

Are Arguments for God as a Creator Just a God of the Gaps Approach?

Often, when I propose a need for God as a creator, I hear that I am just reviving the God of the gaps approach. In the past, when science couldn't explain something, it was just explained by saying God did it. The expression may only date to the late 19th century, but the concept goes back to very ancient times. The concept has included explanations for common events like why it rained (God made it rain). Today, we look to meteorology for why it rained or why it will rain (though I have regretted making plans based on a forecast a week ahead of time). As a Christian, I believe that God could miraculously make it rain or orchestrate conditions to make it rain or not rain. However, as a modern person, I accept that natural conditions can control rainfall.



So, when I say something like chirality poses a problem for natural origin of life proposals, I often hear I am pulling a God of the gaps fallacy. I am told that we just don't have all the data yet. This is followed by hearing one or both of the following:

1. When we get enough data, we will figure it out;
2. We should expect to figure it out because the more data we get, the less necessary it becomes to insert God into the picture.

Despite these responses, I can say that I am not taking a God of the gaps approach. We already have a lot of data about the way many processes act; that data says natural explanations don't work. Of course, more future data can come into play. But, at what point do we say that anything drastically new seems very unlikely? At that point, to take the stance of #1 above, a person has to make a blind faith statement. To invoke divine intervention is at least as reasonable as that. Remember, I am not trying to prove God with these arguments. I am just trying to say strong arguments can be put forth for God's existence. I further say that when all the objective arguments get added up, a compelling case can be made for God. After that, faith and experience also come into play (see my blog writing on faith).

It can also be stated that position number 2 from above does not hold true. New findings do not always strengthen the idea that God is not needed. Many findings in the last 50 years have weakened natural origin theories. Here are two examples:

<https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.7878460> and

<https://evolutionnews.org/2023/09/another-headache-for-the-rna-world-theory/>.

Interestingly, some support on this front has come from atheist champions of purely natural origins. Some have said that proposing intelligent design does not fall into a God of the Gaps philosophy. A really good description of one example of this can be [found here](#).