

July 12, 2009

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD, Part Two

Jeffery Woodhams

When I was my eldest son's age, home computers were new, expensive, and hard to find. However, my small school hired a computer teacher who brought his own computers with him--maybe five or six Radio Shack Tandy computers. Some of you remember those. Those early computers had very limited memory storage, and I remember learning to write simple programs with strings and variables. I would have to rewrite the program each time I logged on because I didn't have and couldn't afford a floppy disk, and back then, computer hard drives were pretty much unheard of.

Radio Shack did come up with a novel addition, though: they made the first (I believe) hard drive for a home computer. This hard drive was the size of the whole computer and had to be plugged into the computer. It was a huge device. Today's hard drives are very small and fit inside the computer (generally speaking). This was a groundbreaking advance back in that day. Nowadays it is not uncommon for hard drives to be able to hold hundreds of gigabytes of information (*giga* means *billion*), but this first drive was a whopping 5 megabytes (*mega* means *million*). The funny thing is that back then, the sales pitch was, "Well, you know, 5 whole megabytes...that's more room than you'll *ever* need!" A 100 gigabyte hard drive today would hold as much information as 20 million of those early hard drives. The density of information we can store now has increased. We see this in the progress from a CD to a DVD to a BluRay disc today as well--they are all the same physical size but the BluRay disc holds a far, far greater amount of information. What do these things all hold? *Information*.

Some of you may be thinking at this point, "Wow, Brother Jeff is quite a computer geek!" Well, yes, I confess that I do have computer skills: I can repair almost any computer problem with just two tools: a *hammer* and a *credit card*! If I'm lacking a hammer, I may even use my head to apply blunt force trauma to the machine.

Now, a few weeks ago I shared with you the kind of information density found in the DNA of every living cell--that the amount of DNA that would make up the volume of the head of a pin, if we were to type out the code in that DNA, would make a stack of books 500 times higher than the distance from the earth to the moon. But now let's look at this another way--what if we took that same volume, the amount of matter contained in the head of a pin, and stretched it out into a wire with the same width as a strand of DNA? You see, DNA is a single molecule. So if we took the mass of the head of a pin and stretched it out until it were as thin as a strand of DNA, how long would it be? Well, the earth measures about 40,000 kilometers around at the equator, or about 25,000 miles. Our wire that we stretched out would go *all the way around the earth at its equator*...a little more than 33 times!¹ That's how thin a strand of DNA is, and yet is encoded with an incredibly complex message.

In part one of this message, we discussed how the Law of Cause and Effect shows us that it is entirely reasonable to believe in an eternally existing, all-powerful, loving, living creator God. Today it is my intention to show that it is reasonable to believe in this God based on the design and information that

1 Werner Gitt, "Dazzling Design in Minature," *Creation* 20(1):6. Available at <http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v20/i1/design.asp>

we find in His creation. First Cause, design, and information are all powerful testimonies to the existence of God, but *they are by no means the only testimonies*. Even within these categories I have to select what I have to say because there is just too much to say. We could study God's design in creation for weeks on end, but I think some people would probably start to complain if I went that long in this sermon!

You know, you can't watch a show about nature without hearing the word *design* over and over. Evolutionists attribute this design to random chance and natural selection; but what does design show? It shows intelligence! Design is the evidence of intelligence.

Let's say a scientist discovers stone tools alongside bones in a cave. Why would he be excited? Because the tools speak of intelligence! Scientists recognize that the tools could not have made themselves.² The building you are in today is not the result of an explosion from a brick factory or a tornado sweeping through a junk pile. It was carefully planned and built from selected materials with the proper tools, and all in the proper proportions necessary. You'll further note that this building is not improving with age--it must be maintained with intelligent input.

The largest stone building in the world is the Great Pyramid of Khufu (or Cheops in Greek). This monument has a foundation of about 13 acres square; and yet the foundation is level from corner to corner to within 1/4 of one inch. How the ancient builders did that is beyond the scope of my sermon; my point is that the building itself shows remarkable intellectual and skillful craftsmanship; and yet this incredible achievement is far less impressive than the design we see carried out in every aspect of the natural world.

