Where Did We Come From? 5 Lines of Scientific Evidence

November 6, 2026

FRANK:
Ladies and gentlemen, the show you're about to see was recorded before the election results. We'll touch on the election results in the next show.

This show, compelling evidence for creation and the existence of God. Here we go. Ladies and gentlemen, there are five major questions that we should all be asking ourselves, and the answer to these five major questions will help us understand what our worldview is.

And if we look at the evidence behind these five major questions, then we will arrive at the Christian worldview. What are the five major questions that every worldview needs to answer, not just the Christian worldview? Here's the first one: origin. Where did we come from? The second question: identity. Who are we? The third question: meaning. Why are we here? Is there any ultimate meaning to life? What are we supposed to be doing? Number four: morality. How should we live? And number five: destiny. Where are we going? Origin. Where did we come from? Identity. Who are we? Meaning. Why are we here? Morality. How should we live? Destiny. Where are we going? When you look at the evidence in investigating Christianity, you'll come out if you agree that Christianity is true, and of course, that's what I believe. You'll have definitive answers to each one of those five questions on origin, identity, meaning, morality, and destiny.

And every worldview needs to answer these questions. Today, I want to investigate the first question: origin. Where did we come from? Now, if you're an atheist, you might say, "Well, we just came from some sort of cosmic accident," and that will inform every other one of those questions. Like if we came from a cosmic accident, somehow just matter exploded for no reason, and ultimately we evolve from non-living matter, then our identity is who are we?

We were just accidents. And meaning, there is no real ultimate meaning. Morality, well, there is no ultimate moral law if there is nothing outside of matter, so there is no really right way or wrong way to live life. And what's our destiny? We're just going to die and go out of existence. But if you answer the origin question by saying that God created us, then the answer to every one of those additional questions identity, meaning, morality, and destiny the answers are completely different.

So let's look at the evidence for where we came from. Where did this entire universe come from? And then where did we come from as human beings? Now we're not going to be able to answer all of that here today. But the reason I'm going back to this is because we just released the updated version of *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, and there's more evidence since the first edition that I want to bring to light under this origin question.

And the first question we need to look at on origin is: Did the universe have a beginning? Because if the universe had a beginning, then common sense would tell you it had to have a beginner. There must be something outside the universe that brought it into existence. Now, in this section, we're not going to assume the Bible is true. What we're trying to establish is evidence outside the Bible that shows that the universe did indeed have a beginning, if in fact it did.

And in the book, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, we have five lines of evidence that the universe did indeed have a beginning, and we can remember these five lines of evidence with the acronym SURGE, S-U-R-G-E. This was in the first edition of the book. It's still in the second edition of the book. And what we're going to find here is this is, by the way, scientific evidence.

I'll give you some philosophical evidence the universe had a beginning as well. Again, we're not assuming the Bible is true at this point. If we assumed it was true, we'd just say, "Okay, in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth." We're going to give evidence that the first verse of the Bible is indeed true. That's what we're working on here. Now, the five lines of evidence delineated by the acronym SURGE are: the S stands for the second law of thermodynamics, the U stands for the fact that the universe is expanding, the R is the radiation afterglow that's the remnant heat from the initial explosion, the creation event.

It's pejoratively called the Big Bang. Why do I say pejoratively called the Big Bang? Because a man who was a Nobel laureate I think he was a Nobel laureate, maybe he wasn't, now that I think about it. Anyway, Sir Fred Hoyle, a famous atheistic astronomer, once the evidence came down that the universe did have a beginning through some of this scientific argumentation or this scientific evidence, and he was a believer in the steady state that the universe didn't have a beginning.

Once this theory came out, he said, "What are you going to call this? The Big Bang?" And they said, "Yeah, yeah, that's what we'll call it the Big Bang." So he meant it sort of as a derisive term, but the term stuck. Now, I need to point out right here, as Christians, people will say, "Well, you

know, I don't believe in the Big Bang." To which I respond, "I believe in the Big Bang. I just know who banged it." And when I say I believe in the Big Bang, it doesn't mean I believe that the universe exploded into being out of nothing without a cause.

Because some people who advocate for the Big Bang theory, they have no cause for this. I'm not subscribing to that. I'm saying if the evidence for the Big Bang is good, it's actually evidence pointing to the God, the God, the Christian God, and I'll get there a little bit later. So, what is the evidence? Second law of thermodynamics, universe is expanding, radiation afterglow, remnant heat from the initial explosion.

