

# Arguments for God's Existence

We cannot simply dismiss the question of God's existence as a purely theoretical and philosophical question. It concerns the very purpose of our own existence. In this article we have gathered various thoughts which ought to help in gaining a clear answer to this fundamental human question.

The article is divided up into three main parts:

Firstly, an [overview](#) of the various questions which we want to address. [Next](#), each of these questions will be concisely answered. If you would like to read a more in-depth discussion of these questions, see the more detailed [third part](#).

## Overview

### Introduction

[→ Introduction](#)

### Various Arguments

#### Why is there something rather than nothing?

Why does our universe exist and why is it just so as it is?

*"Something obviously exists now, and something never sprang from nothing." (Epicuros)*

[→ Contingency](#)

#### Where do order and harmony in the universe come from?

Is it reasonable to believe that everything came into existence and developed only by chance? What is the finality of all? Is this wonderful world without any aim?

*"The order, proportion, harmony amazes us. God is pure order. He is the source of general harmony." (Leibniz)*

[→ Design](#)

#### What is the meaning of life?

Happiness, longing for fulfilment...

*"There is a God-shaped vacuum in the heart of every person." (Pascal)*

[→ Aim of life](#)

#### Why does man feel a basic need for relationship in love?

[→ Human relationship](#)

#### Why is there so much unrighteousness? Is there a final righteousness?

[→ Righteousness](#)

#### If life is just a cruel struggle for survival, where do certain values (like love of beauty and harmony) come from?

[→ Beauty and harmony](#)

#### Why does morality exist and why is there conscience?

[→ Morality](#)

**Why does man have a free will?**

[→ Free will](#)

**Why is there a basic longing for the infinite and for perfection in man?**

[→ Longing for the infinite](#)

**Why are we alive if we all have to die one day? Is it possible that there is nothing after death?**

[→ Wish for immortality](#)

**Can the general belief of so many people be completely baseless?**

[→ Universal consent](#)

**What do scientists say about the human spirit? Is the human spirit merely the result of the evolution of matter?**

Are all spiritual processes, including self-awareness and consciousness only the result of biochemical reactions?

[→ Scientists concerning the spirit](#)

**What is the aim of the arguments? How valid are these proofs?  
Why should we deal at all with arguments if God's existence is in any way a matter of faith?**

[→ Validity aim](#)

**Some Objections**

"I don't believe in God - an old man with long white beard sitting on a cloud"

"Science disproved God's existence. God was replaced by science and it gives a satisfactory answer for all."

"I would believe in God if he showed himself to me". "I want to see a miracle."

"If God is omnipotent and loving, why do evil and suffering still exist?"

[→ Objections](#)

**Conclusions**

[→ Conclusions](#)

## **Arguments for God's Existence Summary**

**1. Introduction**

In the course of centuries a lot of philosophers and theologians have dealt with the question of God's existence. Various kinds of arguments have been collected for and against. This article does not contain an exhaustive list and assessment of all these arguments, or uncontested proofs for God's existence, but we hope it will help someone to assess by himself the reasons of his belief or unbelief.

There are many people who would like to understand deeply the meaning of life, truth, and the marvellous human mystery or generally the different aspects of reality, but stumble at the idea of the incompatibility of faith in God with reasonable thinking. We would like to help to dissolve this tension and to point out that, in reality, the actual belief in God is not a sign of the lack of thinking but, on the contrary, someone who thinks deeply can recognise that life is more than the passing material world and the truth is not only an abstract idea.

### **An important remark for the beginning:**

**The acknowledgement of God's existence touches man at his deepest inner being and prompts him to take a position because the acceptance of God's existence should mean the complete renunciation of his unbelieving and selfish life and demands**

**godliness.** Mostly it means the complete renunciation of his pride and his power reached in the world. It demands humility, the acceptance of his being little and his weakness. The arguments may help one to accept God's existence but to be godly is everyone's free decision that cannot be forced by any argument but depends on one's openness and attitude. Many people don't accept God because they don't want to change their lives. It must be remarked here that the acceptance of God's existence is not equal with faith in God that is to have daily relationship with him and live according to his will.

## **2. Some Objections**

First we will mention some frequently occurring reasons why the arguments for the existence of God are not for everyone interesting enough or clear and persuasive.

2.1. Many people reject a primitive understanding of God, according to which **"God is an old man with long white beard sitting on a cloud"**. **But what is the true nature of God we believe in?** More detailed see: [Objections](#)

2.2. Often people are looking for scientific proofs for the existence of God. **Can science really prove or disprove God's existence? Can one replace God with science to give a satisfactory answer for all?** More detailed see: [Objections](#)

2.3. **"I would believe in God if he showed himself to me"**. Do you think it would really make you a believer if you saw a miracle? More detailed see: [Objections](#)

2.4. Many people fail to believe in God because of the "Problem of evil", saying: **"If God is omnipotent and loving why do evil and suffering still exist?"** More detailed see: [Objections](#)

## **3. Types of arguments**

There can be formulated many different kinds of arguments, like **the classical five arguments of Thomas Aquinas** or many others. More detailed see: [Types of arguments](#)

In our treatise we do not want to use too abstract terms or difficult ways of philosophical reasoning but we will start from some basic questions for which every man expects a satisfactory answer. The question of God's existence is not an abstract idea that is very far from the human thought but it is connected with our deepest basic questions regarding existence and Universe, life and death, sin and suffering, good and evil.

We will deal with the following ways of reasoning:

### **3.1. Argument from existence:**

- **Why is there something rather than nothing?**
- **Why does our Universe exist and why is it just so as it is?**

We formulated the same argument in two different ways:

### 3.1.1. The argument of an independent existence.

"Why do I exist?" We experience our existence as a gift. In the same way, everything in this universe exists because it received its existence from something else or somebody else. We believe that the universe was called to its existence from outside and the one who called it to existence must be independent of everything else. He must be unchangeable, standing above time and space. The Bible speaks about God in this way. More detailed see: [Existence](#)

### 3.1.2. The general causality argument.

In our everyday life we are used to the reasoning that everything has a reason why it is or happens in one way or another. Why should we give up this natural expectation of our mind when we look for the final reason of the existence of the whole universe? It must also have a sufficient reason! It is not logical at all to think that the universe caused itself, or that simply, it exists without any reason, but its cause must be beyond it. Epicurus formulated long time ago:

*Something obviously exists now, and something never sprang from nothing.*

More detailed see: [Contingency](#)

## 3.2. Argument from design:

- **Where do order and harmony in the universe come from?**
- **Is it reasonable to believe that everything came into existence and developed only by chance?**
- **What is the finality of all? Is this wonderful world without any aim?**

We find in nature a very complex and well fitting arrangement and in the universe everything happens in such a wonderful way which provides a very friendly surrounding for harmonious structures, life and man. We see a marvellous unity and concord in nature. Where does it come from? By natural evolution? The natural phenomena do not possess intelligence in themselves and evolution cannot lead itself to its aim, therefore this explanation is not credible, but we have to suppose an intelligence above nature.

