

Does God Exist

Promo Video - Intro

(Guy in robe and long beard on a beach or somewhere)

Socrates – Hey everybody, I’m Socrates. Famous philosopher from way back. Y’know, as a philosopher, it’s my job to discuss the really heavy questions about life. Like, what is man’s purpose? Is there life after death? Boxers or briefs? Do clowns wear really big socks? And, of course, why’d the monkey fall out of the tree? Because it was dead. Ah, but I kid. But perhaps the single biggest question of all man’s existence (and women’s existence, let’s not get crazy) is Does God Exist? We’re gonna take the next 30 minutes and look at a couple of arguments for the existence of God.

(Socrates is in a lab, with goggles and a lab coat, mixing chemicals and stuff)

Socrates – And notice I didn’t say that we were gonna prove that God exists. God, if there is a God, would not be made of the same stuff as our universe because He created the universe. Also, if God made the universe, it follows that He would have to be beyond our universe, outside of time and space, like some kind of cosmic, eternal, all-knowing, all-powerful um, something or other. No, if there is a God, God is gonna be spirit, not matter, which simply means that you can’t combine a couple chemicals and get God.

(Socrates in front of green screen clouds)

Socrates – No, see, God isn’t going to be something you can prove in a lab because we can only prove the natural in a lab and not the supernatural. And, if there is a God, He’s definitely going to be not the normal. See, because He created the normal. Of course, on the flip side, you also can’t prove that God doesn’t exist. Works both ways. But there are arguments for and against God. So, let’s take a look at some of them.

(Title – The Teleological Argument)

Socrates – The first argument for God’s existence that we’re gonna take a look at is a thing called the Teleological Argument.

(Socrates in front of a blackboard with the word TELEOLOGICAL written on it)

Socrates – Now, don’t get scared because Teleological is such a big, complicated and scary word. I think it helps if we break a large word down in it’s components to understand it a bit better.

(Socrates makes a slash between “TELE” and “OLOGICAL”)

Socrates – Well, “tele” means, um...well, there’s a telescope, which we use to look at the stars. And then there’s the telegraph, which they used in pioneer times to tell the sheriff that Jesse James was robbing the bank. And then there’s the telephone, which I used to call my mommy. And what do they all have in common? You got me.

(He X’s through the word “TELEOLOGICAL” and write “DESIGN” above it)

Socrates – Okay, forget it. This one is also called the design argument and it’s pretty easy. The best example of the Design Argument for the existence of God was put forward by a guy named William Paley in 1804. Of course, some buddies of mine, Aristotle and Plato, had their own versions of the Design Argument, but they were kinda lame. So, back to Paley...

(Dream transition to guy walking along the beach)

Socrates (narrating) – So, Paley said that if we were walking along a beach and we came upon a shell or a rock or...

(Guy on beach bends down and picks up a rock)

Socrates (narrating) - ...okay, a rock. If we happened upon a rock, we wouldn’t necessarily think that the rock had been made by some intelligent agent like a human or that it had been placed there on purpose because, hey, rocks are everywhere. They’re natural or what we’d expect to see in nature.

(Guy on the beach throws rock away in disgust, where it hits the head of another guy who is using a metal detector, and knocks him to the ground. Guy on the beach keeps walking.)

Socrates (narrating) - But if we are walking along a beach and came across an, I don’t know, like an ipad or a box of cereal or a...

(Guy on the beach bends down and picks up a cell phone)

Socrates (narrating) - ...or a cell phone, yeah, we wouldn’t think it just appeared there, created by the elements or something. I mean, that’d be kind of dumb to think that the water and sand had, over years, created a cell phone from erosion or something. No, if we found a cell phone on the beach, we’d naturally assume that it had been created or designed by a person. See what I did there with the design...ah, forget it.

(Guy on beach puts phone up to his ear)

Guy – Yeah, I’d like to order a pizza.

Phone – We’re sorry. You have reached a number that is disconnected or is no longer in service. If you feel you have reached this recording in error, please check the number and try again.

(Guy throws phone and it hits the same guy with the metal detector, who just got up from the ground)

Socrates – The Design Argument is pretty simple. If something has the appearance of design, that it probably was designed.

(Go through short slideshow. Show picture of computer.)

Socrates – A computer? Designed.

(A remote-control helicopter)

Socrates – A remote-control helicopter? Designed.

(A book)

Socrates – A book? Designed.

(A toy monkey banging symbols)

Socrates – A toy monkey? Designed.

(Show a piece of toast)

Socrates – But what about things that have the appearance of design? Like what if the butter on my toast resembled the late W. C. Fields? Or what if there was a boulder that looks like President Kennedy's head or a chicken nugget shaped like Shrek or whatever? Couldn't our brains be fooling us into believing that something is designed when it really isn't? Antony Flew presented just such a scenario called the Invisible Gardner. Cue the Invisible Gardner sketch!

(Two teenagers appear in front of a cardboard backdrop. They are dressed like explorers. One is dressed like Indiana Jones. A third teen, the narrator, is off to one side)

Teen Narrator - Once upon a time in a galaxy far, far away came two explorers into a clearing in the jungle. In the clearing, there were numerous flowers and weeds.

First Teen Explorer – What ho...

Second Teen Explorer – I'm sorry. What was that?

First Teen Explorer – I was just saying, what ho.

Second Teen Explorer – What's that supposed to mean?

First Teen Explorer – Forget it. Look, hey, this clearing looks like a garden. I bet there's some gardener that tends it.

Second Teen Explorer – Seriously? What's the matter with you? Look at all these weeds. If there is a gardener, he's really bad at it.

First Teen Explorer – Nevertheless, there must a gardener.

Second Teen Explorer – And who says nevertheless? Who are you, Dr. Seuss?

First Teen Explorer – Nevertheless.

Teen Narrator – So the two explorers pitched their tents and settled in to wait on the gardener to arrive.

(The two explorers shrug and flop onto the ground)

Teen Narrator – And they waited forever but nobody ever showed up.

Second Teen Explorer – See, this is goofy. There's no gardener. It's all a myth. Some kind of story made up by the Gardener's Union to increase potential revenue.

First Teen Explorer – Okay, maybe the gardener is invisible.

Second Teen Explorer – Seriously?

Teen Narrator – So the two explorers set up a barbed wire electric fence...