The G is the Great Galaxy Seeds. That's temperature variations in the radiation afterglow that I'll explain here in a minute. And E stands for Einstein's theory of general relativity. Those five lines of evidence are even having atheistic scientists admit that the universe had a beginning. For example, Stephen Hawking, who was probably the top atheist in the world until he died about eight years or so ago, he was a physicist, as you know.

Famously said this: "Almost everyone now believes that the universe and time itself had a beginning at the Big Bang." Now, Hawking tried to come up with another explanation other than God for this beginning, but he's admitting the evidence that space, time, and matter literally had a beginning. And so, if space, time, and matter had a beginning, what could have caused that?

We'll get to it. Alexander Vilenkin, an agnostic astronomer. Not a Christian, not necessarily an atheist either, but he put it this way: After going through so much of the evidence for the beginning of the universe, he actually was willing to call the conclusion that the universe had a beginning, he was willing to call it a proof.

A proof. Now that's not common among scientists to call it a proof. Why? Because science, by definition, is tentative. There, there are new evidence, or I should say, quite frequently, new evidence is discovered that can overturn pre-existing theories. In fact, I know you can't trust everything on Wikipedia, but you know there's a whole Wikipedia page that is about overturned theories in science.

But I digress. Here is what Alexander Vilenkin said about after looking at the evidence for the beginning of the universe, he put it this way. He said, "With the proof now in place, cosmologists and by the way, a cosmologist is not someone that puts on your makeup. A

cosmologist is someone that studies the universe. "With the proof now in place, cosmologists can no longer hide behind the possibility of a past eternal universe.

There is now no escape. They have to face the problem of a cosmic beginning." Now, the interesting two words in this quote are "proof." As I mentioned, normally scientists don't talk that way, but Vilenkin sees so much evidence pointing to the beginning of the universe that he's willing to call it a proof at this point. The other interesting word is the word "problem" in that quote. Why is it a problem that there was a cosmic beginning?

Because many scientists are atheistic and they think everything happens by natural law. But if all of nature had a beginning, then how can you say it was a natural cause that brought the universe into existence? There was no nature. That's the whole point. Space, time, and matter had a beginning out of absolutely nothing, non-being. So what does that imply? There must be something outside the universe that brought it into existence.

We'll get there as we go through this podcast here in this radio program here in the American Family Radio Network and other stations around the country. What we're doing here is gonna, we're gonna look at the surge evidence briefly, not in great detail, but briefly, just to give you an overview of why scientists, whether they're atheists or agnostics, or whether they're Christians, are pretty much in agreement the universe had a beginning.

So what does that mean? What does that mean about the origin question? Where did we come from? We're gonna get there. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, the brand new updated book. Here it is, right here. It has just hit. The newsstands or the bookstores or Amazon it just came out last week. Check it out, and we'll be back right after the break. Don't go anywhere.

Where did we come from, ladies and gentlemen? What is the origin of all things? That's the question we're investigating here today on I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist and the American Family Radio Network and other stations around the country. I mentioned the acronym that helps us remember the scientific evidence the universe had a beginning. Surge, S-U-R-G-E. Let's look at each one of these briefly.

The S stands for the second law of thermodynamics, which says that the universe is running down. It's running out of usable energy. The longer the universe goes on, the less usable energy we have. The total amount of energy in the universe, if it's not getting energy from outside of

itself, is constant. That's the first law of thermodynamics. By the way, the first law does not say that you can't create or destroy energy.

That's a philosophical statement. If there's a source of energy outside the universe creating energy, i.e., that would be God, then the First Law doesn't apply outside of this universe. What the First Law is supposed to mean is that if there's no energy coming from outside the universe, the total amount of energy doesn't change.

What changes is the amount of usable energy to unusable energy. I mean, you can think of, say, the universe as having a gas tank. There's only a finite amount of gas in the universe, and the longer that the universe is running, the less usable energy we have. Just like the longer your car is running, the less gas you have.