*The order, proportion, harmony amazes us. God is pure order. He is the source of the general harmony (Leibniz)*

More detailed see: [Design](#)

## 3.3. Arguments from human nature:

### 3.3.1. What is the meaning of life? - happiness, longing for fulfilment ...

Each man has a certain claim for finding the aim of his life, joy, and happiness. Though many people try to repress this claim, yet it seems that mankind searches the fulfilment in many different ways. Thus the longing for fullness is a natural human need but finding it is logically and practically impossible if there is not something or someone possessing that fullness in itself. More detailed see: [Aim of life](#)

### 3.3.2. The basic need of man for relationship in love

Man, by his nature, is a social being and cannot find fulfilment without openness and mutual love towards others. On the other hand he can always see his human limits: he cannot get nor give perfect love. The love we can receive from another man has its limits and will have an end when we lose him. Therefore the natural need of man for receiving eternal love can be fulfilled only by an eternal perfect being who is the inexhaustible source of love. More detailed see: [Human relationship](#)

### **3.3.3. Why is there so much unrighteousness? Is there a final righteousness?**

Everybody has a natural sensation of righteousness. We have the wish that people are treated righteously. Even an egocentric man has at least the wish that he himself is treated righteously. In our world there has always existed a lot of unrighteousness and it is not realistic to think that this will completely change. Furthermore we are not satisfied with partial righteousness which people struggle for, like politicians, humanists and religious people. Real all-embracing righteousness that is valid for everyone cannot be found within this world. So is the longing for righteousness only a senseless character of human being or it hints at a transcendent being who can provide it eternally? More detailed see: [Righteousness](#)

### **3.3.4. If life is just a cruel struggle for survival, where do certain values (like love of beauty and harmony) come from?**

Man has a natural wish for beauty, which reflects perfection, the ideal. Beautiful is what approaches the ideal or the perfection of itself. The rhythm of proportions, lines, colours, sounds usually does not have material or biological worth; even if it can be connected, we like it because of other reasons. We have joy when we see beautiful things because they bring us nearer to the infinite beauty we long for and we love. We like to see the waving sea, the high mountains because they remind us of greatness, infinity and majesty. So the attracting power of beauty leads us to an infinite source, to the perfection which can satisfy our longing for it. More detailed see: [Beauty and harmony](#)

### **3.3.5. Why does morality exist and why is there conscience?**

Even if some people are not aware of or consciously do not admit the reality of a universal moral law, generally everybody agrees in some basic moral principles necessary for our lives as individuals and as a collective. The question is, where do they come from? Are they only social conventions or the product of historical evolution? If it were so, the moral law would not have such a compulsory power over us, it would not cause us such a deep remorse in many cases when we are aware that we have to listen to a perfect superior law which judges us personally. More detailed see: [Morality](#)

### **3.3.6. Where does man have free will from?**

One of the most important and precious features of humans is their free will. It is not found neither in the material world nor among animals, therefore it could not develop from there but its origin must be somewhere else. Personal features cannot develop from impersonal features, but the originator of intelligence and free will has to possess these features as well and to be able to pass them on. More detailed see: [Free will](#)

### **3.3.7. Why is there a basic longing for the infinite and perfection in man?**

Even if man is aware of his finiteness and limits (in time, power, knowledge etc.), through all his activities he strives to overcome them because he has the idea of perfection, of the absolute. Man's spiritual activity and intellectual orientation and motivation go beyond the finite world and are directed towards the infinite. This natural ability and striving of man must have an object that is beyond the sensual experience of reality. Otherwise this longing for the infinite would be baseless. How could man realise finiteness and imperfection if the infinite and perfection do not exist? More detailed see: [Longing for infinite](#)

### **3.3.8. Why do we live if once we have to die? Is it possible that nothing comes after death?**

The longing for immortality is at least as old as the human civilisation. The belief in the existence after death is so closely connected with the nature of man that we might consider this fact as having a real base. More detailed see: [Wish for immortality](#)

### **3.3.9. Can the general belief of so many people be completely baseless?**

The idea of the existence of a superior authority, that is religiosity, provably accompanied mankind along the history for millennia, from the oldest ages up to nowadays. The belief in God could not be disproved or abolished by lots of radical social, cultural and ideological changes. How could an absolutely baseless and unreal supposition survive in spite of all these changes? More detailed see: [Universal consent](#)

### **3.3.10. What do scientists say about the human spirit? Is the human spirit merely the result of the evolution of matter?**

Several materialist scientists try to explain the highest spiritual processes, including self-awareness and consciousness, as being only the result of biochemical reactions. They are called reductionists, because they reduce the whole reality to the level of material processes. But there are many other science experts who do not belong to this category, who are aware of the limits of science, who speak about "the wonder and mystery of the human self with its spiritual values, with its creativity, and with its uniqueness for each of us", like John C. Eccles, Nobel prize winner neuroscientist. More detailed see: [Scientists concerning spirit](#)

## **4. The validity and aim of the arguments for God**

### **Why should we deal at all with arguments if God's existence is anyway a matter of faith? How valid are these proofs?**

We do not claim that God's existence can be proved mathematically or demonstrated, but that "it can, from created things, be known with certainty by the natural light of the human reason".

### **What is the aim of the arguments?**

We need not base our belief on scientific or metaphysic knowledge, but we should not give up using our mind and intellectual power in search for answers concerning the existence and nature of our Creator. We have to use rational explanations in order to understand that our belief in God is not in contradiction with the scientific or philosophical approach of the same reality. More detailed see: [Validity aim](#)

## **5. Conclusions**

We mentioned some examples in order to show that the question of God's existence can not be put aside so easily and the idea of His existence is not in contradiction with the human mind but rather fitting well our thoughts, our nature and what we can see around us and in our life.

But in most cases the greatest obstacle in accepting God is not the lack of arguments but the fear of the confrontation with its consequences. Just this should not be so; for if somebody accepts God, he should know that He is a loving God and everything good comes from Him, therefore someone looking for the truth should not have fear but have the confidence that God knows in the best way what is good for all man and he can find the fulfilment of his life only in Him.

*There is a God-shaped vacuum in the heart of every person. (Pascal)*

*Small amounts of philosophy lead to atheism, but larger amounts bring us back to God. (Francis Bacon)*

*There are few people so stubborn in their atheism who, when danger is pressing in, will not acknowledge the divine power. (Plato)*

More detailed see: [Conclusions](#)

## **Detailed Part**

## 2. Objections

First we will mention some frequently occurring reasons why the arguments for the existence of God are not for everyone interesting enough or clear and persuasive.

**2.1. Many people reject a primitive understanding of God, according to which God is an old man with long white beard sitting on a cloud.** This image is implanted in people's minds by many pictures, paintings and statues which are for making belief easy and palpable. Our opinion is in accordance with those who reject this false religious image about God. This rejection, however, should not include the entire question of the existence of the real God.. Jesus' teaching reflects another image that is about a spiritual and invisible divinity that can not be imagined in a material way or painted by human hands.

**But an hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth; for such people the Father seeks to be His worshipers. God is spirit, and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and truth. (John 4:23-24)**

Back to [Summary](#)

**2.2. Many people are looking for scientific proofs for the existence of God.** If we speak about God we have to consider the differences between the nature of things in the material world and the nature of the One whose existence is beyond it. Science is able to investigate and draw conclusions only from those subjects of human interest which are within the frame of the existing universe around us or in us. The right use of the term "God " presupposes Him as being the source of all kind of existence. We can not place Him among the limits of our world because He is the one who created it having determined its limits. That is why those people who look for the answer for the question of God's existence only through science can never find a definitive answer to their question, although science can support theism (belief in God) rather than materialism. Back to [Summary](#)

**2.3.** Perhaps you say: **"I would believe in God if he showed himself to me"**. Why are you sure that you would certainly believe? If somebody doesn't want to accept something, even the clearest sign will not convince him. As an illustration, everybody could experience that one can deny truth. If somebody has lied at least once in his life – who can say he hasn't? – he has rejected already once the truth that he recognised (in that specific situation). So it is possible that someone sees what is right but doesn't accept it. It is not enough only that the truth is revealed, but also a personal acceptance is needed.

If the almighty God showed himself in all his power and might, man would be forced to believe in him. Man would not be free anymore to decide on his own to lead his life according to the commandments of God."

On the other hand, in this writing we try to show that in reality God has already showed Himself to all men, in different forms and He is ready to show even more if readiness and receptivity are present.