(The two teen explorers look around, shrug, and then mime setting up a fence)

Teen Narrator – They setup laser trip wires and a top-of-the-line motion sensor detection system.

(The Teen Explorers shrug and continue to setup the fence)

Teen Narrator – They set up M18A1 Claymore directional anti-personnel mines...

Second Teen Explorer – Are we trying to verify the existence of an invisible gardener or trying to obliterate him?

Teen Narrator – And to top things off, they put some bells on a string, cause you can never be too safe. And then they sat down to wait.

(The two explorers sit back down to wait.)

Teen Narrator – And they waited. But they never did hear the screams of an invisible gardener being electrocuted or the motion detector system going off and not a single one of the anti-personnel mines exploded.

First Teen Explorer – Which is probably good cause we would have probably been sued.

Teen Narrator – But not a single invisible gardener was to be found.

First Teen Explorer – But there is an invisible gardener, I tell ya. He must be invisible, intangible, a snappy dresser, who makes no sound or smell and, um, he's really cool, like a cosmic Nicholas Cage, but invisible.

Second Teen Explorer – You’re nuts. A gardener who you can’t see or smell or touch or tell with any of your senses and he’s really cool, like J. Edgar Hoover? What’s the difference between that and a made-up gardener or no gardener at all?

First Teen Explorer – You’re no gardener at all.

Second Teen Explorer – Burn.

Teen Narrator – And scene!

(All three teens bow. Back to Socrates)

Socrates - Now, this argument wasn’t used specifically against the Design argument, but the basics are the same. We are assuming that the only way to prove that there is a gardener is by evidence of our senses. We are assuming that God, the celestial gardener, must be able to be proven by natural means if we are to take the claim seriously that He designed the universe. Otherwise, it’s like saying that there’s this invisible hotdog tree that gives hotdogs that keep my family and I sustained for decades so I’m not gonna work anymore and just live off the sweet, sweet fruit of the hotdog tree for the rest of my life. And never mind the invisible juice box tree right next to it. We can claim all day that there is an intelligence behind the design, but if we can’t prove it, how can it make a difference in our lives? So, what this is assuming is that all explanations have to be proven by natural means or they’re not worth having as an explanation.

(Late night talk show with a desk next to a couch. The host is behind the desk and the sidekick, Fred, is seated on the couch)

Host – I read something this week that was super interesting. Just super interesting. It seems, and correct me if I’m wrong...

Fred – Oh, I’d never correct you, sir.

Host – Of course you wouldn’t. But some of these young kids today, they’re talking about this thing they call the scientific method. Are you familiar with this scientific method, Fred?

Fred – No, sir, I never touch the stuff.

Host – No, Fred, the scientific method. I hear it’s all the rage.

Fred – I wouldn’t know, sir. I’ve been sober for three years now.

Host – No, I’m pretty sure it has nothing to do with whatever you’re talking about. No, see, the scientific method is this thing, or so I’m told, where the kids today, they try to figure something out scientifically.

Fred – Sounds like witchcraft to me, sir.

Host – No, I'm pretty sure it's not witchcraft, Fred. No, I hear it's what all the scientists are doing these days. See, they start with an observation, ask some questions, formulate a hypothesis, develop testable predictions, test those predictions, and then refine the hypothesis. Surely, you've heard about this, Fred. It's all the rage with the kids these days.

Fred – No, sir. I drive a Volvo.

Host – Well, there you go. Apparently Fred drives a Volvo. Now what the kids are doing these days with the scientific method is that they're proving all sorts of things. But they've run into a couple of snags.

Fred – Like at my bachelor party.

Host – No Fred, snags. Snags! I have no idea what you're talking about but I'm talking about snags. Anyway, apparently, there are some things that they've found that you can't prove with this scientific method.

Fred – Oh ho! Like what's that, sir?

Host – I thought you were gonna have a heart attack for a second there, Fred.

Fred – No, sir. Fit as a fiddle.

Host – Well that's good, Fred. Cause I just fired the staff doctor last Friday. I kept telling him that it hurts every time I scratch my head and he told me that I should have someone else do it instead.

(Fred laughs heartily)

Fred – That's quite a zinger you got there, sir.

Host – Yeah. Zinger. Anyway, these kids these days, they found out there's several things you can't prove with this scientific method. First, they tell me, you can't disprove anything with this scientific method.

Fred – Can't disprove with the scientific method.

Host – That's right, Fred. They say that the way it's setup that you can't disprove anything with the scientific method.

Fred – Can you disprove anything that was previously thought to be proven, sir?

Host – What? No, I don't think you got me on that last one so I'll repeat it. They say that you can't disprove anything with the scientific method.

Fred – So, you can't disprove what you already have proven to disprove?

Host – No, I still don't think you're grasping this one, Fred. So, I better whip out one of my patented examples.

Fred – Whip forth, sir.

Host – Yes, I'll just whip one right out.

(Host consults some note cards)

Host – okay. Here's one right here. They say that this scientific method cannot prove that there are no unicorns.

Fred – Absolutely no unicorns!

Host – Yes, that's right. See, science cannot disprove the existence of unicorns.

Fred – That's quite a trick, sir.

Host – You don't know the half of it.

Fred – I've been told that, sir. From my wife.

Host – I'm sure you have. So, this scientific method cannot disprove the existence of unicorns because in order to do so, it would have to have some sort of omniscience...which it doesn't.

Fred – And omniscience. What would that be, sir?

Host – Well, Fred, it means that you know everything.

Fred – Kind of like that kid in my second grade. Ho ho.

Host – No. Not really. It's not just knowing a lot of things or thinking you know everything. It's that you know everything past, present and future.

Fred – Oh, so like that kid in third grade?

Host – Eh...no. Remember that Volvo you were talking about a moment ago?

Fred – Certainly, sir. It's almost out of gas.

Host – On your salary, I'm sure it is. Anyway, omniscience is what comes out of the tailpipe.

(Fred laughs heartily)

Fred – Oh, ho. Omniscience sounds like emissions. Good one, sir.

Host – Yes. Yes. Thanks for explaining that one for the thick ones in the audience, Fred.

Fred – My pleasure, sir.

Host – Definitely. No back to this unicorn thing...

Fred – Now, even though this scientific method cannot know all things, sir, can't it make a prediction on what could probably happen?

