

Evolution: Improbable or Impossible? *Is God's Existence Logical, Part II*

By [COGwriter](#)

Just how solid is the foundation of the theory of evolution? Is it based on improbabilities as its critics suggest and some supporters admit, or is it absolutely impossible? Is God's existence more logical?

The Bible teaches:

21 Prove all things; hold fast that which is good. (1 Thessalonians 5:21, KJV)

So, can aspects of God's existence be proven or is evolution a more logical conclusion? This article will provide information to assist those interested in the truth prove which is more logical.

Probabilities or Impossibilities?

Some who claim evolution is improbable point out the fact that various amino acids (which always occur 50:50 in nature in the levo and dextro forms) must have for some unknown reason, only congregated in the levo forms which are the only forms in living proteins.

These would then have had to line up in liquid in a particular sequence for certain proteins, including genes, to be produced. This improbability has been estimated to be so high that it could not have been expected to happen by chance (also, even having amino acids in sequence would not cause them to form the necessary proteins without some type of external catalyst).

On the other hand, some supporters of evolution point out the belief that since there are vast numbers of stars, and probably several planets per star, there are enough possible random sequences to overwhelm the probability in favor of such improbable occurrences.

One version of this theory, embraced by some who believe aliens inhabit other planets, is known as the *Drake Equation*. Of course, those who make this argument must realize that the probability of any planet other than Earth having what it takes to support life is remote (the *Drake Equation*, which was developed based on assumptions in the 1960s, seemingly vastly overstates the number of apparently suitable planets). But once again those supporters tend to point to evolution as at least a possibility.

Thus both sides tend to argue that the laws of probability support their position.

Are Functional Computers the Result of Random Chance?

It has been argued that the fact that there is natural law, design, and order in the universe, this proves that there was a law giver, designer, and order maker in the universe.

Before looking at living systems, let's first consider computers.

Does anyone really think that functional laptop computers, for example, randomly have appeared anywhere in the universe, and when they did, they appeared with software on them and electricity to run them?

If you show almost anyone a functional laptop computer and ask, "Do you believe that someone made this or that it just appeared?" When I asked someone that specific question about the laptop I wrote this article on, she gave me a puzzled look like perhaps I meant something else as this did not seem to be logical to her. She then said that she felt that someone had to have made the laptop and that it did not randomly form. And that is what pretty much everyone would say. With a laptop computer, we could consider that the hardware is sort of like protein, the software sort of like DNA, and the battery sort of like for living organisms. Could laptop computers just appear randomly with hardware, software, and electricity?

No thinking person would conclude that it did. If a functional laptop (or something like that) was found on Mars or elsewhere, people would logically conclude that it must have been made by some intelligent being.

Yet many seem to feel that life, which is so much more complicated even at the cellular level, randomly formed and it randomly came alive. This is illogical to believe, though many who consider themselves educated claim to believe it none-the-less.

Does a functional creation require a Creator? Notice some of what the Bible teaches on this subject:

19 Because what may be known of God is manifest in them, for God has shown it to them. 20 For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse, 21 because, although they knew God, they did not glorify Him as God, nor were thankful, but became futile in their thoughts, and their foolish hearts were darkened. 22 Professing to be wise, they became fools NKJV (Romans 1:19-22, NKJV throughout except as otherwise noted).

Similarly I Corinthians says,

Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this age? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?...But God has chosen the foolish things of the world to put to shame the wise, and God has chosen the weak things of the world to put to shame the things which are mighty (1:20,27).

God has designed the universe and the life within it. It is not wise or logical to believe otherwise.

What about Life?

Getting back to the probability and improbabilities arguments, if it is granted that the necessary chain of amino acids randomly exist and come together, what will occur?

Why nothing, because amino acids of themselves are not alive. Furthermore, they would also have to have lined up with the occurrences of various other biological materials such as lipids and carbohydrates, and that also combined at the correct time. But that still would not make anything alive.

Instead of accepting this reality, hard-line evolutionists then claim that it was possible that there was some change in the atmospheric conditions of the Earth (or some other planet whose life somehow ended up on Earth) that allowed the non-living to somehow come alive. While true scientists do not doubt that there have been different atmospheric conditions on Earth throughout its history, there is no scientific proof that any atmospheric condition could cause non-living matter to become even a primitive live cell (and the available evidence suggests that the Earth has not had the type of atmospheric conditions to cause non-living matter to come alive).

