

AFFIRMED GOD HAS EXISTED AT LEAST ONCE.

Can it be said that God has existed at any time in human history and if He has is it reasonable to assume that He exists now? At first it may look as though it is backing away from the usual question does God exist? I do not, however, think that it is, since I am setting out to prove merely that God has existed at least once in human history. If this is the case, and then the proposition that God has never existed is false, since, it only takes one instance of His existence to disprove that proposition.

When we look at the arguments for God's existence in the cosmological, ontological, and teleological arguments and others of this ilk, we can get back to a beginning. We can even posit that beginning as God, however, we cannot with those arguments infer anything about His nature, legal or moral. Neither can we say anything regarding His character.

I am not saying, however, that these arguments are of no use. On the contrary they form a platform which makes the hypothesis of God's existence testable. They take us back to a beginning. But, as we well know, that beginning has also been posited as the "Big Bang."

There is, I believe, another angle to this debate that seems not to have been given a lot of credence. That other angle is Jesus Christ. Atheists will not go there, a lot of philosophers will not go there either. This I believe brings into question their honesty since they leave out something that strictly applies to the evidence in this argument. Not only so but it also when applied destroys their arguments denying God's existence.

What will you do with Jesus? The song asks of us. It is also the question I put to the atheists and agnostics of the world. The footprints of Jesus are left on time, and on this very earth itself, haunting all who would try to dismiss Him in both this debate and indeed from their own lives.

It was C.S. Lewis who posed the question that Jesus Christ is either a liar, a lunatic, or He is Lord. These three positions are about the only ones you could take regarding Him when you look at His claims as to who He was. The same must be said of the Bible, that book is either the ranting of lunatics, the work of liars, or the revealed will of God, in the New Testament especially as revealed through Jesus Christ.

It is significant too that many philosophers, or even sceptics, do not subscribe to the idea of Christ being a liar or a lunatic. They will not, however, enthrone Him as Lord either. They will say such things as Christ was a sublime teacher, a great moral teacher and none of that is what would be ascribed to a liar or a lunatic. It was the French philosopher Jean Rousseau who wrote, "if the death of Socrates was the death of a philosopher, then the death of Jesus Christ was the death of a God." Statements of this kind do not support the character of a liar or a lunatic in any way whatsoever.

The Bible is said to be the revealed will of God. That proposition is either true or false. The law of excluded middle makes it so. There is no halfway house, no middle ground regarding this proposition. Those then who would hold this proposition as being false must come up with the evidence to support that belief. I suspect, however, that those who hold this position have long since closed their minds. The same must be said for those who hold the proposition to be true. They must provide the evidence for their belief as well. If this is not done then both are mere assertions without warrant.

At the outset I will formulate my argument on the presupposition that the Bible is indeed the word of God. That presupposition is at the very beginning of the Bible in Genesis 1:1. The Bible

presupposes God's existence and proceeds from there to reveal both God and His will for mankind. Atheists and agnostics hastily reject that presupposition and simply assert another one, which has a different beginner, the Big Bang or evolution through natural selection for example.

Without a presupposition we cannot proceed since all arguments proceed from something that is presupposed. As an example of an unquestioned presupposition consider the proposition "all houses are built by someone." This proposition has within it a presupposition that is unquestioned. A builder exists for every house that has or will be built. To question it is not logical. Even a child understands that the presupposition of a builder precedes the building of the house.

Every beginning presupposes a beginner and given that this is the case then which beginner is more likely for the universe that houses the earth we live on? Was it intelligence or blind unproven chance? These are basically the only two presuppositions you could come up with is it not? Bertrand Russell did posit the idea that if we say God created the universe then why can't we just as easily say that the universe is eternal? I don't think he ever got the right answer to that question, but I am positive he now knows painfully well what the true answer is. If the "Big Bang" is posited as the beginner then it seems as though the question is left hanging, who or what created the Big Bang?

We must also, I believe, ask that if the universe did begin this way, then how does it come to have the logical order it does after being born of absolute chaos, and who or what made the cosmic order (cosmos) that is so evident? Like begets like, and chaos does not beget cosmos. Surely that, if nothing else, posits a rational, orderly, and creative mind that is behind all that we see in the universe. And given the theories behind evolution and the Big Bang surely it makes more rational sense that it indeed is a rational creative mind behind the cosmic order.

I have already alluded to the implicit presupposition of a builder in every house we see. Consider also that it takes a creative mind to design every house. This is also a presupposition that cannot be questioned. The designer must have a creative mind to design the house that the builder builds.

Consider too that it takes a creative mind to design an artificial or toy animal say a tiger for example. Again this is not questioned. Why then do people throw reason away by questioning the presupposition they never question when applied to the designer of the toys? Why drop it when looking at the real tiger? This speaks, does it not, of an even greater creative mind? Further, the real tiger has life and not one creative genius on earth can give life to their created tiger. The creator certainly endowed us with a creative mind it is, however, below the one who created them and their minds.

Another aspect of mind is the ability it has to relate to other minds. This of course speaks of relationship. If we grant, (and I do), that God is an entity who wishes to have a relationship with the minds He has created, we then see God in a different light. He is a God that wants to relate to us and with us.