Host – Oh definitely, Fred. Definitely. So, it can't say that unicorns are not real, but it can say that, based on what we observe, that unicorns are probably not real. I'm surprised you mentioned that. I thought you were asleep.

Fred – My eyes are still open, sir.

Host – Well, at least it certainly looks that way. Another thing these kids today are saying is that this scientific method cannot prove the laws of logic.

Fred – The laws of what, sir?

Host – The laws of logic, Fred. Logic.

Fred – Oh, I thought you were talking about speeding tickets for a moment there, sir.

Host – Going a little fast in the Volvo lately, Fred?

Fred – I'm afraid the Volvo doesn't go above 45 these days, sir.

Host – That's probably for the best. Another couple of things they say it can't prove are historical truths and aesthetic judgments.

Fred – What was that last one, sir?

Host – I said Aesthetic judgments, Fred. Aesthetic. You know, like beauty or art.

Fred – I thought you were sneezing for a moment, sir.

Host – For a moment there, so did I. No, when I say aesthetic judgments, I mean that if I said I thought your wife was beautiful, the scientific method couldn't prove that I thought your wife was beautiful.

(Fred leaps off the couch and rips his shirt in half)

Fred – I'll kill you!

(Fred leaps over the desk at the host)

(Back to Socrates)

Socrates – But let's think about this. First, do we really think a material being, even an invisible material being could create all this matter out of nothing? And that's not to mention that the being would have had to create time and space and pop tarts and cartoon anvils and other stuff. What other material beings do you see that can create something from nothing?

(A vampire in front of a castle holds up a finger)

Vampire – I have personally counted and there are exactly zero.

(Back to Socrates)

Socrates – Right. In fact, to even create matter, the being would need to be beyond the natural, it would have to be supernatural.

(Backdrop is the moon or some alien planet. An alien enters, strumming a guitar)

Fuzzy – Well, hey there boys and girls. It's your old pal, Fuzzy. Fuzzy Nuffbutter. You know, boys and girls, when I'm have a hard time telling what's natural from what's supernatural, I just remember this old song my pappy used to sing for me to send me off to dreamland. He called it The Supernatural Song and I think you're gonna like it.

Supernatural Song –

Oh, when you see something natural, it's plain to see

Like the speed of light or the force of gravity

It's an everyday thing, like chewing on a dog

Or when dead things decompose or falling off a log

See, when we say something's natural, it's plain to see

It's an everyday phenomenon, like you or me

But if something breaks a law that's natural

It's way past natural...it's supernatural

It's unusual, it's impossible, It's downright irresponsible

It's not natural, it's supernatural

(strums the guitar for a moment)

Fuzzy – Now right around this point is usually when my pappy would tell me that it's not natural for my eyes to still be open. But I guess I'm just supernatural that way. Kinda like how I can fly or sew a quilt out of my Uncle Ernie's dreams. It's beyond the beyond. Kinda like my pappy right now after I disintegrated him with my heat vision.

Oh, when something breaks a law that's natural

It's way past natural...it's supernatural

It's unusual, it's impossible, it's downright irresponsible

It's not...

(A policeman enters and taps Fuzzy on the shoulder with a baton)

Policeman – Alright, me boyo. That's enough out of you.

Fuzzy – why, officer, I think there’s been some kind of mistake.

(The policeman holds Fuzzy’s arms behind his back)

Policeman – Save it for the judge, pretty boy. I’m taking you downtown.

Fuzzy – Guess I’m going up the river now, boys and girls. So, till next time...

Policeman – Yeah, yeah. Let’s go, lawbreaker.

(Back to Socrates)

Socrates - So, you can’t just compare a God that created matter from non-matter with a gardener taking care of a garden. The comparison would really be like, well, like this:

(Back to the Two Teen Explorers and the Teen Narrator)

Teen Narrator – Once upon a time, two explorers with nothing better to do came upon a clearing in the jungle. There they found a huge city.

First Teen Explorer – What ho.

Second Teen Explorer – That joke was old the first time we used it.

First Teen Explorer – Fair enough. Look at this marvelous city. I believe there must have been an architect and builders and craftsmen and maybe a mayor and possibly a vendor of some sort that created this city.

Second Teen Explorer – Well, that makes sense. You don’t just find cities created by nature everywhere you look. Or anywhere you look.

Teen Narrator – And scene.

(Teens bow. Back to Socrates)

Socrates – In fact, with no one from that city still around, you’d have to piece together from the evidence exactly how that society functioned, how it felt about stuff like boy bands or the latest fitness craze, and what sort of tools they used to create their city from the archaeological evidence. But a thought that would never in a million years enter your mind is that this city just popped up overnight as a result of the elements or water erosion or maybe it was the work of bees. See, bees don’t build giant human cities. At least not anymore. Not since the war.

(Back to the beach with the guy and the watch)

Socrates (narrating) – And that was Paley’s point. The universe is ordered. The planets are aligned. Spiders and snakes have actual functions in nature and aren’t just for scaring people. There are like a hundred different constants in the universe, from the amount of carbon and oxygen to the power of gravity that exist in such a way that if you modified any one of them even by a hundred thousand of a percentage point, we wouldn’t have life on earth. The

universe functions like a well-ordered machine. And with any machine, there has to be a machine designer and creator. Machines don't create themselves. Unless they're in a really bad horror movie. Then maybe.

(Title – Counterpoints With Chet, The Devil's Advocate)

(A guy in a red jumpsuit, Chet, red face, horns and holding a pitchfork, is seated at a desk. On a green screen behind him is flames.)

Chet – Good evening. I am Chet, the Devil's Advocate, here to present additional arguments against the tripe you're hearing. Sure, Socrates knows all about William Paley and the Design Argument but what he neglected to mention was that the Design Argument had already been successfully shot down by a certain philosopher named David Hume. Here to explain a little bit more about Hume's very successful argument is my diabolical assistant, Beezy.

(Beezy, a slightly overweight kid in a red shirt, red face paint and a red beany is standing in front of green screen flames)

Beezy – The Design Argument's old, and that makes it dumb. Paley is frailly cause Hume's in the room. I'm an amateur rap artist. Hume was all about a miracle was not provable cause it's based on eyewitness evidence of the peeps. It also goes against everything we know so it's not only improbable but it's dumb. It's like pouring out your toasty o's and finding a yeti in the box. Who's gonna believe that? Am I right?