Actually it is impossible for the non-living to become alive as it violates the scientifically accepted law of *biogenesis* (life only comes from life). But some so-called scientists have decided that they must disregard this--the Bible warns of "science, falsely so-called" (1 Timothy 6:62, KJV).

A Series of Impossibilities Should Lead One to Realize the Existence of God

Even if we allow the possibility of spontaneous primitive life to have occurred, what would happen?

The primitive life would have to die.

Part of the reason for this is that even a single-cell is so complex, and so full of various biological subsystems, that scientists have learned that many systems are essentially necessary for life to exist or continue. Science recognizes that living organisms must be self-contained, eat, digest, and reproduce to continue to exist.

There are basically two type of cells, prokaryotes and eukaryotes. Prokaryotes are mainly bacteria, and eukaryotes almost everything else. They both have membranes, ribosomes, organelles of digestion, and DNA containing nuclei. Eukaryotes contain 21 amino acids, and they all need to be in the right places and in the right proportions for life to exist.

Spontaneously alive lined-up amino acids/proteins (with other substances coincidentally there) would die because:

- 1) All living organisms need biological structures such as organelles and membranes. Within the membranes they contain intracellular water-soluble components. Without a membranous structure, the proteins would ultimately diffuse and destroy the living organism. Living organism

must be somewhat self-contained.

2) All living organisms need nourishment and direction. Since randomness would not have created the biological structure known as a DNA-containing nucleus (or some primitive equivalent), the cell would die. Even if it had some type of nucleus to provide direction, the nucleus would have to have come into existence with ability to determine what to eat and how to find food, another impossibility.

3) Proteins cannot survive without DNA and DNA cannot exist without proteins, hence there is no way both happened at the same time.

4) Even if the cell had all the above with simultaneous protein and DNA, it would die, because there would have been no reason for it to have spontaneously generated a digestive system in order to utilize the food.

5) Even if evolutionists are granted all the improbabilities and impossibilities this article discusses, the primitive life would quickly die out as there would have been no reason for it to have spontaneously generated an ability to reproduce, nor would it have any innate ability to do so.

Let's look at this is a slightly different way:

1. If all the amino acids were to align (as improbable as it would be), it will not become alive. So that step is impossible.
2. If this primitive cell were to somehow become alive, it would die. Why? Because cells contain intracellular water-soluble components, and it is a fact of physics that water-soluble components will dissipate/destroy without a membrane. Thus, going beyond this step is impossible.
3. If this cell did have a membrane, what would happen next? It would die. Why? Because it would not have the innate ability to deduce that it needed to eat as it did not form with a nucleus. The nucleus is the part of the cell that contains DNA and other instructions.
4. Presuming it is in liquid and it runs into food, what will happen? Yes, it will die. Why? Because it was not randomly formed with digestive ability, it will not be able to digest and utilize the food. Thus, going beyond this step is impossible.
5. Presuming it was randomly formed with a nucleus and digestive abilities, what will happen? It will die out. Why, because it would also have had to be randomly formed with the instructions that it needed to be able to reproduce as well as the ability to do so. Evolution as the origin of life is not just improbable, it is impossible.

It is in the Bible that we are told that when God made life He intended it to reproduce (Genesis 1:11,28,29).

The idea of an 'intelligent design' by a Spirit being is the only explanation that does not defy scientifically provable knowledge--for all other explanations result in something that must die out.

Proteins cannot of themselves reproduce--they need DNA. "DNA cannot exist without proteins, and proteins cannot exist without DNA" (Pietzsch J. Understanding the RNAissance. c. 2003. <http://www.nature.com/horizon/rna/background/understanding.html> viewed 05/05/12). DNA can basically do nothing of itself, it needs proteins. Does any scientifically rational person actually

believe that they randomly developed and got together at the same time for life as we know it to exist without Divine intervention?

The answer should be obvious. No.

By the way, as mentioned before, God expects humans to realize that He exists through various aspects of His creation (Romans 1:20).