Now, why does this show the universe had a beginning? Because if the universe had an infinite, or if the universe is eternal, if it didn't have a beginning, and the second law applies, then we would have run out of energy a long time ago. Just like if you were driving your car from an infinitely long time ago, would you have any energy now? No, you'd be out of gas by now. But since you still have gas, since you still have, you still have energy, there must have been a beginning to the universe.

Because if we had run out of energy by now, or we would have run out of energy by now if the universe was eternal, if we had that, it's just like if you had a, if you don't like the car analogy, think about a flashlight. If you turn a flashlight on and leave it, say, in your garage on overnight, what's going to be the strength of the light coming out of the flashlight in the morning?

It'll be dim, if not completely gone. Why? Because there's so much, there's only so much juice in those batteries. And the longer that the flashlight is on, the less usable energy you have in those batteries. Well, think about the universe as having batteries. If the universe was eternal, we, the Sun would have burned out already. But the Sun still exists. Other stars still exist.

They're still burning, which means the universe had a beginning. That's the second law of thermodynamics. There's another aspect to it about disorder. If the universe was eternal, we'd be at complete disorder now. In fact, scientists know that at some point this universe is going to run out of energy and go from order to disorder. Heat death, it's called.

In fact, scientists have a term for this. It's called eschatology. Just like we have in theology, they have it in science. It means end times. That the universe is ultimately going to run out of energy.

Now, according to them, it's billions of years from now, so don't worry about it in your lifetime. But one day, unless energy is given into this universe from outside it, we're going to go to complete heat death, complete disorder, complete equilibrium.

And this second law of thermodynamics is one of the reasons we get old. It's why when you get older, you get dresser disease. That's when your chest falls into your drawers. Things fall apart. You could look at the second law this way: nature will take a building and turn it into a pile of bricks, but nature will never take a pile of bricks and turn it into a building, because nature brings things to disorder, not order. So the second law, which, by the way is independent of the Big Bang, the Big Bang could be wrong and the second law would still apply, which would show that the universe had a beginning.

All right, the next line of evidence is the fact that the universe is expanding. That's the U in surge. And Edwin Hubble, namesake of the Hubble Space Telescope, discovered this in about 1929. He's looking through his telescope, in California, Pasadena, California, the Mount Wilson Observatory, and he's noticing that all these galaxies are moving away from us, and he could see that through a redshift in the light.

You know, it's kind of like a Doppler effect for light. You know, if you're standing at a train station, here's how sound works. You know, when a train is getting closer to you, the pitch gets higher and higher, and then when it trails, when it goes past you, the pitch trails off very quickly. That's the Doppler effect in sound. Well, in light, it's kind of like a Doppler effect.

If something is moving away from you, it'll look red. If it's moving toward you, it will look blue. And Hubble noticed that most of the galaxies out there were red. They were moving away from us. And what he did was is he thought to himself, well, if they're all moving away from us and we go back in time, we're actually going to bring back all of this matter to a single point.

So if time were reversed, the universe would collapse back into this single point known as a singularity, a point of infinite density. I.e., it would collapse back to a point, not the size of a basketball, not the size of a pinhead, but mathematically, it would it would collapse back to nothing. So once there was nothing, and then bang, there was something, and the universe expanded out and is still expanding out.

Now, by the way, this might be one reason why God did not create the universe static and eternal. What do I mean by that? If He had created the universe in a static state, where it didn't come out from a single point, you couldn't detect scientifically that there was a beginning from

the expanding universe. But when you look at an expanding universe and you go back in time, it collapses back to a single point.

In other words, the creation event from a single point, having all space and time and matter expand out, space, time, and matter expand out, shows us empirically that there was a beginning. There was a creation event. So the U was Hubble, and by the way, Einstein didn't like this.

When, when, when Einstein did his special relativity equations back in the, like, I want to say the first 10 years, maybe 1906 or 1916. One of those two dates is sticking in my mind. Anyway, early in the 20th century, he noticed that. According to his general relativity equations, that the universe had a beginning, but he didn't like that, so he put a fudge factor into his equations to avoid that, something called the cosmological constant.

And then when the Hubble discovery took place, Hubble called Einstein and said to him, "You know, Al, what you had predicted in your equations an expanding universe a couple of decades ago, actually, I'm observing through my telescope. Do you want to come out here and look through the telescope here at Mount Wilson, so you can see the expanding universe that your original equations predicted?" And so Einstein went out there.