I will only be able to give a few examples here today; but the universe is full of incredible design. Let's start at the level of basic chemistry needed to form the proteins which are used in living things. Evolutionists such as Richard Dawkins contend:

...[B]efore the coming of life on earth, some rudimentary evolution of molecules could have occurred by ordinary processes of physics and chemistry. There is no need to think of design or purpose or directedness. If a group of atoms in the presence of energy falls into a stable pattern it will tend to stay that way.³

But is this really a way of explaining the origin of life? Dr. Charles McComb, who has over 20 chemical patents, puts it this way:

When evolutionary scientists study the origins of life, they propose that all life resulted from chemical reactions by natural processes, overlooking the fact that chemical processes do not "naturally" behave in this manner. If you accepted chemical reactions as they occur, you would not believe that life came solely from chemicals. Is it legitimate to propose that evolution started in some primordial soup, when the long chain polymers that are present in proteins and DNA are so complicated that the level of chemical control needed during the chain building process is beyond the realm of natural chemistry?⁴

2 Ken Ham, "Is There Really a God?"

3 Richard Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976, 2006), 13.

4 Charles McComb, "Evolution Hopes You Don't Know Chemistry: The Problem of Control." Available at <http://www.icr.org/index.php?module=articles&action=view&ID=45>

After a detailed discussion of the precision involved in the sequence of DNA, he continues:

The problem with life arising from chemicals is a three-fold problem: chemical stability, chemical reactivity, and chemical selectivity during the chain building process. But evolutionists propose that these complex polymer chains built themselves in a precise, unlikely pattern, *without* an intelligent chemist controlling the reactions.⁵

And then he lists a number of problems, but I will only share one for the purpose of this discussion:

Chemical stability is a question of whether the components can even react at all. By definition, all components in a hypothetical primordial soup would be stable, because if they were not, they would have already reacted. Amino acids are relatively stable in water and do not react to form proteins in water, and nucleotides do not react to form DNA. In order to make amino acids and nucleotides react to form a polymer, they must be chemically activated to react with other chemicals. But this chemical activation must be done in the absence of water because the activated compounds will react with water and break down. How could proteins and DNA be formed in a hypothetical primordial watery soup if the activated compounds required to form them cannot exist in water? This is the problem of Chemical Stability.⁶

The stable amino acids require water, but they cannot be formed into compounds in water. Even if proposed evolutionary processes could make it to this stage, natural laws stop the process right here. But there is much more to be said. The author continues in showing that the processes would have to assemble the amino acids and nucleotides in an extremely precise order into which no randomness can enter.

When I used to fly small airplanes, the first thing we would do before flying was to inspect the airplane. Do you know what we would look for? Missing and broken parts. We would look for missing screws and nuts and bolts. When I fly in an airplane, I want all the parts to be there, and in the proper place. You wouldn't fly with someone who had a bucket of spare parts that had come off his aircraft that he "hadn't had time to replace," would you? Let's say we take all six million pieces of an airliner and put them into a pile somewhere. None of these pieces can fly by itself. They must all be fashioned together intelligently, and the pieces themselves must be correctly fashioned in the first place. If we take all six million pieces and leave them alone long enough, will time, chance, and natural selection build an airplane? No. There is design in every part, down to the smallest screw. Living things are like that. There is design in them: the molecules are designed; the organs are designed; the appendages are designed; the systems (nervous, skeletal, muscular, etc.) are designed both as components and as functioning systems. And, of course, the whole organism is designed. There is design at every level. The design is impossible to escape.

We could talk about the incredible design of any organ in your body. The eye is an incredible example of design, but you must understand this: even with all of the proper parts in the proper places, your eyes could not function without imperceptibly tiny muscle movements.

One fascinating discovery in the study of modern ophthalmology (eye science) is that . . . there

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

are three almost imperceptibly tiny eye movements. These three . . . are caused by minute contractions in the six muscles attached to the outside of each of your eyes. Every fraction of a second they very slightly shift the position of your eyeball, automatically, without conscious effort on your part, making sight as you know it possible.⁷

Without these tiny muscle movements, normal sight would be impossible. It is impossible to think of this evolving by random chance; and yet evolutionists realize that the difference in eyes between various species is so great that Richard Dawkins acknowledges that the eye must have evolved several times *independently!*⁸

Living here in the South, I've seen many armadillos--but not many living ones! It's a funny looking little critter. Did you know that they aren't native to this region, though? They came up from South and Central America, and to get here they crossed the Rio Grande around the year 1880. Wait a minute--armadillos can swim? Well, not really. Did you know that the armadillo is the only land animal that can force air into its stomach and intestines, enabling it to float? It's true. Since no other land animal can do this, evolutionists can't determine how the ability evolved. By the way, they can also hold their breath underwater for about six minutes, and can therefore, with their heavy armor, just walk across the bottom of a body of water. The armadillo is just one of many, many examples of living things, both plant and animal, which have design features not found in other living things and which cannot be explained by the teachings of evolution.