Thus since life could not have randomly sprung forth, eaten, and reproduced, only a different type of entity (God) could have caused it to begin. Here is a link to a YouTube video titled [Quickly Disprove Evolution as the Origin of Life](#) and one to a longer sermon titled [Is it logical to believe in God?](#)

Charles Darwin Admitted that Details Could "Absolutely Break Down" His Theory

It may be of interest to note that Charles Darwin, the human credited for the so-called scientific development of the theory of evolution (and to be technical, evolution is a model and not a scientific theory), wrote the following in his book *The Origin of the Species*:

If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down (Darwin C. *The Origin of Species*. In Chapter 6, Difficulties on Theory. Cricket House Books LLC, 2010, p. 124).

And although he did not believe that was demonstrated to his satisfaction when he wrote that, the truth is that cellular life was simply much more complex than he at that time realized.

Thus, even Charles Robert Darwin's writings contain an admission that he understood that additional complexity would disprove his theory (perhaps it should be noted that the discovery of DNA would seem to qualify as sufficient complexity that he was unaware of). Of course, scientists know that random amino acids also do not come with DNA. And while this was not known at Darwin's time, this is known now.

Darwin himself seemed to acknowledge that life could not have started on its own. He seemed to, some degree, rely on the biblical account in the Book of Genesis as he wrote:

There is a grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, **having been originally breathed by the Creator** into a few forms or into one (*The Origin Of Species By Charles Darwin*, 2nd and subsequent editions).

Thus, apparently Darwin recognized the impossibility of life starting on its own without a Creator (God).

Darwin's Denounced Those Who Made a Religion of His Origin Positions

What many do not know is that Charles Darwin disapproved of how many overly accepted his theories. And many scientists have accepted beliefs that are not highly logical.

It has been reported:

The opium of the people

The atheistic philosopher Karl Marx, an evolutionist and a contemporary of Charles Darwin, once called religion the “opium of the people.” In our day, however, Darwin’s theories and their successors have become the “opium of the people”—dulling the mindset of the educated and uneducated alike.

Even without any semblance of genuine evidence, countless millions have made a “religion” out of their blind faith that life originated from lifeless chemicals and that all living beings today are descended from primitive life forms which emerged from the primordial ooze billions of years ago.

Even Charles Darwin himself expressed surprise at how readily people adopted his theories: “I was a young man with unformed ideas. I threw out queries, suggestions, wondering all the time about everything and to my astonishment the ideas took like wildfire. People made a religion out of them.”

What did Darwin mean when he stated that “people made a religion” out of his theories?

Simply put: the idea that life spontaneously evolved from non-life is a belief requiring a firm faith in something that has no proof. “Spontaneous generation” describes a theory of the origin of life—the living springing out of the nonliving.

Scientists long ago abandoned the simple-minded assumption that maggots spontaneously generated out of meat left in open-air meat markets. As soon as it was discovered that flies were laying their eggs in the meat, “spontaneous generation” was laughed to scorn.

The false religion of evolution, though, still makes the claim that, at some point in history, spontaneous generation must have occurred. Way back in past eons of time—somehow, somewhere—the first living organism spontaneously generated from nonliving matter.

Nobel Prize winner Dr. George Wald, from Harvard University, stated the following: “One has only to contemplate the magnitude of this task to concede that the spontaneous generation of a living organism is impossible. Yet, here we are as a result, I believe, of spontaneous generation.”

Talk about blind faith with absolutely no proof! This was an admission that spontaneous generation is impossible. But this very educated Nobel Prize winner still believed! (Fall J. The opium of the people. Commentary,| Thursday, April 23, 2009).

And Dr. Fall is correct. It rarely fails to astound me how the slightly educated can insist that evolution is scientifically accurate and why they want people to mindlessly accept such a preposterous explanation of the origins of life.

The fact is that evolution is a false religion that many cling to so that they do not bother to look into the truth about why they are on this planet nor what their life really is supposed to be about.

Darwin Was Wrong About the Appendix

One of the myths that Darwin began that was perpetuated throughout the 19th and 20th centuries was that the appendix was a vestigial organ for humans that they evolved out of needing.

Appendix May Be Useful Organ After All

Provided by  LIVE SCIENCE.

By CHARLES Q. CHOI

Aug. 24) — The body’s appendix has long been thought of as nothing more than a worthless evolutionary artifact, good for nothing save a potentially lethal case of inflammation.

Now researchers suggest the appendix is a lot more than a useless remnant. Not only was it recently proposed to actually possess a critical function, but scientists now find it appears in nature a lot more often than before thought. And it’s possible some of this organ’s ancient uses could be recruited by physicians to help the human body fight disease more effectively.