(Back to Chet)

Chet – Thank you, Beezy. Eloquent as usual. So, according to David Hume, a miracle, such as God, ha ha, creating a universe from nothing, designing it according to His cosmic blueprints is not only counter to everything that science has taught us but is also not likely to happen. So, what do you have to say about that, old dead guy?

(Back to Socrates)

Socrates – Well, Chet, how wrong you are. Let me count the ways.

(Picture of Chet looking dejected with "ONE" across the screen)

Socrates – Paley's design argument was actually in response to Hume's argument against divine intervention or that you can't prove a miracle. Paley published his Natural Theology in 1804 in direct response to Hume's 1748 work, An Enquiry of Human Understanding.

(Back to Chet at the desk)

Chet – So? That doesn't prove anything.

(Back to Socrates)

Socrates – You’re one hundred percent right, Chet. The timing of the arguments doesn’t prove a thing. I was just correcting your earlier statement that Paley’s argument was shot down by Hume. Actually, it was the other way around.

(Picture of Chet looking dejected with “TWO” across the screen)

Socrates – Hume actually stacked the deck against proving the supernatural by using only natural means. If you only have natural means at your disposal then, of course, you’re never going to prove the supernatural because it’s “super” natural. It’s beyond the natural. It’s like trying to prove that love exists or thoughts or courage. Some things can never and will never be able to be proven by strictly natural methods.

(Back to Chet)

Chet – Ah, but what about the speed of light or the movement of atoms? These cannot be detected by the human eye.

Socrates – But that can be detected by instruments.

Chet – Bah. And love. Who says we can’t measure love? Why, just last week I caught Beezy getting all hot and sweaty and making googly eyes at this little girl in his class. We may not be able to measure love directly, but we can measure the effects of love.

Socrates – Well, first of all, I don’t know what caused him to get hot and sweaty and googly but it doesn’t sound like love. I don’t know what that could have been. Possibly an incurable disease. Second, it’s the same thing with God. We may not be able to measure God directly but we can tell there’s a God by measuring His handiwork, His creation and noting the order and the design.

Chet – Bah. You have proven nothing. (Offstage) Beezy, get your uncle a soda!

(Picture of Chet looking dejected and a “Three” across scene)

Socrates – Lastly...

Chet – Had enough, have you?

(Socrates rolls his eyes and shakes his head)

Socrates – Hume was dealing with what probably would happen and not with the facts of what did happen. From the evidence, we might be able to say that it certainly looks like the pyramids were created using alien technology, but that doesn’t prove they were. We were just going off the archaeological evidence. To know what really happened, we would have had to be there.

Chet – Ah ha! So you admit you weren’t there.

Socrates – Sure. Why not? But we can’t look at miracles and intervention from supernatural occurrence in the same light because they are not repeatable. A miracle, by definition, is an

event that transcended the natural laws. It doesn't happen every day. If it did, it wouldn't be a miracle. It would be an every-day-icle.

Chet – You lost me.

Socrates – We should treat a miracle like an historical event. Should we not believe that Napoleon wasn't born because we couldn't repeat his birth in a lab? Or maybe we should believe that Abe Lincoln is still around somewhere because his death was probably just legend?

Chet – He could be...

Socrates – No. Historical events are one shot deals, just like miracles. And for historical events we're going off the proof of eyewitnesses. So why shouldn't we use the same criteria for miracles?

Chet – Because they go against the laws of nature.

Socrates – But if there's a God that created the laws of nature, why couldn't that same God who created the laws bend or break the laws if He wanted? Especially if He wanted to communicate with those He made. He'd want to show it was really Him instead of some made up God by accompanying His words with miracles.

Chet – This sounds like a load of malarkey with just a hint of flim flam.

Socrates – Yeah. Anyway...today, guys like Michael Behe and Stephen Meyer and William Dembski are backing what's calling the Intelligent Design movement. Their idea is like the Design Argument in that cellular creatures and their attachments work very much like well-oiled machines. In fact, they have such an appearance of design that they couldn't possibly have arrived at their current state simply by natural processes. They are complete, as is, and any attempt to gradually create one of these cellular things would make the cellular thing unable to function properly.

(Farmer in field)

Farmer – Kinda like my artichokes.

(Back to Socrates)

Socrates – So the Design Argument for the existence of God is simple. The universe looks designed and if it was designed, there would have to be a Designer. Easy enough.

(Title – The Cosmological Argument)

Socrates – Next up on our list of hits is the Cosmological Argument. It's pretty easy and goes a little something like this:

(Video – blackness, then a baby)

Narrator – Whatever begins to exist has a cause.

(Video the universe expanding from a speck to the full universe)

Narrator – The universe began to exist. Therefore, the universe has a cause.

(Back to Socrates)

Socrates – Easy and cheesy. So, let's take this step by step or point by point. Whatever begins to exist has a cause. Is that true?

(Farmer in field)

Farmer – What came first, the chicken or the egg? If the egg came first, then what laid the egg? If the chicken came first, it would have grown from an egg cause that's what them thar chickens do. Chicken? Egg? Egg? Chicken? And what ate all my dad burn beets?

(Back to Socrates)

Socrates – Things don't just pop into existence. They must be started or created by something. We don't live in some topsy turvy universe where things create themselves, where it actually rains cats and dogs and where butter comes in a squirt bottle.

(Socrates turns to the side and stage whispers)

Socrates – We don't have that. Right?

(Picture of a bottle of Uncle John's Butter Spray)

Socrates – Well, dang. Gonna have to get me some of that. There's not too many people out there who would argue that it's possible for something to come from nothing.

(Child on bed with cat. Mom enters)

Mom – Where did that cat come from?

Child – It just appeared. Can I keep it?

Mom – no. No you may not.

(Back to Socrates)

Socrates - There are some out there who would argue that the universe and everything in it did not need a God to create it because the universe is eternal. So, basically, the universe is God or something like that. And that leads to our second point.

(Title – majestic – The Universe Began to Exist. Loud majestic music)

Socrates – How can we be sure that the universe wasn't all there was and all there ever would be? Well, we have a couple reasons for that one. Professor?