I think it was 1931, and after he got off the telescope, he said, "The cosmological constant was the greatest blunder of my professional career. The universe did have a beginning." And he said, "All I'm interested now is to find the mind of God. The rest are details." Now, Einstein never claimed to be a Christian, not even a theist.

He appeared to be more of a pantheist that all is God. In any event, his equations, his original equations, showed an absolute beginning, and he put that fudge factor in there to avoid it. He actually was onto something, though. There is a cosmological constant we'll talk about later. But not the one that he had in his equations, and so from that point on, he knew the universe had a beginning, and it was finally confirmed in 1978 when two scientists working at Bell Labs in Homedale, New Jersey, not far from where I grew up.

In fact, we used to run cross-country races in Holmdel, New Jersey, by the name of Penzias and Wilson, discovered the remnant heat from the initial explosion, the Big Bang explosion. It's also called the radiation afterglow. They discovered this by accident. We tell the story in the book, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, but they won Nobel prizes for this. Actually, it was discovered in 1965.

The Nobel Prize came in 1978, and this really put the nail in the coffin of the last doubting Thomas, who at that point, up to that point, some of them still clung to what was known as the steady state that the universe is static and eternal. After the radiation afterglow discovery, they most scientists admitted, "Okay, the universe had a beginning," and this basically is the remnant heat from the initial explosion.

It's still out there. It's just a couple of degrees above absolute zero. But these scientists discovered it by this big antenna that they had at Bell Labs in Holmdel, New Jersey. They discovered it by accident, but they found the background radiation, and it's literally the smoking gun to the creation event, is what it is. Now, scientists thought that if this is really true, we should find very fine temperature variations in that smoking gun, that radiation afterglow.

The problem is, is that we can't measure those temperature variations from Earth. So they had to put a satellite up to discover it, and I won't bore you with all the details, but they literally found the machining marks of the creator, according to George Smoot, who led the expedition, the NASA expedition, to discover the G in surge, the Great Galaxy Seeds.

This was discovered by a satellite. Very fine temperature variations allowed the galaxies to form in the early universe, according to this theory. What scientists had predicted after they discovered the radiation afterglow was these temperature variations would be found, and they were found. That's the G in surge. The E in surge stands for Einstein's theory of general relativity.

I mentioned a couple minutes ago. Einstein knew this back in the early 20th century, but it wasn't until the subsequent discoveries were made the universe expanding, the radiation afterglow did Einstein finally admit? Actually, he was, he had passed on by the time the radiation afterglow took place. He died in 1955, and the radiation afterglow was discovered in 1965.

But Einstein knew the universe had a beginning. He knew that space, time, and matter are co-relative; that they came into existence together. That once there was no time, there was no space, there was no matter, and then the entire space-time continuum leapt into existence out of nothing. And Einstein's theory of general relativity has been verified to at least five decimal places. If you're going to argue against this theory, you're really going against what appears to be a pretty airtight case that space, time, and matter came into existence out of literally nothing.

Now, what does all this mean about the origin question? Where did we come from? We're going to get into it right after the break. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, and we're talking about evidence from the new edition of *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist* here on the American Family Radio Network and other stations around the country. We'll be back right after this.

AD:
Could you answer this question? Why doesn't God let everyone into heaven, or do all religions get you to heaven? Well, Frank Turek can, and now you can. Watch him tackle the toughest questions from his latest college tour appearance. See real students challenge Frank, and watch how truth stands up under pressure. Subscribe to our Cross Examined YouTube channel right now to watch. That's Cross Examined, two words on YouTube, and sharpen your faith for the real world.

FRANK:
Ladies and gentlemen, where did we come from? Where did the universe come from? We're talking about that today here on the I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist show with me, Frank Turek. The website is crossexamined.org. That's crossexamined with a D on the end of it. dot org. And much of what I'm saying, I'm taking from the band new updated edition of *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*. Finally, after 22 years, we've updated it.

The argumentation is the same, the order of the arguments, but there's more evidence for each of the arguments that we make, and I'm going to highlight some of that as we go here today regarding the beginning of the universe. So, if you want to go a lot further than what the original book did, pick up a copy of the new version of *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*. It can be hard to find on Amazon because they still have some copies of the old edition.

