press, Joplin, Missouri.)

To summarize the content of this entire section, we affirm the following unequivocally: Should any of the foregoing Proofs be thought seriously amenable to challenge, certainly all of them, taken together, coalesce to put the fact of God’s existence beyond legitimate possibility of rejection by honest and good hearts. Acceptance of this fact, of course, could hardly be expected of the prejudiced mind or perverted will.

REVIEW QUESTIONS ON PART THREE
1. What is meant by the First Truth? Who is the First Truth?
2. State the Principle of Sufficient Reason or Adequate Cause.
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3. Explain what is meant by Efficient Causality.
4. Explain what is meant by the Mystery of Being.
5. Explain what is meant by “infinite regress.”
6. State the Cosmological Proof of the existence of God.
7. What does the doctrine of Creation ex nihilo really mean?
8. State the Ontological Proof as formulated by Anselm and by Descartes respectively.
9. State the Teleological Proof of God’s existence.
10. What is the origin and meaning of the word “cosmos”?
11. List the evidences of the order characteristic of the universe.
12. Explain: If the universe were not orderly, there could be no science.
13. Explain what is meant by the Will to Live.
15. Summarize briefly the Anthropological Proof of the existence of God.
16. What is meant by “anthropocentrism”? In what sense is the universe really anthropocentric?
17. Summarize the Moral Proof of God’s existence.
18. Explain what the word “value” means.
19. Explain: “Man is a creature of moral law.”
20. What is the significance of the universality of conscience in man?
21. Explain: “Values are facts of the world we live in.”
22. What must be the foundation of moral law?
23. State the three external relationships into which every person is born and the class of rights and duties stemming from each of these relationships.
24. What is meant by “legal positivism”?
25. Explain what is meant by the phrase, “unalienable rights.” Explain clearly the far-reaching significance of this phrase.
26. Explain what is meant by the Natural Moral Law.
27. State the Aesthetic Proof of the existence of God.
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28. State the Intuitional Proof of the existence of God.
29. State the Experiential Proof of the existence of God.
30. Explain: "Where the Word of God is, the Spirit of God is."
31. What special claim does the Bible make for itself?
32. State the Biblical Proof of the existence of God.
33. State the characteristics of the Bible which evidence its Divine origin.
34. What is the Ultimate Proof of God's existence?
35. Explain how the Resurrection of Christ is the final supreme confirmation of the existence of the God of the Bible.

PART FOUR:

THE HEBREW COSMOGONY

As we have learned, the Greek kosmos, the English cosmos, means "order." Cosmology, then, is that branch of human knowledge which deals with the order that is found to prevail in the different areas of the physical world. This word cosmology must not be confused with the word cosmogony. A cosmogony is an account or narrative of the Creation. The Hebrew Cosmogony is given us in Gen. 1:1—2:3. This account is a compact and complete literary and doctrinal whole, and must be considered as such. It would be well, therefore, before taking up the study of the Biblical text itself, to take a look at the various interpretations of the Hebrew Cosmogony which have been suggested, as follows:

1. The ultra-scientific interpretation. Those who hold this view insist that the Genesis Cosmogony must conform in every respect to the conclusions of the sciences. This, however, is asking too much, for two reasons especially: In the first place, the Bible is not, was not even designed to be, a textbook of science; in the second place, science changes its concepts from age to age; hence no account of the Creation could possibly be sufficiently flexible to be in harmony with all these changing views. Moreover, prac-