

In order to build a credible case for a theistic universe, we must start by defining the groundwork of our argument: first principles. First principles, which form the most basic foundations of absolute truth, are inescapable, self-evident truths. Foremost among these first principles is The Law of Non-Contradiction, defined as follows: a statement and its opposite may not both be true at the same time and in the same sense. Embedded within this Law is the Law of Identity, which provides the basis for definitions of terms. These laws cannot be disproven, since, in order to do so, the laws themselves must be used. Finally, we have the principle of causality, the first principle most closely associated with science.

The principle of causality is defined as: every finite event or phenomena must have an adequate cause. This principle may be extended to the farthest reaches of the universe, whether known or unknown, by the following argument: if we remain consistent with the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics (which holds that the amount of useable energy in the universe is decreasing) we know the universe is finite. As previously stated, the inescapable principle of causality holds that every finite thing must have a cause. The concept of "finiteness" also necessitates a beginning. So, if we can reasonably conclude that the universe had a beginning, we may begin to draw conclusions about its cause. A significant piece of "scientific evidence" that supports beginning of the universe comes from the COBE satellite. This satellite was launched searching for a "radiation echo" sufficient to support the idea of the "Big Bang." A massive pattern of background radiation was transmitted back to the scientists from the satellite, exactly matching that of a "Big Bang's" calculated heat and light.

It is reasonable to conclude, therefore, that the universe had a beginning—that is is an effect. The law of causality may be invoked to form an infinitely long chain of finite causes, in which each individual effect, no matter how minuscule, has its own finite cause. This very dichotomy of an "infinite" chain of "finite" causes violates the Law of Non-Contradiction. Something cannot be both infinite and finite; that violates both the definition of the terms (back to the Law of Identity) and the "time/sense" qualifications of the Law of Non-Contradiction. Every first principle states here, including the law of causality, thus demands an original Cause of the universe.

We can sketch out the basic attributes of this primary Cause by logically implementing the same fundamental first principles we have used so far. Since this infinite cause must be outside of space and time, we may logically conclude that it is: eternal, self-sufficient, unchanging, all-powerful, and all-knowing. But exactly how does this Cause relate to us, here within time and space? It relates to us by defining our most critical set of priorities: our morals.

First, we must define our terms (Law of Identity). Morality is what "should" or "ought" to be; a system for recognizing, defining, and distinguishing right and wrong.

Every system of morality falls into one of these two camps: natural or the transcendent. The natural system holds that any moral inclinations of man can be explained away by his natural instincts, as determined by the evolutionary forces of nature, e.g. self-preservation, the herd instinct, and survival of the fittest. Morality functions on no higher plane than a man's (or an animal's) most basic survivalist impulses. Whatever is moral and therefore "ought" to be already exists, as defined by nature and her laws. Even man's thoughts are no more than a series of chemical reactions in his brain. There is no individual value inherent in a man except that conferred on him by society; and societies themselves are products of their own environments (back to natural forces again).

What are these laws of nature? They are the operating codes of nature, and include the law of gravity, the law of conservation of energy, the second Law of Thermodynamics, etc. We must again define our terms clearly; these are not

moral laws, only descriptions of phenomena. As such, the laws of nature cannot function as the basis for a moral system. Natural processes have no mind with which to regulate behavior. They are mechanics, descriptions of effects— but not causes. In this case, there is nothing but the status quo. You can't say anything is good or bad; it simply "is."

Here we encounter a problem: there is absolutely no way to build a logical bridge between a description of a situation (what is) and a moral prescription (what ought to be).

For example, let us turn to the war trials of Nuremberg, conducted in the bloody wake of World War II. After the defeat of the Nazis, the world clamored for justice top Nazi leaders, who faced accusations such as conspiracy, crimes against peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. It was clear that the crimes of these men and the trial itself could neither be tolerated or ignored. However, what law was there on the books to condemn crimes against humanity? Under the natural viewpoint, nothing that the Nazis did, thought, or said was wrong; they were simply a byproduct of their genetics and environments, themselves subject to the forces of nature. In fact, the natural view has no quarrel whatsoever with the Nazis; they were, after all, only products of their own "blood and soil." The natural view of morality does not provide a credible basis for justice at Nuremberg trial.

Associate Justice Robert H. Jackson, the chief prosecutor on behalf of the United States, bore witness to this himself, describing Nuremberg:

"...an international military tribunal, it rises above the provincial and transient and seeks guidance not only from International Law but also from the basic principles of jurisprudence which are assumptions of civilization."¹

Jackson himself was arguing for a transcendent moral code, the only system of morality under which the Nazis could be legitimately tried.

The transcendent view of morality puts forth the only reasonable and reliable explanation for these "principles of jurisprudence" and "assumptions of civilization." By definition, a man cannot manufacture an objective system of morality to which he will hold every else accountable. An objective, universal code must come from an outside source, a Cause beyond the observable effects. Without a standard, we cannot accuse anyone of injustice, much less of crimes against humanity. Morality, as defined by this Cause, transcends nature and makes her subservient to a moral code. This morality is composed of prescriptions rather than descriptions. Not only does it lay out moral laws—this Cause also has the force to back them. The Cause of time and space himself is hardly a puppet of society's whims. In fact, this Cause has left evidence of this transcendent moral code upon our very minds. To illustrate this, let us return to the idea of instincts.

How, using the "hard and fast" rules of survival of the fittest and self-preservation, are we to explain human behavior such as courage? Men are often courageous and brave in the face of incredible odds which threaten their very existence. According to the natural perspective, the instinct of self-preservation should not only overrule this lower courageous inclination, but thoroughly squash it. However, our own experiences testify to the fact that something within us may choose the lower instinct. This is directly contrary to the "established" laws of nature. Something within us tells us that we "should" choose to be courageous rather than self-preserving; tells us to run into a burning building rather than save our own skin. What law of nature explains this strange occurrence? There is none—this is no product of nature. This mysterious, discretionary instinct, our conscience, bears witness to an absolute, moral law instituted by an outside Cause of the universe.

The previously discussed Cause of the universe, as well as the transcendent view of morality builds a scientifically credible case for absolute truth. The natural view of morals fails to provide a credible system for morality or justice. To quote from Bertram Russell:

If, when a man writes a poem or commits a murder, the bodily movements involved in his act result solely from physical causes, it would seem absurd to put up a statue to him in the one case and to hang him in the other.²

Those who ascribe to a natural view of morality are left with nothing but this absurdity. Neither they nor their thoughts have any ultimate value or any power to distinguish between rights, right, and wrong. The reality of absolute truth, as

characterized by a theistic Cause and revealed in a transcendent moral code, is therefore the most reasonable conclusion we may draw.

-
1. Robert H. Jackson, *The Nuremberg Case* (New York: Cooper Square, 1971), 120-22
 2. <http://www.positiveatheism.org/hist/russell2.htm>