So, if you want to find the right link, go to the link here in the show notes, and you can go right to that that edition of the book on Amazon. We also have it at crossexamined.org, so you can go there and get it there if you want it signed. Happy to do so. But before I go back to that, I want to point out that this coming Monday, we are going to be at Freedom House Church here in Cornelius, California.

Why do I have California on the mind? Cornelius, North Carolina, just above Charlotte, 7:30 p.m. Freedom House Church. We're going to be doing the third edition or the third episode of the War on Reality. My co-author, Phoenix Hayes and I are going to be talking about what are the

rules of reality? How do you know what reality is? That night it's going to be live stream, 7:30, Lord willing, you can see it on our YouTube channel.

But if you're anywhere near the Charlotte area, go to our website, crossexamined.org, join us that night, 7:30 p.m. Everybody's welcome at Freedom House Church in Cornelius. Then next. Let's see. Next Sunday, I'm going to be down. Oh, wait, I forgot. There's an event between that. The TPUSA Make Heaven Crowded event at Charis Bible College, not far from Colorado Springs, Colorado, is the 13th of November.

I'll be there, and several other speakers. Then the 15th, all the way across the country down to Miramar, Florida, which is near Miami. You're going to be at Calvary Fellowship Church down there on the 15th. Then going to be at the William Lane Craig event, 20 years of Reasonable Faith, back to Denver, Colorado, on the 20th of November.

I'll be speaking that night, and the conference goes over into the next day, the 21st. So if you're anywhere out in that area, I'd love to see you. Then we got more events coming up in December, check our calendar for more. All right, let's go back to the *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist* data on the beginning of the universe.

Just before this, we talked about five lines of scientific evidence the universe had a beginning. The second law, all by the acronym SURGE. Second law, universe expanding, radiation afterglow, great galaxy seeds, Einstein, Einstein's theory of general relativity. What does all this mean? Well, way back in 1978, there was an agnostic astronomer by the name of Robert Jastrow, who was a very well-credentialed scientist at NASA.

In fact, he is the founder of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies. Anyway, in 1978, he wrote a book called. Called, oh gee, what's the name of the book? It's escaping me all of a sudden. Oh, *God and the Astronomers*, that's the name of the book. Jastrow, J-A-S-T-R-O-W, Robert Jastrow. And in the very first page of the book, or the first couple of pages of the book, he says, look, I'm an agnostic on religious matters.

In other words, I don't, I don't have a, I don't have a dog in this fight. I don't know whether God exists or not. But here's what he said in this book after going through some of this surge evidence. He says, "The astronomical evidence leads to a biblical view of the origin of the world. The essential element of the astronomical and biblical accounts of Genesis is the same." And then he went on to say this in an interview.

Not long after he had written the book, I think he, think this interview I want to say is from 1982. He actually did an interview with Christianity Today, and here's what he said. Remember, this guy's an agnostic. He says, "Astronomers now found they painted themselves into a corner because they have proven by their own methods that the world began abruptly in an act of creation to which you can trace the seeds of every star, every planet, every living thing in this cosmos and on the earth, and they have found that all this has happened as a product of forces they cannot hope to discover." Here's the key line: "that there are what I or anyone would call supernatural forces at work is now, I think, a scientifically proven fact." Unquote.

Robert Jastrow, agnostic astronomer. Now, why would he say? Why would he say that supernatural forces are at work, and that's a scientifically proven fact? Here's why: because if the evidence is showing that space, time, and matter had a beginning in other words, that all of nature had a beginning then what could have caused that? Only something outside of nature.

In fact, I was at a college in Michigan, not well, this had to be 15 years ago now. Former Christian gets up to the microphone. We have this in the new edition of *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, and he says, after I go through this surge evidence, he says, "Frank, I think this is a God of the Gaps argument that you're saying that there has to be a God out there." And I said, "No, John, it's not a God of the Gaps argument." And he said, "No, no, I think it is." I said, "John, I'm not arguing from what I don't know.

I'm arguing from what we do know." You see, a God of the Gaps argument is when you plug God into the gap of your knowledge and you say, "Well, since I don't have a natural cause, there must be a God that created this." And he's saying, "No, this is a God of the gaps." I'm saying, "No, John, there's no way that a natural cause could have created all of nature, because there were no natural causes prior to nature beginning." And he said, "Well, if we give science more time, we're going to find a natural cause for all of nature." And I said, "First of all, John, that sounds a lot like faith.