*There are only two ways to live your life. One is as though nothing is a miracle. The other is as though everything is a miracle. (Albert Einstein)*

Back to [Summary](#)

**2.4.** Many people fail to believe in God because of the "Problem of evil", saying: **"If God is omnipotent and loving why do evil and suffering still exist?"**

The detailed explanation of this topic exceeds the frame of our present paper, but as a starting point we can easily see that in many cases the reason of evil and suffering in our world are the evil decisions of men. In the Christian understanding God never wanted anything bad for the people, he

created a good world in which man was provided with volitional freedom. God honours man and his dignity and so he even accepts the bad decisions of man. Man would not be really free if God accepted only partially the deeds of man e.g. his good deeds because they do not cause suffering. In this way God lets evil happen, he does not make it impossible, otherwise man would be degraded to a puppet. The reality is that often man does not use his free will in a good way, people do not think of the others, but of themselves. Many sufferings could be avoided if people helped each other and acted according to the principle "Love your neighbour as yourself". Many diseases have their cause in the lack of responsibility of people, even if it is not always obvious enough, people influence each other in many ways.

But there are other events like thunderstorms, floods, earthquakes, ... which are not directly caused by human beings and can lead to a lot of suffering. At this point we should be conscious of the fact that man is endowed with intelligence and many abilities which can help him to prevent himself from many bad consequences of such natural phenomena. Using our knowledge in a reasonable way and not especially for personal profit could protect us in many cases much more than it is usual nowadays. One very simple first step would be that people should not live in dangerous areas.

Nevertheless we have to admit that this question is perhaps one of the most difficult questions in human life for many people. Also, we have to express our compassion towards those who ask this question while experiencing severe suffering. On the other hand, suffering can lead man to a deeper understanding of his life and of the aim of his existence because it challenges man to think about the sense of his life. Often suffering people become easier aware of how unimportant material things are than healthy ones and start to look for a better base for their lives. Back to [Summary](#)

### 3. The formulation of some well known arguments

Thomas Aquinas had the following five arguments which can be found in more detail in his writings (Summa Theologica I:2:3; Cont. Gent., I, XIII.):

1. The "unmoved mover". Motion, as it takes place in the universe implies a first unmoved Mover (primum movens immobile), who is God. Otherwise we need an infinite series of movers, which is not a logical explanation.
2. Everything is caused by something. If we follow the sequence of events happening in the universe and search the preceding reasons then we necessarily come to the conclusion of the existence of a First Cause that is uncaused.
3. Every existing thing in the world came into existence once and will pass away. None of them is completely independent of other things. This is called contingency. The fact of the contingent universe implies the existence of a necessary being, who is God.
4. The different degrees of perfection in the world can be understood only by comparison with an absolute perfection who is God.
5. The wonderful order and harmony in the Universe is the evidence of an intelligent Designer, who is no other than God Himself, who directs all things to their goals (this is also called the teleological argument).

All these and still other arguments are actually not distinct and independent arguments, but only many different formulations of one and the same general causality argument. This argument is based on the fact that the above mentioned phenomena cannot be sufficiently explained without the acceptance of a self-sufficient and self-explanatory cause or ground of being and activity, to which everything is referred. Back to [Summary](#)

We will now deal with the following ways of reasoning:

[3.1. Argument from existence](#)

[3.2. Argument from design](#)

[3.3. Arguments from human nature](#)

Back to [Summary](#)

#### 3.1. Argument from existence

Our first argument starts from the very basic observation that we and the Universe exist. What is the reason of it?

We will give the answer in two different forms which are both based on the same train of thoughts.

### 3.1.1. The Argument of the Independent Existence

#### *Introduction*

When we say God we mean the One who has no beginning and no end and who does not alter. His existence is completely independent of anything else. The aim of the following text is to show that a being with the above mentioned attributes must exist if our world should make sense. These attributes are not alimportant attributes of God but they are very basic.

#### *Existence is a gift*

The closest example is our own life. Once we were born and once we will die. We live, but our life is dependent on many circumstances. We did not decide to live and we can not decide whether we want to die or not. There are many conditions and external reasons of our existence. With other words our existence does not contain its reason in itself. We are not independent. We ask, "Why do I exist?" and we have to look for the answer outside ourselves. With other things in this universe it is similar. In case of some of them we can directly observe their beginning and their end. They come and go, start to exist and perish. In case of other things we can observe their changeability. Everything that alters is subject to changes and is not totally independent in its existence. Its life consists of several periods, which come and go, start and perish. So we observe that not only we but all things in this universe received their existence from outside. It is a gift.

#### *Universe*

Little children get to know things and they ask, "why?", "where from?". If we try to give an answer our answer might cause other questions. It is impossible to find an answer which would not cause other questions. Sooner or later we give up. Now there are two possibilities. The final answer exists but it is too complex or the final answer does not exist within this universe because the universe was called to existence from outside. The Christians believe the second is true and they are often accused to have chosen the simpler solution. The reason for this belief is not that the solution is more simple. It is the fact that the universe can not be more than the parts which form it in the same way as a human race is not more than the humans which form it. If everything in the universe received existence as a gift, how could we say about the universe something else? The universe is nothing more than the sum of the parts which form it.

#### *Who is the giver?*

We believe that the universe was called to its existence from outside and the one who called it to existence must be independent of anything else. He must be unchangeable, standing above time and space. The Bible speaks about God in this way.

**The God who made the world and all things in it, since He is Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in temples made with hands; nor is He served by human hands, as though He needed anything, since He Himself gives to all {people} life and breath and all things. (Acts 17:24-25)**

**"I am the Alpha and the Omega," says the Lord God, who is and who was and who is to come, the Almighty. (Revelation 1:8)**

**Thus says the LORD, the King of Israel and his Redeemer, the LORD of hosts: "I am the first and I am the last; And there is no God besides Me. (Isaiah 44:6)**

Back to [Summary](#)

### 3.1.2. The general causality argument (contingency)

**The validity of the principle of causality or sufficient reason** is the base of the logical thinking on which all sciences and all human knowledge is built. That's why in the following we use it as the premise of our reasoning. This is one of the four basic laws of thinking (the law of identity, the law of contradiction, the law of the excluded middle and the law of sufficient reason) that all people use in everyday life, even if they are not aware of it.

This principle says that whatever exists or takes place must have a satisfactory reason either in itself or in something else.

Theoretically we could distinguish two categories of existence: the absolute necessary existence which is self-explanatory regarding its own existence and contingent existence which could be explained only by a proportionate cause exterior to it. If we try to categorise everything around ourselves into these two categories then sooner or later we must draw the conclusion that in reality **everything must be regarded as belonging to the category of contingent existence**. Going further with the conclusion drawn we extend our principle to the whole universe because if we claim that the elements of a cluster are contingent, then the whole cluster must be contingent as well. We cannot assume that elements to which we ascribe only contingent characteristics just because of their connection to one another could give absolute features to the cluster they form. That's why when someone supposes that although all the elements of the universe are contingent but the universe as a whole is self-explanatory and self-existent we must say that his statement is illogical because it neglects the fact that we call absolute features just those attributes which are not consequences or results of preceding processes or causes. But here the supposed "absolute character" is dependent on the connection of the particular contingent elements. Consequently, the **whole made of contingent elements must be contingent as well, which means that we have to find a satisfactory reason of the coming to existence of the whole Universe, external to it**.

William Ockham, a philosopher from the 13th. century, formulated a basic principle of scientific investigation when someone looking for the answer to an unexplained phenomenon must apply as few suppositions as it is really necessary.

Some atheists using this idea came to the conclusion that it is baseless to suppose the existence of God just because we can not explain the universe and its coming into existence. They think it's more logical to believe that the cosmos is self-explanatory. However, in reality, just because of this principle, it is easier and more logical to suppose a single transcendent being as the source of every existence, which by its nature owns perfect qualities and from this supposition every other features would be logically derived than to ascribe separately many different absolute attributes to the universe that, according to our observations, does not possess these qualities. Investigating any element of the universe we do not have even the least allusion to an absolute or self-explanatory attribute of our world. Is it really more childish to suppose the existence of an invisible first cause than the existence of invisible absolute attributes?