“Maybe it’s time to correct the textbooks,” said researcher William Parker, an immunologist at Duke University Medical Center in Durham, N.C. “Many biology texts today still refer to the appendix as a ‘vestigial organ.’”

Slimy Sac

The vermiform appendix is a slimy dead-end sac that hangs between the small and large intestines. No less than Charles Darwin first suggested that the appendix was a vestigial organ from an ancestor that ate leaves, theorizing that it was the evolutionary remains of a larger structure, called a cecum, which once was used by now-extinct predecessors for digesting food.

“Everybody likely knows at least one person who had to get their appendix taken out — slightly more than 1 in 20 people do — and they see there are no ill effects, and this suggests that you don’t need it,” Parker said.

However, Parker and his colleagues recently suggested that the appendix still served as a vital safehouse where good bacteria could lie in wait until they were needed to repopulate the gut after a nasty case of diarrhea. Past studies had also found the appendix can help make, direct and train white blood cells...

Moreover, the appendix appears in nature much more often than previously acknowledged. It has evolved at least twice, once among Australian marsupials such as the wombat and another time among rats, lemmings, meadow voles, Cape dune mole-rats and other rodents, as well as humans and certain primates...

Parker told LiveScience. "It's just that Darwin simply didn't have the information we have now."

He added, "If Darwin had been aware of the species that have an appendix attached to a large cecum, and if he had known about the widespread nature of the appendix, he probably would not have thought of the appendix as a vestige of evolution." <http://news.aol.com/health/article/researchers-say-appendix-has-uses/637211?icid=main|htmlws-main|dl1|link3|http%3A%2F%2Fnews.aol.com%2Fhealth%2Farticle%2Fresearchers-say-appendix-has-uses%2F637211>

I never accepted Darwin's claims against the appendix and have known for many years that the appendix played a role in maintaining a properly functioning digestive system for humans (but this information about its role in white blood cells is new to me).

I remember being taught that humans having an appendix was proof that it was a vestigial organ—"useless organ" that we were somehow stuck with after we supposedly evolved past the point of needing it. But it is not even true that the appendix is useless, only that scientists often do not know all the facts the suggest that they know. Also notice the following:

A Vestigial Organ? The appendix is an organ that evolutionists have viewed as an unnecessary part of the body. Removal of the organ is a common practice in the western world. However, recent research sheds new light on why God created the appendix. Duke University scientists discovered that the appendix is designed to help the body handle and manage bacteria in the gut. It also manufactures "good bacteria"—playing a significant role in keeping us healthy (*MSNBC.msn.com*, October 5, 2007). Scientists are just now discovering the answers to "why an appendix?"—answers that God knew when He designed the human body. Human nature tends to dismiss items, concepts, and even body organs, as unimportant or "no longer useful," *if we do not understand their purpose*. Yet, 3,000 years ago, David asked, "What is man that You are mindful of him?" (Psalm 8:4). David concluded, "I will praise You, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; marvelous are Your works" (Psalm 139:14). David demonstrated his teachability and "faith" in what he could not see and understand (Psalm 119:27)—unlike many today who deny a purpose *until* and unless they can first demonstrate it. It is exciting to watch modern research substantiate the validity of Scripture and a God-ordained creation (World Ahead Weekly Update. March 13, 2008).

The reality is that Darwin made a lot of assumptions that were unproven, and many of which have been scientifically proven to have been in error.

More on DNA

I am not the only one that understands about DNA. Some have gone into further detail and realized that DNA is not only more complicated than many have assumed, but that it contains evidence of design:

"The digital code in DNA points powerfully to a **designing intelligence behind the origin of life**. Unlike previous arguments for intelligent design, DNA By Design presents a radical and comprehensive new case, revealing evidence not merely of individual features of biological complexity but rather of a fundamental constituent of the universe: information." <http://www.amazon.com/DNA-Design-Stephen-C-Meyer/dp/B0040MPOI2> <http://www.stephencmeyer.org/biography.php>

To build their circuits, the **researchers used pieces of DNA to make so-called logic gates** -- devices that produce on-off output signals in response to on-off input signals. Logic gates are the building blocks of the digital logic circuits that allow a computer to perform the right actions at the right time. In a conventional computer, logic gates are made with electronic transistors, which are wired together to form circuits on a silicon chip. Biochemical circuits, however, consist of molecules floating in a test tube of salt water. Instead of depending on electrons flowing in and out of transistors, DNA-based logic gates receive and produce molecules as signals. The molecular signals travel from one specific gate to another, connecting the circuit as if they were wires. <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/06/110602153032.htm>

Again, science supports the idea of a created, not evolved, cell. Going back to the laptop argument, computers do not function without software--they are useless without it. Life does not function without DNA. Both are needed at the same time.