You know, science hasn't found it yet, but one day we will. And secondly, you're not going to find a natural cause for all of nature." To say that if you just give me more time, I'm going to figure out a natural cause for all of nature would be like me saying, if you give me enough time, I'm going to figure out that I gave birth to my own mother. That's obviously, in principle, impossible.

And here's the bottom line, ladies and gentlemen. If space, time, and matter literally had a beginning, which is what the evidence shows, then whatever created space, time, and matter

must transcend space, time, and matter. In other words, the cause must be outside of space, time, and matter. The cause must be spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful to create the universe out of nothing, personal in order to choose to create.

Because to go from a state of nothingness to a state of creation, someone had to make a choice, and only persons make choices. Impersonal forces don't make choices. Gravity doesn't decide what it's going to do. Gravity just does the same thing over and over again. And there, there was no gravity prior to creation. That's the whole point. The space-time continuum came into existence.

By the way, the cause would also have to be intelligent to have a mind to make a choice. Now, ladies and gentlemen, when you think about a spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal, intelligent cause, who do you think of? You say God, but how do you know it's the Christian God, Frank? We don't yet. We don't know if Jesus rose from the dead or not.

You don't get all the way to Jesus or the God of the Bible with, say, what is known as the cosmological argument, which is what I'm talking about here that the universe had a beginning. If it had a beginning, it must have had a beginner a spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal, intelligent beginner. You don't get all the way to Jesus, but as we point out in the book, when you do look at the evidence for Jesus and you realize that he predicted and accomplished his own resurrection from the dead, then you can go back to this cosmological argument and say the same being that walked out of the tomb 1,993 years ago is the same being in whose divine nature created the universe out of nothing.

We haven't gotten there yet, but it's in the book if you want to ultimately get there. In fact, a couple of weeks ago, we did a section from the new version of *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist* called The Top 10 Reasons We Know the New Testament Writers Told the Truth. You might want to go back and listen to that. There's also a chapter in here on why we know the resurrection took place. But if the resurrection did take place, then this same being that walked out of the tomb 1,993 years ago is the same being in whose divine nature created the universe out of nothing.

It's not a God of the gaps argument. There, there is no natural cause you can find for all of nature. That's the whole point. And Jastrow, well, it wasn't just Jastrow who said things like this. Physicist Paul Davies. Who is again not a Christian. He's an agnostic. He teaches at Arizona State University.

Here's what he said about all this. He said, "The coming into being of the universe, as discussed in modern science, is not just a matter of imposing some sort of organization upon a previous incoherent state, but literally the coming into being of all physical things from nothing." What is nothing? Nothing is non-being.

Nothing, nothing is not something. Nothing is non-being. Nothing is what rocks dream about. There was no, there was no, nothing physical, nothing temporal. There was no space-time or matter, and then space-time and matter came into existence. Logically, what could have caused that? Only something outside of space-time and matter. Now Davies doesn't go that far.

He just says, this is the evidence. He doesn't give you a cause, but he's saying this is the evidence. And it was Jastrow, after going through all this evidence, by the way, this scientific evidence that had a great line that I'll share with you after the break. Other people that helped discover the surge evidence said similar things. Arno Penzias, who helped discover the R, the radiation afterglow, by the way, won a Nobel Prize for this, said this quote, "The best data we have concerning the Big Bang are exactly what I would have predicted had I had nothing to go on but the five books of Moses, the Psalms, and the Bible as a whole." His colleague Robert Wilson, again, not a believer, said this: "Certainly there was something that set it all off.

I can't think of a better theory of the origin of the universe to match Genesis." George Smoot from UCAL Berkeley, the guy that discovered the radiation after I'm sorry the Great Galaxy Seeds, he was behind it. He said this again. These aren't Christians, ladies and gentlemen. He said, "There is no doubt that a parallel exists between the Big Bang as an event and the Christian notion of creation from nothing." Now, what new evidence has come to bear regarding this?

We're going to share it after the break, and we're also going to deal with the question: What if the Big Bang is wrong? Because some people will say it's wrong. We're going to get into it. I'm going to show you some philosophical evidence that the universe had to have a beginning, because science can change, right? We might get new scientific data out there that says, "Okay, maybe the universe didn't have a beginning." I don't think that's going to happen. In fact, we have a whole section in the book on that, but we'll entertain that question right after the break and that amazing quote from Jastrow, the agnostic astronomer from NASA, how he ends his book it's spectacular.