Why is it not contradictory to say that everything must have a preceding cause but nevertheless there is an uncaused first cause?

When we say that everything must have a preceding cause we think of the immanent elements of our contingent world. Our claim about the first cause is that it is transcendent to it. The contradiction would stand only if we regarded God as an immanent element of the universe. Consequently the features that we ascribe to the source of the world needn't be the same as the features we ascribe to the world itself.

Many people naturally come to the idea by themselves, even without thorough philosophical or theological reasoning that **the universe has a final cause in its background**. Their only question is what we should call it and often a more exact answer is not significant for them. We frequently hear people say it might be called: the **ancient Matter, the Atom, the Absolute, the Idea, the Spirit, something or somebody**. Some of these proposed descriptions of the final cause could be

easily recognised as wrong just because of the meaning of these terms. For example, if we use the term "Matter", we cannot forget about the fact that according to our experience everything that is material is contingent and belongs to the elements of our contingent universe and that's why we must suppose that the superior existence of the final cause should also have superior characters, not changeable or perishable like matter or atoms or any other element of the material world.

Here it must be mentioned that sometimes people expand the limits of the theory of evolution too broad and misunderstand its purpose. The theory of evolution cannot explain the final origin of the world since its field is the development of the existing things and not the question how existence came from non-existence.

Others who claim **that the final cause is of spiritual character**, like the Absolute, the Idea, the Spirit often deny it to be personal.

We experience that man's spiritual nature is manifested in his intelligence, free will, ability to love, ability to build selfless relationships with other spiritual beings. We include all these features when using the term "person". If we start from the previously mentioned principle, namely that the characters of the absolute and definitive cause can not be inferior to the characteristics of the contingent elements, then consequently we must admit that the absolute and definitive cause must also be on a higher level than the impersonal existence.

The term person is misunderstandable if we think of its daily sense. This term we usually don't separate from the specific and determined limits of a human being. Man lives in space and time, he has a body and limits in communication and ability to express his love. Of course, God is not subject to these limits, that is why using the term "person" we only mean someone being able for personal relationship and dialogue with his intelligent creatures. **For this reason, He must be someone who possesses intelligence, free will, self-awareness.**

**Therefore, the existence of an intelligent and free First Cause, a personal God, distinct from the material universe and the human mind, is an absolute necessity.**

All the approaches which miss the idea of the existence of an independent and personal Creator and explain the existence of the world by interior reasons, ascribing self-existence to the matter or spirit or anything else from the contingent world, could be regarded as different forms of indirect Pantheism. This way of thinking leads to contradiction in terms because it confuses the cause with the effect, the contingent with the self-existent, the finite with infinite. In the case of many people the consequence of this turn of mind is a pessimistic and hopeless attitude to the world because the one who believes it must regard evilness and everything bad in the world as eternal and unavoidable necessities. If man substitutes God with something else, he might lose his own human values like personality, responsibility and his common sense convictions and might lose the right motive to good conduct.

The one who accepts the existence of a personal loving God has the possibility to recognise the way out of this pessimistic and hopeless thinking, because the mentioned negative things don't belong to God's independent and perfect nature. Man has the possibility to assess also himself concerning his contribution to the development of the world instead of accusing the final cause. Back to [Summary](#)

### **3.2. The argument from design (also called the teleological argument)**

Although Kant rejected the validity of the traditional proofs for God's existence, he admitted that:

*This proof will always deserve to be treated with respect. It is the oldest, the clearest and most in conformity with human reason...We have nothing to say against the reasonableness and utility of this line of argument, but wish, on the contrary, to commend and encourage it.*

This argument is built on a very basic and obvious observation of man:

### 1. *There is order and harmony in nature*

If we look around we see there is a very complex and well fitting arrangement everywhere and in the universe everything happens in such a wonderful way which provides a very friendly surrounding for the harmonious structures, life and man. We see a marvellous unity and concord in nature. The whole universe is a complex system, consisting of strongly correlated and connected parts, subjects to exact laws, developing together in an interdependent way towards a specific purpose.

It would be too long here to list the fields (even without giving details) in which science clearly shows the evidences of regularity, order and harmony. There are other books (or rather libraries) which complete this task. The one who deals with it will recognise it in every part of the remote macro-universe and in the enigmatic behaviour of the micro-universe, in the complex structures of the inorganic and organic matter, in the world of the cell and biological processes, in the behaviour of animals or the dance of bees, in the composition of the human eye or the well co-ordinated functioning of other organs.

Even if some can regard the world from the opposite direction and observe rather imperfection, disharmony, discord or the existence of physical evil, natural calamities, others draw the conclusion from the evolutionary view that nature is ruled by cruel struggle for survival and development is always possible through the oppression of the weak one, there always still remains a large balance on the other side: regularity, order and harmony is obviously present in the universe, life and man finds the best protection even in severe conditions.

### 2. *The design of the universe can be explained neither by chance, nor by natural laws*

The coincidences "by chance" are too well tuned that we can explain them by "chance". Chance is not an explanation but renouncing to explanation. Scientists explain natural phenomena by assuming that the effects have their causes. Generally there are no doubts in applying this principle in the case of those phenomena for which man has already found a certain explanation, but there are some difficult questions for which science hasn't found an answer yet. If they are more complex questions, why should we give up the logical inference that they need more complex explanation and not just the contrary, the chance or chaos which is accepted as the simplest?

Does the theory of evolution give sufficient explanation?

Many claim that the theory of evolution gives the explanation for the development of the universe and life, instead of God. But there are many other serious scientists who testify that just the very opposite is true. Even from the evolutionary standpoint the universe doesn't show disorder but a marvellous design which will lead the honest scientist to a humble wondering that everything happened in such a well adjusted way that, despite so many hindrances and great gaps between the different steps, it was possible to reach the appearance of life and at the top of evolution man with conscience who can admire today all these things. Isn't it rather a clear evidence for a highest intelligent design?

Following the formulation of William Paley concerning a man who found a watch, and concluded that it must have been made by a watchmaker, Voltaire resumed:

*If a watch proves the existence of a watchmaker but the universe does not prove the existence of a great Architect, then I consent to be called a fool.*

Now, if somebody finds an automated factory that produces watches without any human intervention, will not he think that it must have been designed by a higher intelligence? In the same way, scientific theories will never show that everything can explain itself but rather they will make even clearer how wonderful this world is and everything functions in a fitting order, therefore it requires a more intelligent supernatural Creator.

The fact is that the theory of evolution, at least at the present stage, can give a sufficient answer

neither for the purposeful development, because it contains great gaps in the chain of explanations, nor for the origin of the universe, the origin of life, origin of species or the origin of human spirit. Even if many people hope that it is a question of time and once mankind will find explanation for everything, there are serious reasons to doubt it. But even if we find a sufficient explanation of how something happened, it doesn't mean that it happened by itself. Even the best scientific explanation or the most comprehensive or general theory would not explain why the natural laws are just these and why just these processes must happen. Science can explain many details of the cosmos but it can not grasp questions that are outside its frame.

*3. Therefore the design of the universe can be explained completely satisfactorily for human mankind by an intelligent supernatural Designer that we can believe in Him and it does not leave place for other explanations.*

Natural phenomena do not possess intelligence in themselves and we can not speak about their intentional acting so their purposeful acting can be explained only by the control of a wise being having free will. This argument does not prove in itself the infinity and perfection of the Designer, but it shows at least that He is beyond the universe and is a superior Mind who directs everything towards the fulfilment of a certain aim. We can get to know also something about this aim, at least that everything is guided so that humans owning mind and free will able to love come into existence.