(Professor in crazy/Einstein hair seated on chair in front of a bookcase and holding a pipe. He has a thick German accent)

Professor – Yeah. You see there are really two important scientific theories that point to the beginning of the universe. First, the universe is expanding, which indicates that there was something causing it to expand. It's like a balloon that grows when you put air into it. When it shrinks, it's smaller. I call this the expanding-contracting phenomenon. Also, the background radiation in the universe leads many scientists to believe that there was a Big Bang that caused the beginning of the universe and that's where all this background radiation came from. I call this the background radiation from the Big Bang Phenomenon. Finally, there's the Second Law of Thermo-Dynamics. Here, maybe you should watch this little film I used to show to my second-grade science students at the academy. Roll film.

(Black and white film with cartoon characters explaining the Second Law of Thermo-Dynamics. Possibly with a cartoon badger, dressed in a little tuxedo, and a cartoon ferret, dressed like a garbage man. The Badger is named Fiddles and the Ferret is named Larry.)

(Title – Fiddles and Larry Meet the Second Law of Thermo-Dynamics)

(Larry is in an alley, digging through a dumpster when Fiddles enters the alley)

Fiddles – Larry, is that you?

(Larry looks up from the dumpster with some fish bones attached to his face)

Larry – Fiddles, my old friend. What are you doing here?

Fiddles – Well, I was wondering the same thing about you. Larry, are you eating out of your neighbor's dumpster again?

Larry – Sure. He has the best food. Plus, he had a party last night and you know how much I love them oeur d'oeuvres.

Fiddles – Well, you better watch out or one day you'll get caught by the cops and have to pay a hefty fine.

Larry – I can afford it. I've got plenty of checks.

Fiddles – But your bank account's so empty that the bank started charging you for free checking.

Larry – What does that mean?

Fiddles – I don't know.

Larry – Well, it doesn't matter anyway. As long as I have checks, I'll never run out of money.

Fiddles – Never run out of money? Larry, you ignorant simpleton. If you run out of money in your account, your checks are worthless. If you don't deposit money, you'll have none to work with. It's kind of like the Second Law of Thermo-Dynamics.

Larry – The second law of what?

Fiddles – The Second Law of Thermo-Dynamics, Larry. The first law of thermodynamics states that in a closed system there is only so much energy to go around. It cannot produce more energy. The second law says that something called entropy happens.

Larry – Entropy? Is that when I gotta go to the bathroom real bad at the beginning of something? I intro-pee.

Fiddles – That is literally the worst joke I have ever heard in my life. You should be ashamed.

Larry – I'm a ferret that eats out of a dumpster. How could that joke bring me any lower?

Fiddles – Good point. Well, let's think about your bank account situation.

Larry – I'd rather not.

Fiddles – You should have thought about that before you became an adult! Let's say your bank charges a fee for when you have less than \$100 in your account. If you have \$95 in your account...

Larry – I wish.

Fiddles – Okay, but if you did and you never put another penny into the account, then your money would slowly be eaten away by the fees until there was nothing left. That's entropy.

Larry – Well, what if I made a deposit?

Fiddles – Then it wouldn't be a closed system, would it, you big dolt?

Larry – I guess not.

Fiddles – You guess right! So, there's only so much energy available in a system...

Larry – Or money in an account.

Fiddles – We're back talking about energy now, Larry. Stay with me.

Larry – Dur, okay.

Fiddles – So, in a closed system, the energy available is slowly going away, meaning that there was once more energy available than there is now.

Larry – Like when I eat a can of beans?

Fiddles – Larry, you're dead to me.

(Fiddles walks away and Larry jumps back into the dumpster)

(Back to professor)

Professor – Well, that was a bit of fun. That Larry. What a cutup. So, the Second Law of the Thermodynamics states that the energy in a closed system is slowly being used up. It's winding down. It's dying. Since nothing eternal can die, it must not be eternal and it must have had a cause. What is winding down must have once been wound up. And who did the winding? Huh? Which one of you did it?

(Back to Socrates)

Socrates – So, the Big Bang, background radiation and the Second Law of Thermodynamics all show that the universe is not eternal. And if it's not eternal...

(Title – Counterpoints with Chet, The Devil's Advocate. And over the top of that title is another title in Red bold that says, "Special News Bulletin")

(Back to the flame office with Chet sitting on the corner of his desk)

Chet – This is a special new bulletin. I believe I have seen the flaw in your universe is not eternal argument. And to degrade you further, I shall allow my diabolical assistant, Beezy, spell it out for you. Over to our news correspondent, Beezy.

(Cut to Beezy)

Beezy – The energy in a closed system runs down. Well, dur hur hur. Who doesn't know that? But your lack of knowledge, grandpa, comes from the fact that this universe is not a closed system. It's an open system. Hah. Eat that and like it.

(Back to Chet)

Chet – That was Beezy, reporting live from the studio next door. Now, we'll return you to your regular broadcast. Chet out!

(Back to Socrates)

Socrates – Wait a minute. If our universe is an open system, then there's some other system outside our universe that is feeding our universe its energy. Chet, can you prove that there's another universe outside our universe?

(Back to Chet, who is eating a banana)

Chat – What? Prove? Open? Uh, sure. What's that one with the appliance or something. Beezy? Help me out.

Beezy – Dur. What about the steady state model of the universe? Or how about the Oscillating Universe model? Are either of those open enough for you?

Chet – Yes, what about the steady state model of the universe?

Socrates – Okay, well they have a point. There is a model of the universe currently out there that's called the oscillating model of the universe. There's also one that's been floating around for a while called the Steady State Model of the Universe.

(A big guy in a cheap robe and obvious fake beard pops up right next to Socrates. This is Fartophocles)

Fartophocles – Woah! And what's the steady state model, brah?

Socrates – Okay, I don't know how you got in here, but we're making a video about the existence of God. So, I'm afraid you'll have to...

Fartophocles – No, brah. The producers sent me. They thought you weren't appealing to a wide enough demographic, woah-ho-ho brah. So, they sent your old Greek buddy, Fartophocles to come give you a hand. Your welcome.

Socrates – No, I don't need any assistants, thank you very much. And if I were to have an assistant, it would be one with an actual Greek name like Sophocles or Plato or Thucydides.

Fartophocles – Woah, brah. Thucydides. I thought I had Thucydides one time, but it was only gas. Wooooooah.