Don't go anywhere. We'll be back right after this.

One of the five great questions every worldview has to answer is origin. Where did we come from? That's what we're talking about today, ladies and gentlemen. We're just looking right now at the scientific evidence the universe had a beginning, but let's give you some evidence that time had to have a beginning. And this is just a philosophical argument. Think about it this way. Here's a question: If there were an infinite number of days before today, in other words, if space, time, and matter didn't have a beginning, if the universe was eternal, would the day we're in right now have a begin, or would the day we're in right now have arrived?

Think about this for a second. Would today have arrived if there were an infinite number of days before today? The answer is no. Why? Because before you got to this day, you'd always have to live another day before this day if there are an infinite number of days before today. So if this day has arrived, there can only be a finite or limited number of days before today, which means the universe had a beginning.

Time had a beginning. Now, I know this kind of thought here can give you intellectual constipation, but this is often known as the Kalam cosmological argument that there can only be a limited number of days before today, which means the universe had a beginning, time had a beginning, space, time, and matter are correlative, as we learned from Einstein. But even without Einstein, you know, time had a beginning.

If time had a beginning, ladies and gentlemen, what could have caused time? Only something outside of time. You're timeless, right? You've got to be outside of time. By the way, this answers the age-old question: Who made God? If you're timeless, do you have a beginning? No, you're eternal, which means you don't have a cause. So, to ask who made the uncaused cause is a silly question because nobody made the unmade, nobody created the uncreator.

There has to be an uncaused first cause. You can't go on an infinite, you can't go on an infinite regress of causes. Ultimately, you're going to get back to an uncaused first cause. a cause that's outside of time, that transcends time and space and that cause is what we mean by God. By the way, if you don't like the name God or the word God, you're thinking of an old man on a cloud or whatever. Of course, that's not the Christian God, but just put that aside for a second.

Put the word God out of your mind for a second. Just think about this question: Who is the source and sustainer of all things? Who is the source and sustainer of all things? It's not me. I came into existence. I'm going to go out of existence. It's not you. You came into existence. You're going to go out of existence, at least at least here on Earth.

There's something that is the source of everything else that exists. Who has always existed? Aristotle called this being the unmoved mover. Now he mistakenly thought the universe was eternal, but Aristotle still said you had to have a cause for all this, to sustain this universe. So who is the source and sustainer of all things?

That, whoever that is, that's what we mean by God, and the evidence shows this, ladies and gentlemen. So, what about new evidence related to this? Well, actually, let me, let me mention Jastrow for a second again, because here's how he ends his book. Well, first of all, we've got two options.

If the universe had a beginning, it must have had a beginner. We've got two options: either no one created something out of nothing, which is the atheistic view, or someone created something out of nothing, which is the theistic view. Now, which view is more reasonable, ladies and gentlemen? No one created something out of nothing, or someone created something out of nothing? Well, obviously, someone created something out of nothing. Because no one can't do anything.

There's no one there to create. There's no cause. Do you realize everyone believes in at least one miracle? Atheists believe in miracles, just like Christians. Christians believe someone created something out of nothing. Atheists believe no one created something out of nothing. Now that's a miracle. And we always hear atheists talking about, well, extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. Notice that they claim that no one created something out of nothing.

That's an extraordinary claim, without any evidence. It goes against all of our common experience. So, it's the atheists that have to have a lot more faith, blind faith in this sense, to believe what they believe. Christians are reasoning back to an uncaused first cause. A spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal, intelligent cause that we call God.

You can call him the source and sustainer of all things, who created this space-time continuum. That someone created something out of nothing. In fact, here's a question to ask an atheist: If there is no God, why is there something rather than nothing at all? Why does anything exist? So, anyway, here's Jastrow. Jastrow, at the end of his book, *God and the Astronomers*, after going through all this scientific evidence, says this: "For the scientist who has lived by his faith in the power of reason, the story ends like a bad dream.