**Science can only be created by those who are thoroughly imbued with the aspiration toward truth and understanding. This source of feeling, however, springs from the sphere of religion. To this there also belongs the faith in the possibility that the regulations valid for the world of existence are rational, that is, comprehensible to reason. I cannot conceive of a genuine scientist without that profound faith. The situation may be expressed by an image: science without religion is lame, religion without science is blind. (A. Einstein)**

Back to [Summary](#)

### **3.3. Arguments for the existence of God from the human nature**

The following thoughts will start from the uncontested existing reality, from our human nature, that all of us experience. We want to remind the fact that our deepest intentions and longings contain in themselves a final aim that really can fulfil them.

We experience life as a continuous search. Every goal in this world can offer only a temporary satisfaction. This can be explained only if we accept that there is a final goal and without reaching it man can not be satisfied with provisional solutions. Therefore the final goal of our search should be beyond this world.

#### **3.3.1. Final aim of life, happiness - longing for fulfilment**

Every man struggles day by day for things he considers important in his life. Youth struggle for success in studying, adults for earning money for maintaining themselves and their families. Some invest a lot of time and energy in improving science or serving the benefit of society in other areas. These are good things in themselves but what is the final sense of all these? Although people can be satisfied by these claims finding temporal joy nevertheless they can not find final fulfilment and security in them. An earthquake can annihilate everything that a man builds up all his life, a death of a beloved family member can drive somebody into depression. There are many cases when man is forced to be confronted with the finiteness of his life and of the things of this world.

There is also another outlook on life, which proclaims amusement and enjoyment as the real sense of life. Every honest man can recognise that this thinking and manner of life causes people to go empty losing the ability to appreciate the actual values of life. This ideology is the best source of licentiousness, immorality and aggression. Consequently this can not be the real aim of life either.

All the people would like to possess a solid base that they can lean on. What can it be? Jesus Christ said:

**Do not store up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust destroy, and where thieves break in and steal.**

Even if someone does not accept him as Son of God, nevertheless can see that His words are true. How many people finding material wealth or great reputation committed suicide? How many of them who put their whole trust in man became human wrecks after getting disappointing in them? What can a man discover in this world at all that could supply absolute security for him? Who could give satisfactory answers to the greatest questions of mankind? Jesus finishes his statement like this:

**But store up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust destroys, and where thieves do not break in or steal; ... But seek first His kingdom and His righteousness, and all these things will be added to you. (Matthew 6:19-34)**

Each man has a certain claim for finding the aim of his life, joy and love. Though many people try to repress this claim, yet it seems that mankind searches the fulfilment and those who failed to find their aim sink in themselves. **Thus longing for fullness is a natural human need but finding it is logically and practically impossible if there is not something or someone possessing that fullness in itself.** Since as far as we know man is the being of the highest level in the universe, it can be logically excluded in advance that his longing for fullness could ever be completed merely by material things – which are on lower level. Of course one can find joy in other people or material things, too. This joy, however, derived from its nature, – is only provisional and partial and the quest for fullness based on them is a self-cheat and illusion. Man is unable to fulfil another man completely since they stand on the same level and they “struggle” with the same needs. Thus the existence of an absolute being above man able to complete his needs is a prime necessity for life. Back to [Summary](#)

### 3.3.2. The basic need of man for relationship in love

According to personalistic philosophy ( e.g. Martin Buber), the basic need of man is relationship: openness and mutual love towards others. Love is the deepest manifestation of the essence of our personality. Man, by his nature, is a social being. Therefore all the possibilities of our human nature can be realised not only regarding the individual but breaking the frame of our own existence and referring to our place among the others. This means that for the realisation, opening and fulfilling our personal being a relationship between “You and me” is indispensable. Mainly our need for the others and our devotion to them can form in us the sense of responsibility and the right assessment of ourselves and of the others. Only relating ourselves towards other personal beings we can attain self-reflection, self-disposition, self-consciousness and so the sense of responsibility. Because man has the need of being in community, the main obstacle in perfecting his personality is self-contentness, withdrawing in himself. Selfishness can serve only apparently for gaining one’s own interests, because the one who doesn’t take into consideration the other’s needs, who doesn’t know sacrifice (renouncement) for the other one or who is mistrustful towards others, isolates himself from the community and so isolates himself just from what he is looking for: finding fulfilment for his own being. A man who lives for himself or wants to gain power over the others can not be free, only serving others can make one free. Only in devotion one can be satisfied with his life and his realisation.

But man can see always the human limits: he cannot get nor give perfect love. The love we can receive from another man will have an end when we lose him. Therefore the natural need of man for receiving eternal love can be fulfilled only by an eternal perfect being who is the inexhaustible source of love.

Once man’s longing for perfect love is fulfilled he himself will own the source from which he will be able to give love to others. Everybody can experience that he cannot satisfy perfectly the other one

by his own power because the other one's needs go beyond one's human limits. A right relationship with another man is possible only through taking into consideration his whole nature, all his needs, that often surpass one's own abilities. This is the way someone has to regard the other one in order to see him not only as a tool for his own happiness but in his complete reality as a being having need for absolute love. In this way man's natural longing for relationship in love can not be fulfilled perfectly without an absolute source of love that is God. Back to [Summary](#)

### 3.3.3. Wish for righteousness

Everybody has a natural sensation of righteousness. This can be easily seen by the fact that bad deeds of "enemies" are strictly assessed. People are usually much more sensitive towards their "enemies" than towards themselves. We have the wish that people are treated righteously, or at least the wish that they themselves are righteously treated.

Now evolutionists try to explain this phenomenon as a result of common life of human beings because it is advantageous for the collective to be righteous. However, the sense of righteousness cannot simply develop, there is no more or less of it. It does not seem to be a sensible thought that mankind decided at an early stage to be righteous and consequently it was transmitted to the descendants. Such phenomena, abilities cannot be inherited but every individual has to decide to be righteous or not. Secondly, righteousness does not ask for being advantageous for oneself or others. A righteous deed is done independently of its consequences. So how can our longing for righteousness be fulfilled?

Our world has always been full of unrighteousness and it is not realistic to think that this will completely change. Furthermore we are not satisfied with partial righteousness which people struggle for like politicians (sometimes), humanists and religious people. Real all-embracing righteousness that is valid for everyone cannot be found within this world.

So is the longing for righteousness only a senseless character of human being or doesn't it just hint at a transcendent being who can provide it eternally? Back to [Summary](#)

### 3.3.4. Beauty and harmony

If the reason of the coming into existence of the universe and man is just the sequence of extremely rare events, where are beauty and harmony from? Why does man have abilities that are completely unnecessary from the point of view of survival and race preservation? Where are the artistic gifts, poetry, literature, and music from? If life is just a cruel struggle for survival, where are these values from and why have they survived?

There was a child who liked to paint, and indeed he painted nicely. One day he sat in his room and started to paint a beautiful landscape. After sitting many hours with his utensils, he became tired and went out. He looked up at the sky and at the trees and spontaneously shouted out: "Oh, this is more beautiful than what I painted and I can ever paint ! But who is the one who painted all these?"

Man has a natural wish for beauty, which reflects perfection, the ideal. Beautiful is what approaches the ideal or the perfection of itself. The rhythm of proportions, lines, colours, sounds does not have usually material or biological worth, even if it can be connected, we like it because of other reasons. We have joy when we see beautiful things because they bring us nearer to the infinite beauty we have wish for and we love. We like to see the waving sea, the high mountains because they suggest greatness, infinity, majesty. So the attracting power of beauty leads us to an infinite source, to the perfection which can satisfy our longing for it.