When we look at the Biblical account of creation we can see that everything was created in its own class or order. Plants, fish birds, animals, and man. Further none of these boundaries were crossed as the theory of evolution clearly (and blindly) asserts. God put in place an immutable law right at the beginning, and again it is an unquestioned presupposition and that is like begets like." You reap what you sow. Humans beget humans and not non-humans. Apes beget apes and not non-apes. Birds beget birds, and dogs beget dogs and so on. In the same vein there is another immutable unquestioned law, and that is, nothing begets nothing QED. And no intelligent person will argue with these laws either. What is astounding, however, is the fact that every rational person ACKNOWLEDGES these laws and presuppositions in every other sphere of life. Banking,

commerce, business, art, and so on, yet when it comes to origins and God these same people arbitrarily throw them out, why and on what evidence do they do this?

It would seem from all of this that once a person decides not to believe in God then there is no accountability to these laws and presuppositions and so they can then deal capriciously with them. If those things were taken out of banking and money for example then these ones would scream blue murder and have you arrested. They would have us obey that law in this instance and expect us to give up on rationality when we say they must be applied to origins, God, and the Bible as well.

So then what role does Jesus Christ have in answering our question has God existed at any time in human history? Firstly consider this. If we believe the Bible to be the true words (or mind) of God and Christ and we grant the presupposition of a builder of the universe which houses our planet (and I do in both cases). Then we cannot escape the fact of God's existence. When, however, we look at Jesus Christ we can see that these propositions are strengthened.

In (II Corinthians 4:4) we are told that Satan, referred to as the "god of this world" and it is he who blinds the minds of the unbelievers, that they might not see the light of the Gospel of the glory of Christ who is the image of God. Then in (Colossians 1:15) we are told that Christ is the image of the invisible God. (John 1:18) puts it this way, No man has seen God at any time but (or except) the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he has explained Him. (Hebrews 1:3) states that Christ is the radiance of God's glory and the exact representation of God's nature, and when Christ made purification for sin He sat down at the right hand of (God) the majesty on high.

These passages perfectly plainly propose that Jesus Christ was the image of the nature of the invisible God and also that He explains Him. Therefore, He is the exact representation of God's nature, a mirror image. We are also told that He went back to heaven (which implies that He came from heaven), and now sits at the right hand of the God He represented on earth.

In (Hebrews 1:3) the word used to define nature is ὑποστασεως (hupostaseos) the context this word signifies the basis or foundation of existence. The word is used in conjunction with the word χαρακτηρ (charakter.) This word has the meaning of express image. We get our English word character from this word. Further this word is used once only in the New Testament in this way. Therefore the proposition is this. Jesus Christ existed as the very (mirror) image of the character or nature of God.

In (II Corinthians 4:4), we have the Greek word εικων (eikon) English icon. The meaning here is that Christ is the icon or image of God. Christ is the impression or pattern of God in human form. Charakter also speaks of the impression of an original pattern (or template), and thus we see that Christ is the eikon or image of that original pattern.

In (John 1:18), the word used for explain is εξεγεομαι (exegeomai). This means to bring out or to declare thoroughly. Thus Jesus Christ thoroughly declares or explains God. We get the English word exegesis from this word which means to unfold or reveal from teaching.

In (Colossians 1:15) we have eikon being used for the image of the invisible God. All of these passages are telling us that Jesus Christ is the exact representation of God's nature, the very impression of the original template (God). And that has been brought out and thoroughly explained by Christ's character, actions and teaching. Christ therefore is a foundation proof of the existence of God.

What then can we say about these things? It is evident that if Christ was indeed the express image of God, the exact representation of God's nature, and fully explains God. Then at the very least God

did exist in the form of Christ, since Christ is said to be the mirror image of God Himself, a claim Jesus made of Himself. The argument may then be put like this:

If A is an exact representation of B's nature,
Then B exists (or at the very least has existed at one time.)
If B never existed then A could never have represented B.
Since there would be no pattern to represent.
A is an exact representation of B's nature.
Therefore: B exists, or has existed at one time.

A representation must come from an original template or pattern. If there is no template or pattern then nothing can represent it. From nothing nothing comes this is our unquestioned presupposition, however, since a representation was made, then a pattern or template actually exists or has existed.

Christ claims this for himself, and given that he is not regarded as a liar or a lunatic even by philosophers, two charges that must be absolutely proven against him. This leaves only one thing that he is who he says he was, the Son of God bearing the exact template of his Fathers nature.

From this we can say that at the very least there was a time that God did exist at least one time in human history. Therefore to say that God has never existed is palpably false. Christ is clearly the counter argument to that proposition.

Since then there has been at least one time when God can be said to have existed, is it reasonable to assume that He exists now? I strongly affirm that it is. Christ ascended into heaven where he now sits at the right hand of the God he represented, and since this is the case, God existed before Christ came to earth and He exists now after Christ went back to heaven.

We can say too, that given the attributes normally ascribed to Deity, such as, eternity, immortality, omnipotence, omniscience, and so on, then since God has been seen to exist at least one time by being represented by Christ, then it is not unreasonable or illogical to say that therefore God has always existed? Now too I think we can see why the atheists will not go near Christ

Now we come back to the presupposition of the Bible, that it presupposes the existence of God and that presupposition is never questioned just as the presupposition of a builder of every house is not questioned. Deity does not come and go in and out of existence. Since Christ is the exact representation, character, and explanation of God, then God has always existed. Reasonable people since Christ cannot question these presuppositions, which as we well know, exist in both biblical and secular history.