He has scaled the mountains of ignorance. He's about to conquer the highest peak as he pulls himself over the final rock, he's greeted by a band of theologians who've been sitting there for centuries." Yeah, no doubt reading Genesis 1:1. Because the evidence shows the universe had a beginning, and if it had a beginning, it must have had a beginner. And it really seems that this beginner, given the evidence, is spaceless, timeless, immaterial, powerful, personal, and intelligent, at least.

That could be the God of the Bible. We don't know it's the God of the Bible yet, because we still have to see if Jesus rose from the dead, and that's what we're going to do in a future program. But the evidence shows the universe had a beginning. Now. What if the Big Bang is wrong? Well, first of all, a couple of things you need to know: the Big Bang, if it's wrong, the Big Bang doesn't depend on, or let me put it another way, the beginning of the universe doesn't depend on the Big Bang, because the second law shows the universe had a beginning.

That's regardless of whether or not it had a creation point and exploded out of being from a single point, and then everything rushed out, as we can see through our telescopes. Also, the E in surge. Remember the acronym S-U-R-G-E? The S and the E don't require the Big Bang. Those two lines of evidence hold whether it had a Big Bang beginning.

So the second law and Einstein's theory of general relativity show the universe had a beginning, and this is even admitted by atheists. Here's what we say in the new edition of *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, the updated edition. Victor Stenger, a physicist who taught at the University of Hawaii, once wrote that the universe exploded out of nothingness. Stenger acknowledged that the Big Bang is looking more probable all the time. "We have to leave open the possibility that the Big Bang could be wrong," he said.

But, "every year that goes by, more and more astronomical data comes in. It's more and more consistent with at least the general Big Bang picture." Victor Stenger's words have turned out to be prophetic because in 2003, more evidence came forth that the Big Bang is correct. NASA's WMAP satellite confirmed the findings of its predecessor COBE, another satellite, and returned pictures of the background radiation ripples 35 times sharper than COBE.

So this confirmed the G in surge. The evidence supports the Big Bang again. And that same year, cosmologists Borde, Guth, and Vilenkin developed a theorem, a theorem now called the BGV theorem, that concluded that any universe like ours that has, on average, been expanding throughout history cannot have been infinite in the past, but must have had a beginning, a past space-time boundary.

Now, Vilenkin went on to say this. Again, he's an agnostic, but he went on to say this. When he's the guy that said, with the proof now in place, cosmologists can no longer hide behind the past possibility of eternal universe. There's now no escape; they have to face the problem of a cosmic beginning. He said, "It is said that an argument that convinces reasonable men is what convinces reasonable men, and a proof is what it takes to convince even an unreasonable man." And then he goes on to say, "With the proof now in place, cosmologists can no longer hide behind the possibility of a past eternal universe." He went on to say that, he said, "a remarkable thing about our theorem is its sweeping generality." He said, "we made no assumptions about the material content of the universe.

We did not even assume that gravity is described by Einstein's equations. So if Einstein's gravity requires some modification, our conclusion will still hold. The conclusion is that a past eternal inflation without a beginning is impossible." So his theorem shows a beginning, regardless of the other elements of the Big Bang cosmology, the other elements, the surge elements I mentioned earlier.

He's saying his BVG or BGV theorem shows the universe had a beginning, and so did the James Webb Space Telescope, which we got data from in 2022. This is more updated information that we have in the new edition of the book. We write: "this finding is causing scientists to refine their theory of galaxy formation in the early universe.

But the fact that the universe had a beginning was again confirmed" because the James Webb Space Telescope showed an even more dramatic expansion of the universe through the redshift. So. The data keeps coming in, and this has been going on for almost a century now. The more data comes in scientifically, the more scientists are sure that the universe had a beginning in a great explosion.

And if that's the case, that fits perfectly with Genesis 1:1. In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth. And he created it out of nothing. Now, when atheists are agreeing with the evidence for Genesis 1:1, you might want to take note of that. You might want to take note of that, because if there was a beginning, no matter how far back this took place thousands or billions of years they of course say billions due to the starlight situation there had to be a beginner.

No matter how far back the universe was created, it had to have a cause, in other words. So. What's our origin? There's some sort of super intellect out there that created this universe. Now, do we know it's Jesus? Not yet, but we're going to find out in future shows. And you can

find out much quicker if you get the new version of *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, the updated edition. We're going to put the link in the show notes. Great being with you this time, ladies and gentlemen. We'll see you here next week. God bless.