An illustration concerning the love of beauty, belonging to the nature of man:

The expedition led by Ralph Solecki of Columbia University in the rugged Zagros Mountains of northern Iraq excavated in 1960 in the Shanidar Cave the bones of an old Neanderthal man who died 60.000 years ago. His burial was prepared in a special way: He rested in a bed with bundles of woody horsetail branches. Festoons of yarrow, hollyhock, groundsell, grape hyacinth, cornflowers

and other flowers were woven among the ramose stems of the woody horsetail. Solecki wrote about this "flower burial":

*We are brought suddenly to the realisation that the universality of mankind and the love of beauty go beyond the boundaries of our own species.*

*No longer can we deny the early men the full range of human feelings and experience.  
(Science 190 / 1975)*

Back to [Summary](#)

### 3.3.5. Morality (The argument from conscience)

Why does morality exist and why is there a basic longing for good in man and why is there conscience?

#### 1. There is an objective moral law

Even if some people are not aware of or consciously do not admit the reality of a universal moral law, generally everybody agrees in some basic moral principles necessary for our life as individuals and as collectivity.

It is true that there always existed differences concerning the moral principles but these differences were always smaller than their consent. If somebody compares the moral teachings of different cultures from different times among different nations, will see the great similarities among them and the great similarity to our moral precepts.

C. S. Lewis proves in his book, *The Abolition of Man*, that the ancient Egyptians, Babylonians, Hindus, Chinese, Greeks and Romans had very similar moral teachings. In no culture were treason, cheat, impostors or selfish men admired. There are differences in different cultures concerning the number of wives in an official marriage, but no culture has ever glorified the act of adultery or shown as a virtue to take away the wife of the other man. In no culture was permitted to murder anybody without any reason, not even among cannibals, who also have their laws and they don't murder anybody they want either. The fact that Nazis considered their supreme aim to root out some other nations doesn't show that this can be also part of the natural law. Just the fact that we may criticise them shows that there is a superior truth in this question to which all are submitted and by which all can be judged.

Let's examine the development of this inner law in the life of the individual. The reality of the development of conscience of the individuals is observable from their childhood on. This change is influenced by several things but the most important influencing aspect is personal decision. Man can deny his conscience and every such a decision affects our inner law. They influence the work of our conscience regarding what things and to what extent it draws our attention to. This is the main reason of the differences that we see in people's moral assessment. But these influencing personal decisions do not change the reality of the existence of a common starting point and purity of our conscience determined by the objective law of morality.

Everybody experiences the obliging character of the word of this inner law. Even if man does not conform to it, he knows "it should be", "it would be good" or "it would have been good". These inner warnings have superior authority because even if I don't like it, I must face its message. The assessment of the voice of conscience is at work before, during and after our actions, accusing or justifying us. Its unconditioned obliging character is for the purpose of education. Its task is to correct the subjective deviations created by our bad motives and decisions and to direct us back to the purity of the objective and the highest good. It means that even if individual conscience changes in the course of time its origin is shown by its task to lead people to the absolute truth and objectivity superior to them.

## 2. What can be the source of the objective moral law?

Can conscience be only the product of social education or environmental influence? If conscience may be only the product of these outward influences then the strongest influence, namely the parents' life would always necessarily determine the moral orientation of the child as well. But a child of murderer parents will not necessarily become a murderer. Fortunately, we also often see young people who have not become victims of the various forms of immorality offered by our modern society but try to escape from it. It would not be possible if also their conscience were produced by the contemporary society. That is why we think that although these aspects indeed influence the forming of conscience of people, nevertheless these ways of explanations in themselves must be regarded as simplifications of a complicated question.

Here we don't intend to deal with the materialists' proposal for the evolutionary coming into existence of human conscience. Let us only refer to the general opinion of Nobel- scientists regarding the enormous gap between human conscience and forms of spiritual behaviour and the highest manifestations of instinct combinations of the animal kingdom. Since the difference is not just the matter of the level of development of the same features but of unique and new qualities, the answer of the origin of our conscience must be found somewhere else. We have collected some quotations of famous scientists of this field in a separate part, see [Scientists concerning spirit](#).

If the objective moral law can not come only from the material world through evolutionary processes, nor can it be explained by some individual or collective psychical influence of the society, then it must have a source exterior to our world. This superior Lawgiver must be someone whose nature is in perfect accordance with the moral laws he gives. We call this perfect, supreme and personal Lawgiver God.

## 3. Other arguments based on morality

In a later period of his life Kant rejected the traditional proofs and considered that the existence of God and the immortality of soul were matters of faith, not of reason, which, he claimed, is limited to sensation. Out of many arguments he accepted only the moral argument, but not in the form presented above. Kant reasoned that everybody's aim is perfect happiness and everybody should seek the summum bonum (highest good) by obeying the moral law. But mortal men can not reach a proportionate happiness through striving for morality, therefore there must exist a perfect God who will reward us with perfection after death.

"The argument from damnation" given by Peter Berger in his Rumour of Angels is in fact a negative version of the reasoning with morality. His idea is thought-provoking even if it is not a strong argument because it assumes a positive turn of mind, according to which everybody must receive what he deserves. It starts from the fact that some deeds like slavery, genocide or holocaust are so evil that they deserve not only an earthly punishment but a supernatural condemnation, otherwise there would be no justice. Back to [Summary](#)

### 3.3.6. The freedom of human will

The freedom of will means the accomplishment of acts considered the most expedient on the base of one's own discretion, obeying his own sense of responsibility without any external force. Thus it can be concluded that the freedom of one's ideas and decisions can not be determined by any moral, biological, chemical or physical law nor can it be described by any formula. Man can always weigh consciously the choice from among numerous possibilities of actions while the matter behaves always according to the qualities by which it is determined. Man is able to form himself by his decisions, he is able to develop his abilities and he has the possibility to decide opposing his instincts, disposition and features. Moreover man is able to make the material world serve him through his mind both in good or bad directions and he is able to interfere into the law of nature though sometimes at the expense of grave consequences. All these show explicitly that the attributes of human intelligence and will are in a radical opposition to the characteristics of matter. So it is obvious that the reason of the coming into existence of volitional freedom cannot be found in matter which is unable to act in a reasonable and purposive way by itself. The originator of

intelligence and will has to possess these features as well and to be able to pass them on. It implies that the reason which caused - and so possesses - the intelligence and volitional freedom has to be a person, too, for these attributes presuppose consciousness and can be connected only to a person. Back to [Summary](#)

### 3.3.7. The dynamism of human spirit (longing for the infinite)

The conscious phenomena in the case of animals are always the product of inward and outward information taking place at the present moment. The human self-awareness is not motivated only by instincts or information coming from outside, which we can see from several spiritual activities. The life and interest of animals are determined and complete in the frame of their existence.

The realisation of human life is characterised by the unlimited openness and freedom of our knowledge and aspirations.

Man is interested and open not only towards his own everyday life, but he asks some basic questions concerning the origin and final reason of his existence: "Who am I? Where do I come from? Where do I go? What is my place in the surrounding world?" Furthermore, he has also questions concerning the whole existence: "What is the world? Where did it come from? What is the truth? How can I get to know it? What is the final aim of the whole existence?" Questions like these show that human mind strives to understand the totality of the infinite existence. It surpasses the senses and concepts and wants to grasp the total existence. Man's personality contains the longing to break out from the limits of space and time. Human spirit does not connect only to the present point of space and time. People can be in spirit (in thoughts) at any point of space and time of the world, which shows that our mind is not dependent only on matter. Man's spiritual activity and intellectual orientation and motivation go beyond the finite world and are directed towards the infinite and complete reality.

This natural ability and striving of man must have an object that is beyond the sensual experience of reality. Otherwise this longing for the infinite would be baseless. How could man realise the finiteness and imperfection if the infinite and perfection did not exist? Back to [Summary](#)

### 3.3.8. Wish for immortality

*Life is a great surprise. I don't see why death should not be an even greater one. (Vladimir Nabokov)*

Man is the only living being who is aware of his death.

