

# Reasons for Believing In God



Ricki Lee Brooks

It has been said there are no atheists in foxholes. This may not be universally true, but it is true for a great many and should be true for all. For in the final analysis — when the chips are down, when the artillery explodes, when a loved one is lost, when health declines, when business goes sour, and relationships stumble — there is no real hope without God.

Many have attempted atheism. And some live with its logical conclusions. Many others, however, finally acknowledge the emptiness and folly of believing that time, space, matter, and energy are the beginning and end of existence.

George Bernard Shaw finally rejected his liberal thinking when late in life he wrote, “The science to which I pinned my faith is bankrupt. Its counsels, which should have established the millennium, led, instead, directly to the suicide of Europe. I believed them once. In their name I helped to destroy the faith of millions of worshippers in the temples of a thousand creeds. And now they look at me and witness the tragedy of an atheist who has lost his faith.” The faith he lost was his faith in atheism.

Jean-Paul Sartre, was a philosopher who spent his life insisting there was no God and, therefore, no absolute guidelines about life. We are alone. We must fend for ourselves. These were his creeds. Yet, like Shaw, late in life Sartre said to his friend, Pierre Victor, “I do not feel that I am the product of chance, a speck of dust in the universe, but someone who was expected, prepared, prefigured. In short, a being whom only a Creator could put here; and this idea of a creating hand refers to God.”

We could go on with example after example, but we need not. Instead we need to understand why foxholes have very few atheists. Have we not been told otherwise? Has not science brought us out from the dark ages of myth? Is it not true that really educated people, the intellectuals, have pretty much demonstrated that life just is? Can we not admit that believing in God is an unreasonable matter of blind, ignorant faith?

While it may be true that we’ve been told otherwise, the simple answer to these questions is “No.” The really educated people, the intellectuals — and, for that matter, people with common sense — are not necessarily saying that life just is. In fact, it is not difficult to say with integrity that there are no logical proofs for the non-existence of God, but many logical proofs for God’s existence.

With this in mind, let’s ask the question in a different way...

**Question:** Is it reasonable to believe in God or is belief in God a matter of blind faith?

Two needs drive us to find an answer...

**Needs:**

- 1 Seekers need these questions answered so they might get past their own question: “I can’t see God, so why should I believe in God?”
- 2 Believers need these questions answered so they may be prepared to give a reason for the hope that lies within them (1 Peter 3:15). ” (John 1:1).

## **So, let's get busy...**

Francis Bacon once said, “A little philosophy inclines man to atheism, a depth of philosophy brings him to religion.” This has never been more true than it is today. Our popular media, halls of education, and government by bureaucracy flood our culture with practical atheism. It is a common notion to indicate that believing in God or a god or gods is fine, but one must be willing to say that such a belief is simply a matter of blind faith. A more reasonable conclusion, according to popular culture, is atheism. Such a conclusion is based not on sound education, but sound-bites.

To demonstrate the validity of Francis Bacon's statement we need to implement a simple process and apply a simple principle.

The process we need to implement is not too difficult. We need to ask questions, offer alternatives, and ask more questions.

The principle we need to apply is also not difficult. It is a basic tenet of philosophy known as “Occam's Razor.” It states that, all things being equal, the simplest explanation is the best.

## **So, let's implement the process and apply the principle...**

When considering the reasonableness of God there is a simple question that demands an answer. It is this: “Why is something here rather than nothing?”

It's easy to see how this question impacts the “reasonableness of God” issue. If we ask why the universe is here we find that only four alternatives can possibly provide our answer. Here they are:

### I. Something came from nothing

#### A. Simple Logic

Does something coming from nothing make any sense? Hardly. So, let's go no further with this point.

#### B. Occam's Razor

Within the world of scientific method there are fundamental principles that guide the scientist. The scientist creates a hypothesis—an idea about how he or she thinks about reality. He then tests his hypothesis. The results of the test must be measurable, repeatable, and without contamination from outside variables. The scientist then interprets his findings. During the interpretation phase another principle is implemented—Occam's Razor. This principle states that “all else being equal, the simplest explanation is the best.”

This principle can be applied in other areas of knowledge as well. With regard to our present discussion, Occam's Razor would state, “all else being equal, something from nothing does not make sense, does not correlate to reality, cannot be observed, does not have observable effects attributed to it, and, therefore, does not work.”

## II. Something came from an impersonal something

- A. The Force of Star Wars or Eastern Mysticism
- B. The Dense Atom of the Big Bang Theory
- C. Questions...

If the “something” that gave birth to time, space, and matter is impersonal, how do we explain the order we see in the universe? Those who point to a dense atom exploding into the known universe, also hypothesize, given enough time and enough chance, that sooner or later order will occur from universal chaos. This makes no sense since for every step along the way there will always be the same amount of chaos because chaos is the absence of order. The absence of order can be defined mathematically as zero—and we all know that zero plus or times zero is zero. Therefore, no order plus or times no order must always equal no order. Time and chance simply do not allow for order out of absolute chaos.

If the “something” that gave birth to time, space, and matter is impersonal, how do we explain the personality of man and all that goes into the making of personality—emotion, thinking, volition, choices, communication, etc.? Personality requires order. Therefore, personality must have derived from something that possessed order.

- D. Should we cling to the notion that something came from an impersonal something, we cannot explain the order of the universe or the personality of man (or, for that matter, the personality found within all the animal kingdom).
- E. Occam’s Razor: once again the simple answer is that whatever brought the universe into being has to be not only beyond the limitations of time, space, and matter, but also personal.

## III. Something came from a personal something

- A. This third alternative answers our need for both order and personality: thought, emotion, meaning, purpose, communication, and the will to accomplish something.
- B. This third alternative is not limited by the laws of nature since it transcends time, space, and matter.
- C. A being who transcends time would be eternal.
- D. A being who transcends space would be infinite.
- E. A being who transcends matter would be spirit.
- F. By all definitions, such a being would be called...supernatural, the supreme being, God.

**The Bible says...**

“In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth” (Genesis 1:1).

“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God” (John 1:1).

Ricki Lee Brooks  
Sound Communication  
A Division of West Sound Community Church  
360.779.9996 or [ricki@soundcommunication.org](mailto:ricki@soundcommunication.org)  
[soundcommunication.org](http://soundcommunication.org) or [westsound.org](http://westsound.org)