There are innumerable examples of design in biology and in every other field of science. The universe itself is finely tuned for life:

- The electromagnetic coupling constant binds electrons to protons in atoms. If it were smaller, fewer electrons could be held. If it were larger, electrons would be held too tightly to bond with other atoms.
- Ratio of electron to proton mass (1:1836). Again, if this were larger or smaller, molecules could not form.
- Carbon and oxygen nuclei have finely tuned energy levels.
- Electromagnetic and gravitational forces are finely tuned, so the right kind of star can be stable.
- Our sun is the right colour. If it was redder or bluer, photosynthetic response would be weaker.
- Our sun is also the right mass. If it were larger, its brightness would change too quickly and there would be too much high energy radiation. If it were smaller, the range of planetary distances able to support life would be too narrow; the right distance would be so close to the star that tidal forces would disrupt the planet's rotational period. UV radiation would also be inadequate for photosynthesis.
- The earth's distance from the sun is crucial for a stable water cycle. Too far away, and most water would freeze; too close and most water would boil.
- The earth's gravity, axial tilt, rotation period, magnetic field, crust thickness, oxygen/nitrogen ratio, carbon dioxide, water vapour and ozone levels are just right.⁹

Sir Fred Hoyle, who developed the Big Bang theory and spent years trying to revise it before discarding it, made this statement: "Commonsense interpretation of the facts is that a super-intelligence

7 Tom Wagner, "Darwin versus the Eye," *Creation Ex Nihilo* 16 (September, 1994): 10-13. Available at <http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v16/i4/eye.asp>

8 Dawkins, p. 24.

9 "The Universe Is Finely Tuned for Life." Available at <http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/510.asp>.

has monkeyed with physics, as well as chemistry and biology, and that there are no blind forces in nature.”¹⁰

Again, these are just a few examples of obvious design, because there are too many to discuss in one, or even a hundred or a thousand sermons. We need to turn our attention briefly to information.

Any organized system is the product of information. This building is the product of intelligent input of information. The piano, the stained glass, the sound system--everything is the product of information. It takes information to build anything. Let's say we built a house on the side of a hill, such as you've maybe seen in the Smoky Mountains. The house is built from materials that are fashioned together according to a plan. Now, given time and chance, any number of things might cause that house to roll down the hill--mudslide, earthquake, tornado, or even just the normal processes that cause deterioration over time. When that house rolls down the hill, it will disassemble--it will "lose information." Rolling it back up the hill will not restore that information; the rubble will still be rubble. Nor will rolling rubble down the hill cause a gain of information and build a house, no matter how many times you try. That's the way the information in the universe exists. Everything, from the formation of stars and the solar system, to the formation of DNA inside the cells of your body, exists because of information that it was built with. That information can be subtracted or altered, but nothing in the realm of science has ever shown that information can be added to what already exists.

As information scientist Dr. Werner Gitt has observed, "There is no known law of nature, no known process and no known sequence of events which can cause information to originate by itself in matter."¹¹

Let's put this in the simplest of terms. I want you to imagine two floral arrangements, one real and one artificial. We examine both. It becomes obvious to us which is real and which is fake. The fake one is made of plastic. The fake is obviously a man-made product--no one in his right mind would suggest that the fake one evolved or was the product of random chance. We are in one hundred percent agreement that the fake one was produced by guided processes. Likewise, we agree that the vase in which the arrangements are placed are man made, the products of a guided manufacturing process. The flowers, too, were arranged by an intelligent arranger--neither the fake flowers nor the real were put into the vase by random chance. However, there is a divided opinion about the real flowers. Some suggest that they are, in fact, the product of millions of years of unguided, random processes, even though the sheer amount of information to produce these flowers is astronomically more than the information needed to produce the fake flowers, the vases, and put them in arrangement combined. Carl Sagan observed that the information contained in a simple, single cell bacterium would fill over 100 million pages of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*.¹²

Just as rolling rubble together can't build a house, or throwing parts in the path of tornado can't build an airplane, so natural processes can't build the building blocks of life, improve upon them, and reproduce them as evolutionists would have us believe. My stated intention in this sermon is to show

10 Ibid.

11 Werner Gitt, *In the Beginning was Information*, Christliche Literatur-Verbreitung e. V.: Bielefeld, Germany, 1997, p. 107. Quoted in "Evolution: Bad Economics" by Dave Mateer. Available at <http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs2002/0709widgets.asp>.

12 Tom Wagner, "Creation in a Basket," *Creation* 17 (March 1995):38-39. Available at <http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v17/i2/basket.asp>.

you that it is reasonable to believe in an eternally existing, all-powerful, loving, living creator God. Whether or not you choose to do so is entirely up to you, but there is no lack of evidence for His existence as shown by the universe around us. It is only by suppressing the evidence and refusing to believe that one can conclude that there is no God.

In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth--He is the First Cause, the Designer and Programmer of all.