The wish for immortality is at least as old as the human civilisation. We can see already in the earliest cultures that people prepared and equipped their dead carefully for their life in the other world. Different tribes and nations had different burial customs but usually all of them reflect some kind of belief in the existence after death. This shows that the belief in life after death is so closely connected with the nature of man that we might consider this fact as having a real base. The fact that many people nowadays accept so easily the idea of annihilation often shows rather the lack of thinking than a deep conviction. If we accept that human spirit is immortal then it can not be the product of evolutionary processes (which lead only to ephemeral things) but supposes an immortal Creator. Back to [Summary](#)

### 3.3.9. The argument of universal consent

Religiosity, the idea of the existence of a kind of superior authority has provably accompanied the history of mankind everywhere in the world for millennia, from the earliest ages up to nowadays. **People's belief in God could not be disproved or abolished** even by lots of radical social, cultural and ideological changes. How could a supposition have survived in spite of all these changes absolutely baseless and unreal?

It is true that there has always been a large variety of disfigured religious beliefs and superstitions

and many people have accepted Polytheism, Dualism, Pantheism or other kinds of erroneous understandings. But this fact does not disprove our argument because by universal consent we do not understand the way people exactly understood deity and what they believed about it, but we speak about **the general belief in the existence of a superior being or beings on whom the material world and man himself are dependent**. Even if people often distorted their recognition, the common germinal truth from their belief cannot be explained in another way than that it is the result of the natural common sense of man that draws conclusions from the existing evidences.

There are many explanations for the origin and the universality of religion but generally anthropologists and philosophers of religion agree about the above stated consent of mankind. Moreover, there is a good deal of positive evidence for supporting the theory that the first religion of mankind was Monotheism and during the history it degenerated instead of progressing. But even if it became in many cases very obscure, the core of the original truth was not completely abolished.

Concerning atheism, we can not say the same. History proves that atheistic philosophy is a “modern achievement” and it is not characteristic in the normal human society but is a rather abnormal reaction of a relatively few number of people. Its present form is closely connected with the sudden and intense improvement of human knowledge by modern science from the last century on and although science has really developed considerably in this period, it should honestly be acknowledged that the greatest questions of life are still open. From the writings of many ancient so-called atheists we can see that they were rather against the abuse of religion and against the rejection of rationality than against the existence of all kinds of divinity. In some cases it could be considered as an admirable virtue of the nonconformists who do not adhere on the mind of the large mass just because of the fact that they are in the majority, if their contribution has real bases and have a superior aim like uncovering the truth and a better way of life. But this is not the case with atheism where many examples show rather the contrary. Therefore neither the ancient nor the modern opponents of religion can uproot the belief in God which is so deeply implanted in man’s heart. Back to [Summary](#)

### **3.3.10. What do scientists say about the human spirit? Is the human spirit merely the result of the evolution of matter?**

Thomas Henry Huxley, Darwin’s friend wrote in 1863:

*No one is more strongly convinced than I am of the vastness of the gulf between ... man and brutes ... for, he alone possesses the marvellous endowment of intelligible and rational speech [and] ... stands raised upon it as on a mountain top, far above the level of his humble fellows, and transfigured from his grosser nature by reflecting, here and there, a ray from the infinite source of truth.*

Several materialist scientists try to explain the highest spiritual processes, including self-awareness and consciousness as being only the result of biochemical reactions. They are called reductionists, because they reduce the whole reality to the level of material processes. But there are many other science experts who do not belong to this category, who are aware of the limits of science, who speak about “the wonder and mystery of the human self with its spiritual values, with its creativity, and with its uniqueness for each of us”, like John C. Eccles, Nobel prize winner neuroscientist. (John C. Eccles, *How the Self Controls Its Brain*, Springer-Verlag, 1994, pp. 33, 176.) He rejects the materialist reductionism and, in co-operation with the philosopher Sir Karl Popper, holds the dualist-interactionist theory, which says that the Self controls its brain while in a close interaction they act on one another.

*... the anthropic principle achieves a new dimension in the coming-to-be of each of us as unique self-conscious beings. It is this transcendence that has been the motive of my life’s work, culminating in the effort to understand the brain in order to present the mind-brain problem in scientific terms. I maintain that the human mystery is incredibly demeaned by scientific reductionism, with its claim in promissory materialism to account eventually for all*

*of the spiritual world in terms of patterns of neuronal activity. This belief must be classed as a superstition. (John C. Eccles, Evolution of the Brain, Creation of the Self, Routledge, 1989, p. 241)*

He sees no tension between his life's scientific work and the belief in the existence of spiritual reality unapproachable for science:

*Since materialist solutions fail to account for our experienced uniqueness, I am constrained to attribute the uniqueness of the Self or Soul to a supernatural spiritual creation. To give the explanation in theological terms: each Soul is a new Divine creation ... (Evolution of the Brain, p. 237.)*

*We may conclude by saying that biological evolution transcends itself in providing the material basis, the human brain, for self-conscious beings whose very nature is to seek for hope and to enquire for meaning in the quest for love, truth and beauty. (Evolution of the Brain, p. 243.)*

*I here express my efforts to understand with deep humility a self, myself, as an experiencing being. I offer it in the hope that we human selves may discover a transforming faith in the meaning and significance of this wonderful adventure that each of us is given on this salubrious Earth of ours, each with our wonderful brain, which is ours to control and use for our memory and enjoyment and creativity and with love for other human selves. (How the Self Controls Its Brain, pp. 180-181)*

John Eccles` opinion about death is:

*we can regard the death of the body and brain as dissolution of our dualist existence. Hopefully, the liberated soul will find another future of even deeper meaning and more entrancing experiences, perhaps in some renewed embodied existence ... in accord with traditional Christian teaching. (Evolution of the Brain, p. 242)*

What is consciousness? If it is nothing but chemistry, merely the function of some molecular structures in the brain, who is the "I" who experiences the reality? John Searle, modern philosopher, writes:

*I'm conscious, I AM conscious. We could discover all kinds of startling things about ourselves and our behaviour; but we cannot discover that we do not have minds, that they do not contain conscious, subjective, intentionalistic mental states; nor could we discover that we do not at least try to engage in voluntary, free, intentional actions. (John Searle, Minds, Brains and Science, 1984).*

Descartes, often regarded as the father of modern philosophy, suggested that from our direct experience we know that mind exists and through observation and reasoning we perceive that matter exists, too. "I think therefore I am". He thought there is a constant interaction between body and mind in a certain unity of the human individual.

*I am not lodged in my body as a pilot in a vessel, but that I am besides so intimately conjoined, and as it were intermixed with it, that my mind and body compose a certain unity. For if this were not the case, I should not feel pain when my body is hurt, seeing I am merely a thinking thing, but should perceive the wound by the understanding alone, just as a pilot perceives by sight when any part of his vessel is damaged. (René Descartes, Meditations, 1641).*

The Cartesian dualist view has been maintained and developed in the twentieth-century by several scientists and philosophers. Nobel prize-winning neuro-scientist C.S. Sherrington laid the foundations for the understanding of the operation of the brain. One of his most notable pupil, the Canadian neurosurgeon Wilder Penfield started his brain studies as a materialist, but reached the conclusion that:

*It is easier to rationalize man's being on the basis of two elements than on the basis of one. (Wilder Penfield, The Mystery of the Mind, 1975).*

We do not want to enter in details in different mind – theories, only to point out that real science can not deny the spiritual values of man, but the materialistic-reductionist conception of human nature dangerously reduces his worth, as Roger W. Sperry (Nobel prize winner) observed:

*Before science, man used to think himself a free agent possessing free will. Science gives us, instead, causal determinism wherein every act is seen to follow inevitably from preceding patterns of brain excitation. Where we used to see purpose and meaning in human behaviour, science now shows us a complex bio-physical machine composed entirely of material elements, all of which obey inexorably the universal laws of physics and chemistry ... I find that my own conceptual working model of the brain leads to inferences that are in direct disagreement with many of the foregoing; especially I must take issue with that whole general materialistic-reductionist conception of human nature and mind that seems to emerge from the currently prevailing objective analytic approach in the brain-behaviour sciences. When we are led to favour the implications of modern materialism in opposition to older, more idealistic values in these and related matters, I suspect that science may have sold society and itself a somewhat questionable bill of goods. (Sperry, Roger W., "Mind, Brain, and Humanist Values," Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, September, 1966, pp.2-3.)*

Back to [Summary](#)

## 4. THE VALIDITY AND AIM OF THE ARGUMENTS FOR GOD

Why should we deal at all with arguments if God's existence is anyway a matter of faith?