Comments About Other Evolution Arguments

Evolutionists, of course, have come up with a variety of arguments to try to justify their position. But upon further review, they tend not to hold up to long-term scientific scrutiny.

The March 1, 2008 issue of *New Scientist* makes the following claims:

“Yet the idea still persists that the fossil record is too patchy to provide good evidence of evolution. One reason for this is the influence of creationism. Foremost among their tactics is to distort or ignore the evidence for evolution; a favourite lie is “there are no transitional fossils”. This is manifestly untrue.”

“Creationists simply have no answer for such irrefutable evidence.”

Of course, the above is false.

The history of evolutionist “proof” has been riddled with made-up “evidence,” lies, and ignoring the laws of science (all living organisms must have the ability to eat and digest or life would never continue for more than maybe a day or so--and some type of brain/DNA seems to be needed for life to exist).

For example, speaking of made up proof, I remember looking at drawings supposedly of human and non-human embryos in a science text in school, only to learn later that the drawings were not accurate, but were modified to make the embryos look more similar in order to support “evolution”.

I also recall seeing pictures of dark moths on trees in the UK which supposedly proved some aspect of evolution only to later learn that those moths do not stay on trees and were pinned on them for purposes of making a photo for evolutionary “proof”.

Furthermore, some of the early so-called “missing link” skulls for alleged human “evolution” turned out to be scientific frauds even though evolution accepting scientists accepted this evidence, sometimes for decades.

What about this “transitional fossils” argument?

Essentially, it seems that many evolutionists hope that if they can CLAIM some fossil is a “transitional species”, then this proves that there were some many other “transitional species” (which they never have produced complete evidence of) and that evolution is true.

But evolution has never actually provided that evidence. Furthermore, the concept of “transitional” species violates at least one of the principles of evolution. And that is, that the organism is developed to where it is best to survive. Or in other words, since (according to evolutionists) there is simply random development and the fittest survive, then there is absolutely no reason why any species is or could be “transitional”.

One so-called “transitional fossil” is supposed to be a reptile with feathers, allegedly proving that reptiles evolved into birds. But, that has also been proven to be false. Notice the following news items on that:

Paris - Palaeontologists have fired a broadside over a fossil which is the cornerstone evidence to back the theory that birds descended from dinosaurs.

The row focuses on *Sinosauropteryx*, a fossil found in 1994 by a farmer in Liaoning province, northeastern China, a treasure trove of the Early Cretaceous period some 130 million years ago.

About the size of a turkey, the long-tailed meat-eating dino was covered with a down of fibres that, Chinese researchers claimed, were primitive feathers.

That claim had the effect of a thunderclap.

Although the “feathers” were clearly not capable of flight, their existence dramatically supported a theory first aired in the 1970s that birds evolved from dinosaurs. As a result, a once-outlandish notion has become the mainstream concept for the ascent of Aves, as birds are classified.

But a new study, published by a team led by South African academic Theagarten Lingham-Soliar at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, sweeps away the proto-feathers claim.

The two-branched structures, called rachis with barbs, that were proclaimed as early feathers are quite simply the remains of a frill of collagen fibres that ran down the dinosaur’s back from head to tail, they say.

The evidence comes from a recently discovered specimen of *Sinoauropteryx*, also found in the same Yixian Formation at Liaoning, that Lingham-Soliar put to the scrutiny of a high-powered microscope.

“The fibres show a striking similarity to the structure and levels of organisation of dermal collagen,” the kind of tough elastic strands found on the skin of sharks and reptiles today, the investigators say.

The fibres have an unusual “beaded” structure, but this most likely was caused by a natural twisting of these strands, and a clumping together caused by dehydration, when the dinosaur died and its tissues started to dry.

The tough fibres could have been either a form of armour to protect the small dinosaur from predators, or perhaps had a structural use, by stiffening its tail.

The first known bird is *Archaeopteryx*, which lived around 150 million years ago.