Socrates – Okay, that's it. You need to go.

Fartophocles – But...

(Socrates shoves Fartophocles away)

Socrates – See ya.

Fartophocles – Braaaaaaaaaaaaaah...

Socrates – So, anyway. The Steady-State model of the universe is...

(The guy who played Fartophocles pops up, and now he's wearing his beard for hair.)

Fartophocles – Say, if it isn't my old wibbly-wobbly buddy, Socrates. Well, Howdilly-dowdilly and a scrumdisculously doo. It's your old buddy, Senor Dribblesworth. Now what's all the imply-dimply scrimply on this steady state model?

Socrates – Look, if you promise not to say another nonsense, made-up, Dr. Seuss rolling over in his grave, word, I will tell you all about the Steady State Model of the Universe.

Fartophocles – Well, hey dill...

(He looks over and sees Socrates giving him a stern look)

Fartophocles – Well, okay then.

Socrates – The Steady State model basically states that as the universe spreads further apart, matter is formed in the now open spaces.

Fartophocles – Well, hey, that’s just like my great Uncle Irv once said, if you’ve got a big space...

(He looks over and sees Socrates disapproving look)

Fartophocles – Sorry.

Socrates – But that model has never been very convincing. After all, what is creating the new matter in the gaps and it’s kind of a direct attack against the First Law of Thermodynamics. Now, the Oscillating Model...

Fartophocles – Oscillating! That sounds fun. What does that mean?

Socrates – It’s like a spring or a slinky. The universe expands up to a point and then it retracts, closing in on itself, until the matter gets hot enough to cause another Big Bang.

Fartophocles – Well, that could happen. Right?

Socrates – Not right. Let me ask you a question, uh, guy with the hair. What happens when you put a stick of dynamite in a watermelon?

Fartophocles – I don’t know. Can we try it?

Socrates – No, we can never try it. But what do you think would happen?

Fartophocles – Why, it would explode, of course. Don’t be a silly.

Socrates – Yeah. And once the exploding parts got out far enough, what force is it that would bring them back together automatically?

Fartophocles – What? Like the rewind button on a remote?

Socrates – Exactly. What is it, like the tenth law of thermodynamics?

Fartophocles – Why, that sounds more like magic to me.

Socrates – Sounds like fiction, no matter what you’d want to call it. So, no. Matter doesn’t suddenly appear between gaps in this universe and matter doesn’t suddenly start pulling itself back inward after it’s exploded outward.

Chet – So, matter doesn’t suddenly appear, huh? I think I’ve got you now, smart guy. If matter doesn’t suddenly appear, then how did it suddenly appear for the Big Bang?

Socrates – God created it.

Chet – What? That’s crazy. Then, uh, what created God?

Beezy – Yeah, you got him good this time.

Chet – Get out of here, Beezy.

Socrates – Nothing created God. God is an eternal being, the uncaused cause. He has always been and will always be. Remember, anything that comes into existence needs a cause. Something that has never come into existence because it has always been there does not need a cause.

Chet – Beezy, a little help?

Beezy – Yeah. Um. So, hold on a second. Okay, I got it. So, why couldn't the universe be that eternal something that doesn't need a cause? Why couldn't it be the uncaused cause? Yeah. eat it and like it!

Socrates – Okay, I'm pretty sure we covered this before. Remember the Einstein looking guy who showed us the really bad cartoon? The Second Law of Thermodynamics show that the universe is winding down. Nothing that is eternal can have an end. Second, the Big Bang shows that the universe had a beginning. Nothing that is eternal can have a cause. The universe cannot be eternal because it has limitations. Only something outside of time and outside of this universe could have created the universe. And that something couldn't be simply a mindless force. It had to have created this universe on purpose.

Fartophocles – Why?

Chet – Yeah, why?

Socrates – Cause this universe is too ordered, too exact to be an accident. That's the whole point of the last argument. This universe runs like a well-designed machine. Machines are not made by accident by natural forces. They are created with a specific purpose in mind.

Chet – I cede your point for the moment until I can come up with an adequate response. For now, you may continue, but know this: I hate you.

Socrates – I'll keep that in mind. Thank you. Now, I believe we've beaten this horse enough. We're gonna move on to the next argument. But before we do, we need to set a few ground rules. No more sidekicks...

Fartophocles – Aw.

Socrates – No more panel discussions...

Chet – Now you've gone too far!

Socrates – And no more Beezy!

Beezy – Wait. What?

Socrates – I'm just kidding. But no more of the guy with the hair.

Fartophocles – But this is my only part.

Socrates – I've got a couple things you can do in the next segment.

Fartophocles – Well, alright then.

Socrates – And on to number three...

(Title – The Moral Argument)

Chet – Ah ha! Now I've got you...

Socrates – I said no more panel discussions.

Chet – I thought you were talking to Beezy.

Socrates – No. I meant no more interruptions. No more everybody gets a chance to comment and everything is chaos. I'm not doing that anymore. And since I'm the host, I get to say what we're doing.

Chet – You're a meanie is what you are.

Socrates – Maybe. Now, onto the moral argument. There are several ways to explain this argument. Now, we could say that every human holds some of the same basic moral truths: like killing is wrong and you shouldn't torture babies for fun and if there's a female in the house, then you always put the seat down when you're done. And if there are universal or objective moral codes, morals that are not simply based on preference, then there has to be a universal moral law giver.

(An explorer, Sir Reginald, is cutting his way through a thick jungle with a machete)

Reginald – And here is where the narrator was completely wrong. For deep within the jungles of Bola Bola, there exists a strange race of people: The Johnson Tribe.

(Reginald separates the foliage to reveal a backyard with several teenagers playing volleyball)

Reginald – For five years, I stood on the outskirts of their tribal land, regarded only as a stranger and an outsider.

(Lady comes up with a cup full of lemonade and some cookies)

Lady – Care for some lemonade and cookies, Sir Reginald?

Reginald – Oh, yes. Thank you.

(Next lines are over scenes of Reginald leaving a microscope and other small gifts on the ground)

Reginald – I started by offering the tribe small gifts that I would leave at the edge of the clearing. After they had gotten used to my presence, I felt I could move just a bit closer.