Concerning the arguments for the existence of God there are always some great questions: their **validity (the power of the proofs)**, their **method (the way of proving)** and their **aim (how they help)**.

### 4.1. How valid are these proofs?

They were often contested in different ways by many philosophers, but our assessment should be in accordance with the deep conviction of Paul concerning the sure knowability of God:

**What can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. Ever since the creation of the world his eternal power and divine nature, invisible though they are, have been understood and seen through the things he has made. (Romans 1:19-20 NRSV).**

This basic idea of recognising the invisible God from his visible created world is to be found in every culture, from the ancient thinkers to our modern scientists. We do not claim that God's existence can be proved mathematically or demonstrated, but that "it can, from created things, be known with certainty by the natural light of the human reason" (as Catholics formulated at the Vatican Council). Perhaps we can say that the proofs supply a high degree of evidence that will exclude reasonable doubt even if their demonstrative deductions are not logically inevitable or inexorable.

The proofs for God's existence never compel anybody to accept them necessarily because they give space to the free will. Mathematical or scientific demonstrations start from some axioms or postulates, and work with some logical rules accepted with general consent by all in that area of science. In case of metaphysical reasoning there are certain conditions for grasping the content and the relations between the proofs. One has to be familiar with the terms and with some abstract way of thinking to see larger connections. Therefore the power of the arguments depends on one's personal turn of mind, mentality, disposition or education. And the most important condition is that one has to show personal readiness and openness to examine one's own way of thinking and life.

## 4.2. The ways of proving

From the many different ways of argumentation we dealt only with the inductive (a posteriori) reasoning, which starts from different aspects of the existence (the contingent world, both in its existence and its features), or of our human experience and which leads to the first cause that is God.

We did not deal with the deductive (a priori) reasoning that starts from the notion of God and infers His actual existence (like Anselm, Descartes, Leibniz). This way of reasoning is contested by many although the question is not always so simple, it depends on how much we accept a certain pre-knowledge about God.

To some extent in all our reasoning both ways are connected, we anticipate some notions of God's nature when we use the inductive method in order to prove His existence. We can not search what is completely unknown for us. On the other hand, we have to pay attention not to presuppose what we want to prove.

## 4.3. What is the aim of the arguments?

Why do we need at all arguments and what should we use them for? What is the gain of these mentally so costly and exhausting methods? Indeed they do not supply us either the whole or the top of our knowledge about God. It is clear that someone does not have to be able to lead a certain way of argumentation in order to become a believer. But we use some rational explanations to understand that our belief in God is not in contradiction with the scientific or philosophical approach of the same reality. We need not become philosophers or scientists to be able to understand God's existence. But we have to assume a point of view if we are confronted today with so many different world-views that are widespread. We need not base our belief on scientific or metaphysic knowledge, but we should not give up using our mind and intellectual power in search for answers concerning the existence and nature of our Creator, to look for his footprints in nature and his image in man in order to get to know Him and to strengthen our relationship with Him.

**For while I was passing through and examining the objects of your worship, I also found an altar with this inscription, 'to an unknown God.' Therefore what you worship in ignorance, this I proclaim to you. The God who made the world and all things in it, since He is Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in temples made with hands; nor is He served by human hands, as though He needed anything, since He Himself gives to all {people} life and breath and all things; and He made from one {man} every nation of mankind to live on all the face of the earth, having determined {their} appointed times and the boundaries of their habitation, that they would seek God, if perhaps they might grope for Him and find Him, though He is not far from each one of us; for in Him we live and move and exist, as even some of your own poets have said, 'For we also are His children.' Being then the children of God, we ought not to think that the Divine Nature is like gold or silver or stone, an image formed by the art and thought of man. Therefore having overlooked the times of ignorance, God is now declaring to men that all {people} everywhere should repent, because He has fixed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness through a Man whom He has appointed, having furnished proof to all men by raising Him from the dead. (Acts 17:23-31)**

Back to [Summary](#)

## 5. Conclusions

As we said in the beginning the arguments contained in this treatise do not give uncontested proofs for the existence of God. Our intention was to show through them that the question about God's existence can not be put aside by the usual objections. We wanted to give help to those people who honestly search the truth to recognise that the idea of God's existence is not far from our human nature. In most cases the greatest obstacle in accepting God is not the lack of arguments but the confrontation with its consequences and the lack of wish to experience the relationship with God.

To accept God means to accept also the relationship with Him that he offers. It presupposes readiness to get to know Him, to give my time for Him, to have ears to listen to Him, to change my life according to His plan. It also means that I should entrust to Him my life, my way, everything that concerns me, completely, without reservation. And it means to reject everything that is contrary to Him and to renounce everything that hinders me to reach Him. Many people see just renouncement in the relationship with God but they do not consider that man should renounce only those things that hinder him to find the fulfilment of life and only the loving God is able to satisfy man's needs completely.

*There is a God-shaped vacuum in the heart of every person. (Pascal)*

**For whoever wishes to save his life will lose it; but whoever loses his life for My sake will find it. For what will it profit a man if he gains the whole world and forfeits his soul? Or what will a man give in exchange for his soul? (Matthew 16:25-26)**

**Submit therefore to God. Resist the devil and he will flee from you. Draw near to God and He will draw near to you. Cleanse your hands, you sinners; and purify your hearts, you double-minded. (James 4:7-8)**

**[God] desires all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. (1 Timothy 2:4)**

**... that they would seek God, if perhaps they might grope for Him and find Him, though He is not far from each one of us; for in Him we live and move and exist ... (Acts 17:27-28)**

**For if you cry for discernment, Lift your voice for understanding; If you seek her as silver And search for her as for hidden treasures; Then you will discern the fear of the LORD And discover the knowledge of God. For the LORD gives wisdom; From His mouth {come} knowledge and understanding. (Proverbs 2:3-6)**

**Ask, and it will be given to you; seek, and you will find; knock, and it will be opened to you. For everyone who asks receives, and he who seeks finds, and to him who knocks it will be opened. (Matthew 7:7-8)**

**Come to Me, all who are weary and heavy-laden, and I will give you rest. (Matthew 11:28)**

**Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if anyone hears My voice and opens the door, I will come in to him and will dine with him, and he with Me. (Revelation 3:20)**

Back to [Summary](#)

---

© 2011 [www.christians.eu](http://www.christians.eu) - All rights reserved.

The content of this article may only be republished or reprinted in an unchanged, complete form for private use. Content may not be reproduced in any other form without written permission from **[www.christians.eu](http://www.christians.eu)**

Unless otherwise noted, Scripture quotations taken from the NASB.

Scripture quotations marked NIV are taken from the Holy Bible, New International Version®, NIV®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by Biblica, Inc.™ Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved worldwide. [www.zondervan.com](http://www.zondervan.com)

Last modified: 9th December 2011