What is missing are the links between *Archaeopteryx* and other species that would show how it evolved. But fossil record is frustratingly small and incomplete and this is why debate has been so fierce.

The birds-from-dinos theory is based on the idea that small, specialised theropod dinosaurs - theropods are carnivorous, bipedal dinos with three-toed feet - gained an advantage by developing plant-eating habits, growing feathers to keep warm and taking to the trees for safety.

From there, it was a relatively small step to developing gliding skills and then the ability to fly.

Lingham-Soliar’s team do not take issue with the theory itself.

But they are dismayed by what they see as a reckless leap to the conclusion that *Sinoauropteryx* had the all-important “protofeathers”, even though the this dinosaur was phylogenetically far removed from *Archaeopteryx*.

The evidence in support of the primitive feathers lacked serious investigation, Lingham-Soliar says.

“There is not a single close-up representation of the integumental structure alleged to be a protofeather,” Lingham-Soliar says.

Given that the evolution of the feather is a pivotal moment in the history of life, “scientific rigour is called for”.

The study appears on Wednesday in Proceedings of the Royal Society B, a journal of the Royal Society, Britain’s de-facto academy of sciences. http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?set_id=1&click_id=31&art_id=nw20070523091808579C659855

And even if there were feathers, since this creature apparently did not fly, it makes no sense to claim that it was evolving into something that would fly.

Evolution normally attempts to try to explain life beginning without a creator. Something that other laws of science show is not true.

The truth is that for life to randomly begin and have the immediate ability to find/ingest/digest food and to reproduce ignores various laws of science.

The other truth is that evolution is accepted by many who do not actually want to live God’s way of life, nor do those “believers” tend to take seriously the prophetic warnings of the Bible. Actually the Bible is supportive of the idea that those who accept theories like evolution have allowed their minds to de-evolve in the sense that they wish to believe a lie (Romans 1:18-32).

Carbon dating and similar techniques have long been used by evolutionists as "proof" that certain of their beliefs are correct. But is that method accurate? Notice something published on October 20, 2012:

Researchers discover secret of more precise carbon dating

By Stacey Pounsberry | October 20, 2012...

The process of radiocarbon dating relies on the known rate at which radioactive isotopes decay and measuring the remaining amount of radiocarbon within a sample. This ratio provides scientists with a precise estimate of how old a certain artifact might be. Complications in these calculations arrive from how the initial radiocarbon in the environment varies from year to year and from one part of the global carbon cycle to another.

Therefore, carbon dating often has a wide range, which could stretch anywhere from a couple hundred to a few thousand years...Professor Ramsey. “In most cases the radiocarbon levels deduced from marine and other records have not been too far wrong. However, having a truly terrestrial record gives us better resolution and confidence in radiocarbon dating.”

<http://www.belljarnews.com/2012/10/20/researchers-discover-secret-of-more-precise-carbon-dating/>

That last statement causes me to chuckle. In MOST (but not all) cases, carbon dating is BELIEVED by certain professors to not have been TOO FAR WRONG. Well, since there are problems with most dating methods, even those MOST CASES can still be quite wrong. This is almost comical.

Furthermore, what the article by Stacey Pounsberry implies, but tries to reason around, is that faulty claims of carbon dating have often been used by evolutionists as “proof” that their version of life on the planet, etc. are correct. Yet, scientists have long known that carbon dating is flawed and based upon assumptions that are not always truly scientific.

The plain truth is that evolutionists, and those that support them, are the ones that actually ignore science.

Comments From a Renowned Academic and Atheist

Sometimes, those who advocated evolution as the origin of life change their mind once they look into the details. And although Charles Darwin died before having detailed knowledge about DNA, others who have learned more about DNA have taken note.