(Scenes of Reginald eating at a barbecue, playing Bocce ball, a teen instructing Reginald in how to fist bump a volleyball and other general party scenes)

Reginald – Over the next few years, I began to integrate myself into their culture. After gaining a rudimentary knowledge of their language, I began to study their customs and morality and was greatly surprised at my findings.

(Scene of Reginald sitting around with teens and mom, talking)

Reginald – So, correct me if I'm mistaken, but on Saturday afternoons, it is the habit of this tribe to invite friends from neighboring villages over to a barbecue. After spending a few hours playing volleyball and other yard sports, your guests would be sufficiently exhausted. And it is at that point that you would kill them and eat them?

Teen boy – Pretty much.

Teen girl – If we eat them, we gain their essence.

(Reginald looks directly at camera)

Reginald – Fascinating. (Back to teens) Have you ever eaten any of your own kind to gain their essence?

Teen girl – Ew, gross.

Teen boys – That is not cool. We're not savages!

(Reginald looks at camera)

Reginald – Remarkable. And why did you decide not to eat me?

(The teen boy points down to Reginald's foot, where a child is eating it)

Reginald – Fascinating!

(Back to Socrates)

Socrates – Basically the argument goes like this: If God does not exist, then objective moral values do not exist. However, Objective moral values do exist. So, God exists. So, what do I mean by objective moral values? Well, objective just means something that is not influenced by

our opinions or feelings. It's universal. Subjective, on the other hand, refers to something that is dependent upon a feeling or opinion. So, objective moral values are values that we say are governing our lives and are not just our opinion on how things should be.

(Gameshow with three contestants and host)

Host – Welcome back to Subjective/Objective. The gameshow where we tell the difference between what is subjective and what is objective. First, contestants, can you each give me a subjective statement.

Girl #1 – I like ice cream.

(Checkmark appears over the screen as a bell goes off – ding!)

Girl #2 – I like cats more than dogs.

(Checkmark appears over the screen as a bell goes off – ding)

Boy #1 – Murder is wrong.

(Red X appears on screen accompanied by a buzzer noise)

Host – Oh, I'm sorry, contestant number three but "murder is wrong" is an objective statement and not a subjective statement. If it applies to everyone, then it's objective.

Boy #1 – Well, uh, it could be subjective.

Host – How so?

Boy #1 – Well, say, what if I'm in a war. Then murder would be fine. Or what if someone is trying to kill my family? Don't I have the right to defend my family?

Host – Judges?

(Host puts finger up to his ear like he's listening to a blue tooth)

Host – Oh, I'm sorry. The judges have informed me that murder is the taking of innocent life and, as such, cannot be justified by your two scenarios. I'm afraid you'll have to leave.

(Two big guys come up behind Boy #1 to escort him off)

Boy #1 – Wait! Okay, well what if the society I'm in says it's okay to take innocent life. Is it subjective then?

Host – Judges? (Listens) Clarification, contestant number 3. By society saying that it's okay to take innocent lives, are we talking about a Nazi Germany/Rwanda kind of thing?

Boy #1 – Yes! Sure.

Host – Judges? (Listens) I’m sorry. But even if the society you are a part of considers murder to be subjective, that doesn’t make murder subjective. For example, the United States considered slavery to be legal at one point, did that make slavery okay?

(They begin to drag contestant 3 away)

Boy #1 – Yes! No! Hold on a minute!

(They stop)

Host – Yes?

Boy #1 – Okay, so slavery has always been bad...

Host – Thomas Jefferson didn’t think it was.

(Contestant #3 hangs his head as he is dragged off)

Boy #1 – You got me.

Host – We’ll be right back.

(Back to Socrates)

Socrates – There are a lot of people who say that there is no such thing as objective morality. They say that all morality is relative and depends on the situation and the people involved.

(A courtroom. A judge, in a big, floppy wig is behind a desk. A lawyer stands in front of the desk)

Lawyer – Your honor, I don’t think you should judge people. It’s just not right.

Judge – Wait! Aren’t you, by telling me not to judge, judging me when I judge others?

Lawyer – Well, uh, you see...

Judge – Case Dismissed!

(Lawyer winks)

Lawyer – Touche.

(Back to Socrates)

Socrates – But the relative truth arguments fall flat for two reasons. First, it's impossible to live like all morality is relative and just personal opinion.

(Woman on street corner – holding up sign that says, “All Morality is Relative!” A man approaches her with a gun)

Robber – Give me all your money.

Woman – You can't rob me. It's not right.

Robber – Robbery may not be right for you, but it's just fine for me.

Woman – Well, you got me there. Here, take my car too.

(Hands over her keys to the guy who leaves. After a moment, another guy comes along with a gun)

Killer – Lady, your sign seriously annoys me. I'm gonna kill you.

Woman – Wait. You can't kill me. It's not right.

Killer – Well, murder may not be right for you, but it's fine with me.

(He shoots her and she falls over. Her leaves as she shakes her fist at her sign)

Woman – Darn you, objective morality! You win again.

(Back to Socrates)

Socrates – And second, the statement ‘all truth is relative’ is not a relative statement. It's more of an absolute or an objective statement. Basically, you're saying that everyone everywhere should believe that all truth is relative, whether they believe that all truth is relative or not.

(Two Star Trek guys, let's say Kirk and Spock, are in front of a robot)

Kirk – Hey robot, I say that all truth is relative.

Robot – But is the statement “all truth is relative” relative? And if the statement that all truth is relative is relative, then I can believe that all truth is not relative. But how can all truth be relative if all truth is not relative. Relative – not relative. Relative – not relative. Does not compute.

(Robot's head explodes. Kirk turns to Spock)

Kirk – And if that one didn't work, I was gonna tell him that my mother was Abe Lincoln.

(Turn to Spock, who is really Reginald from the cannibal sketch with pointy ears, who raises an eyebrow)

Reginald – Fascinating!

(Back to Socrates)

Socrates – So, to even believe that all truth is relative, you'd have to buy into some really bad logic and it's very unlikely that anyone could be consistent with that type of morality. You'd end up like that lady with the sign...who was shot. Do you wanna be shot? Is that what you want?

(Chet breaks in)

Chet – Excuse me? But can I do my thing now?

Socrates – Oh, do you want to do your counterpoint thing again? Do you have something good this time or are you just gonna rehash old arguments?