One modern example who be Professor Anthony Flew:

"What I think the DNA material has done is show that intelligence must have been involved in getting these extraordinary diverse elements together," said Professor Antony Flew, 81, of the University of Reading, United Kingdom. "It could be a person in the sense of a being that has intelligence and a purpose, I suppose". (Richard Ostling, "Leading Atheist Now Believes in God", Associated Press report, Dec 9, 2004)... "Flew is one of the most renowned atheists of the 20th century . . . ," says the atheist writer Richard Carrier. "So if he has changed his mind to any degree, whatever you may think of his reasons, the event itself is certainly newsworthy" ("Antony Flew Considers God . . . Sort of," December 2004, www.infidels.org). Professor Flew mentions that his mind began to change for the existence of God and against atheism over the last year. One line of evidence that became a clincher was the biological investigation of DNA. He says in the video "Has Science Discovered God?" that DNA evidence "has shown, by the almost unbelievable complexity of the arrangements which are needed to produce [life], that intelligence must have been involved"...*The Sunday Times* of Britain also stated: "Darwin's theory of evolution does not explain the origin and development of life to Flew's satisfaction. 'I have been persuaded that it is simply out of the question that the first living matter evolved out of dead matter and then developed into an extraordinary complicated creature,' he said. The article went on to explain that Professor Flew is, in his words, "following the argument wherever it leads. The conclusion is—there must have been some intelligence" (DNA evidence prompts famous professor to renounce atheism. Good News, March-April 2005, p.17).

Of course, intelligence had to have been involved, which is why what is considered to be the Darwinian concept of evolution without a Creator is an impossibility.

Comments On Science and Religion From Albert Einstein

Perhaps this might be a good place to show a quote from the renowned physicist Albert Einstein:

Science without religion is lame, religion without science is blind (Albert Einstein, *"Science, Philosophy and Religion: a Symposium"*, 1941)

Although it seems like a lot of modern scientists have forgotten this, even National Geographic News, as recently as October 18, 2004 quoted the above in an article by Stefan Lovgren.

The truth is that scientists who do not believe in God are worse than blind--the blind cannot help it, those who could see it but refuse to are subject to condemnation:

Then some of the Pharisees who were with Him heard these words, and said to Him, "Are we blind also?" Jesus said to them, "If you were blind, you would have no sin; but now you say, 'We see.' Therefore your sin remains (John 9:40-41).

The Pharisees were part of the educated class of their day.

Conclusion

Science recognizes that living organisms must be self-contained, eat, digest, and reproduce. Living matter could not have progressed to the point of eating, digesting, or reproducing without intelligence. And there has been no plausible explanation of why initial life itself could have any intelligence.

No randomly occurring series of improbable and impossible events could have ever done that. Thus, the foundation of evolution is beyond being highly improbable. The foundation of evolution is completely impossible. Only the acceptance of a Creator God is logical to explain life.

And all the pointing to evolutionary "evidence" still does not prove that life began from non-life and somehow evolved to its present stage. The scientific evidence simply disproves evolution as the origin of life.

Christians realize:

1 In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. (Genesis 1:1)

And the facts of physics and biology clearly support that.

Belief in a Creator God is logical. It is only through the acceptance of the false religion of atheistic evolution that people foolishly conclude (cf. Psalm 14:1) the opposite.

And because there is no doubt that there is a Creator God, are you willing to completely live as He would have you live?

Here is a link to a YouTube video titled [Quickly Disprove Evolution as the Origin of Life](#) and one to a longer sermon titled [Is it logical to believe in God?](#)

[Back to home page](#)

Additional articles of related interest may include:

[Is God's Existence Logical, Part I?](#) Some say it is not logical to believe in God. Is that true?

[Living as a Christian: How and Why?](#) In what ways do Christians live differently than others. What about praying, fasting, tithing, holy days, and the world? There is also a YouTube video related to that also called: [Living as a Christian: How and Why?](#)

[Where Did God Come From?](#) Any ideas? And how has God been able to exist?

[How Old is the Earth and How Long Were the Days of Creation?](#) Does the Bible allow for the creation of the universe and earth billions of years ago? Why do some believe they are no older than 6,000 years old? What is the gap theory? Where the days of creation in Genesis 1:3 through 2:3 24 hours long?

[How is God Omnipotent, Omnipresent, and Omniscient?](#) Here is a biblical article which answers what many really wonder about it.

[What is the Meaning of Life?](#) Who does God say is happy? What is your ultimate destiny? Do you really know?

[Bible: Superstition or Authority?](#) Should you rely on the Bible? Is it reliable? [Herbert W. Armstrong](#) wrote this as a booklet on this important subject.

B. Thiel, Ph.D. Evolution: Improbable or Impossible? Is God's Existence Logical, Part II.
www.cogwriter.com 2004/2005/2006/2007/2007/2009/2011/2012/2013 0501

<http://www.cogwriter.com/evolution.htm>