Chet – Oh, we've been cooking up a good one that'll quite possibly blow your mind.

Socrates – Okay.

(Title card – Counterpoints with Chet, the Devil's Advocate)

(Chet behind desk with green screen flame behind. Chet rubs hands together and laughs diabolically)

Chet - Muwahahaha! So, objective morality exists, eh? That's what you'd like us to believe. But is it true? Beezy?

Beezy – Yeah. You're so old, you gave us the answer yourself. During that sketch with the teenagers that were cannibals, they had a morality that was different from other peoples. They thought it was okay to kill people and eat them. So, how can you say that there's a universal morality if cannibals believe that you can kill people? I will now go into my thinking chair and think.

(He falls to the floor)

Chet – So, there you have it. Universal laws means a universal lawgiver? Why, that's preposterous.

Socrates – Chet, Chet, Chet. You've fallen for the oldest trick in the book.

(Chet looks around wildly)

Chet – What? Where is it?

Socrates – You misunderstood my previous statement, Chet. What I said is that everyone holds to a distinct moral code. Even the cannibal teenagers wouldn't eat their own kind. That was their moral code. Even though they killed and ate outsiders, and who wouldn't, they wouldn't eat their own.

Chet - Okay, so you're saying that even though people say it's wrong to steal, Beezy could go rob a bank and that would still prove that there is a moral law giver?

Beezy – I can do what?

Socrates – No, I didn't say Beezy could rob a bank.

Beezy – Oh, man.

Socrates – I was saying that even in societies that have unusual takes on certain morals that other societies would never permit, such as killing your elders or eating your neighbors, the people in that society would not say it's right for you to just randomly kill someone. When pressed, everyone has a concept of right and wrong and that concept is the universal moral code.

Chet – Okay, Mr. smart guy, maybe they get this so called morality from someone or something besides a moral lawgiver. Like maybe, um...a book, no. Television. Maybe. No! Well, if they were right handed and stood on one foot...Beezy! A little help.

Beezy – Yeah. Maybe they don't kill anyone because they don't want to get thrown in jail. Gosh!

Socrates – So, you're saying that most individuals get their idea of what's right and wrong from their society. Is that what you're saying?

Beezy – You're so old, you forgot what I said.

Socrates – No, I was just making sure that was your argument. So, if your society is the giver of your morals, then being morally perfect would mean that you obey everything that your government tells you?

Beezy – Double dur.

Socrates – And what happens if your society is Nazi Germany and they say that exterminating a whole race of people is right? To be perfectly moral, you'd have to obey them.

Chet – I see what you're doing here and I do not approve. I would have a higher right to protect human life than I would in obeying my government at that point. Thought you'd got me.

Socrates – And what, exactly gives you that higher right to protect human life? If your morality comes from your government and your government says that you should take human life, then not taking human life would be immoral.

(Chet folds his hands on top fo the desk)

Chet – We'll be right back.

(Cut to Beezy in front of a parking lot green screen)

Beezy – This is Crazy Beezy from Beezy's Used Car Outlet and I want to get you into a new car for no money down.

(Chet appears in a wig)

Chet – No money down? But Beezy, that's soooo crazy!

Beezy – I know. Right?

Socrates – That's for avoiding my question. Let's try a different approach. Okay, let's say you get your morals from your government or your peers or your parents. What happens when they conflict with one another?

Beezy – I pick the one I like the best.

Socrates – Most people do.

Beezy – I'm with the in-crowd. I'm popular.

Socrates – Sure. But you'd probably pick the one that would get you in the least amount of trouble, right? So, since the government is the one that enforces their morality with punishments such as prison time or public ridicule, you'd probably obey them. Right? So, what do we make of the reformers in a society? Shouldn't we treat them as immoral?

Chet – Now, when you say reformers, you mean...What exactly?

Socrates – Well, I mean people like Martin Luther King Jr. or Gandhi, who fought against abuses in the government. Were they immoral to stand up against their government?

Beezy – Um...

Chet – Is this a trick question somehow?

Socrates – If government is the ultimate source of our morality, then anyone that stands up and opposes that ultimate moral source is immoral. So, the question is are people like William

Wilberforce who stood up against slavery in England and Dietrich Boenhoffer, who stood up against the atrocities in Nazi Germany, were they immoral?

Chet – We'll be right back.

Socrates – No, you don't. And why would you question your government in the first place if they were the ones who gave you your morals? Who are you to say that slavery and murder are wrong when your society says that they are right?

Chet – Well, maybe, and I'm just spit-balling here, maybe morals are things we just agree on so we can cooperate as a society. Maybe it's something we develop.

Socrates – Like a really good ham and cheese sandwich?

Chet – Exactly.

Socrates – Maybe. So, after you've cooperated and you've gotten enough and so has the other guy, then you're free to kill him or steal from him or do whatever you'd like.

Chet – Possibly.

Beezy -I'm gonna go do that right now.

Socrates – Isn't it odd, though, that if, deep down, we are inherently self-centered, that we would praise those people who are completely selfless? If the bottom line is cooperation to meet a favorable goal, then why do we say that selfless people like Mother Teresa, who spent her life helping the poor in India, who had no way of ever repaying her, why do we honor people like that? And why do we hand out medals to those who perform selfless acts? It would be a little counterproductive, don't you think?

Beezy – Yeah. Maybe we should eat them instead and gain their essence.

Socrates – So, we have this idea inside of us that says that selfless acts are good and being kind and just is what we all want to strive to be. But if all we are is self-centered, then this idea of a highest moral goal must come from outside of us. Also, how can we say that one act is morally better than another without an idea of what moral perfection is? We'd just be comparing moral shades of grey.

(Socrates on a beach, mountain or somewhere majestic...like a backyard)

Socrates - So, there you have the cosmological, the teleological and moral argument for God's existence. Are they enough to prove without a doubt that God exists? No, they are arguments for the existence of God, not proof. If you'd like to read more on the arguments for the existence of God or go into a little more depth, check out some of the following books:

(Rolling Title -)

Socrates – This has been an actor portraying Socrates...

Chet – And Chet.

Beezy – And Beezy.

Socrates – They're not the hosts or anything. That's just me. Anyway. See you next time when we find out if the Bible is historically accurate and how to get those tough stains out of your favorite clothing. See ya.