

From DNA to Galaxies

Rom 1.18-20 – “For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without **excuse:**”

Introduction

- ❖ Last week we looked at the Cosmological argument for the existence of God and its implications. Today we will be looking at another argument type, the Teleological. Simply stated the Teleological (Teleo) is the argument that design implies a designer. The fact that the universe is bursting with the signs of design, point to a supreme engineer.
 - Today I would like to talk about several touch points for design. We will begin with a look at intelligent design and some of its sub categories.
- ❖ After years of Darwinian Evolution being the only option in biology a new and growing school of thought has emerged. Intelligent Design, named this for the idea that what we observe in Biology is too complex and organized to be random and therefore must have been designed. Things appear to have purpose and the probability of it happening by chance is mathematically impossible. As you can expect this doesn't sit well with naturalists and their true colors come out. Darwinist Richard Lewontin once said
 - “Our willingness to accept scientific claims that are against common sense is the key to an understanding of the real struggle between science and the supernatural. We take the side of science, in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfill man of its extravagant promises of health and life, in spite of the tolerance of scientific community for **unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment to materialism.** It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concept that produce material explanations, no matter how counterintuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover that materialism is absolute for we **cannot** allow a divine foot in the door.”
 - There is so much that is telling of the naturalists here. These men and women have a commitment to naturalism. This is a commitment that they will cling to despite evidence and proof that they are wrong. They will cling to the lie for the simple

reason that they do not want to face the fact that there was and is a creator of the universe.

- So what are some of these evidences and proofs that have the scientists chanting mantras as they hold their naturalist prayer beads? Many of them center on the Teleological Arguments.

Teleological Arguments

- ❖ Probably the most famous Teleo is William Paley's classic watchmaker analogy.
 - This argument goes something like...
 1. The complex inner workings of a watch necessitate an intelligent designer.
 2. As with a watch, the complexity of x (a particular organ or organism, the structure of the solar system, life, the universe, anything that is extremely complex) necessitates a designer as natural processes could never account for it.
 - Many Atheists have attempted to take a stab at this analogy and Darwinian evolution and natural selection has largely been the anti argument to this. Richard Dawkins even wrote *The Blind Watchmaker* to show how evolution answered this analogy. This answer is that natural processes must have given the appearance of design and are mistaken as design. In my opinion they have all fallen short of answering it as I believe Darwinian evolution is all but dead. The coffin is being nailed shut as we speak by many brilliant and talented scientists who have all found themselves moored in the harbors of intelligent design and no longer under the boughs of Darwin's tree of life.
- ❖ Irreducible complexity
 - "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." – Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of Species*, Ch 6 difficulties of the theory
 - Darwin himself was at least honest about his own lack of knowledge. His Theory was based on now over 150 year old technology and scientific

knowledge. He was bound to get things a little messed up. For scientists today to go on believing his theory without any question is ridiculous, as James Gills and Tom Woodward state in the introduction to their book *Darwinism under the microscope*.

- “Darwinism can no longer be granted a relaxed acceptance as it was for nearly all of the twentieth century. A new century has opened with nearly every aspect of Darwinism, every one of its branches, every line of its thought, under an intense scrutiny never before experienced. This is a healthy development, and long overdue, because an unexamined science tends to decay into a lazy, unaccountable caricature of science- one that substitutes suppositions and speculations for rigorous explanation.”
- Darwinism held the first chair throughout the 20th century, and Christianity or any form of creationism was not even allowed a voice in the academic world. Any opposition was silence and the person who stood for Christ was berated for their “religious biases”. Religion and Science had separated and a hard line drawn in the sand, But much of this is being reversed due to the efforts of men like Michael Behe and his work in the area of irreducible complexity.
- Irreducible Complexity is the idea that some organs and organisms are too complex to evolve. The irreducible part means that if you make only one slight modification to the organ or organism it will die or not function. Behe write about this in his book *Darwin’s Black Box*.
 - One example he gives is the common mouse trap. The mouse trap has 5 essential parts if you are missing one of them it will not work. You can build it one piece at a time but it will not trap mice until all pieces are present and in order. He goes on to explain the intricacies of the cells and flagellum motor. These are way more complex and need all their parts to function. No slow, successive model can account for them. Behe makes this analogy and shows us that without one part it won’t catch half the mice or even a quarter. The trap will catch no mice for it never can.
 - Behe defines Irreducible complexity as “a single system which is composed of several well-matched, interacting parts that contribute to the basic function, and where the removal of any one of the parts causes the system to effectively cease functioning.” Behe gives many examples of these sort of systems two of which we will consider as naturalists have attempted to falsify them.

- The first is the bacterial flagellum. This is a highly sophisticated out board motor, which can spin at 10,000 rpms and in a quarter turn reverse to 10,000. It has 40 distinct protein parts that are all necessary to function. Behe argues that this is impossible to be explained by natural processes but bears the distinguishing marks of design.
- He also gives the example of the blood clotting system found in living animals and humans.
- So what is the response of naturalism?
 - Barry Hall's, E. coli evolved operon. The claim some make of his experiment is that, subjected to certain elements the E. Coli evolved new ability to use lactose for food.
 - The next is a study by Bugge et al.(research group led by TH. Bugge) The experiment altered two groups of mice in regards to clotting. One could not clot the other could not remove clots. When cross breeding the two the double knockouts were alleviated from some symptoms.
- But do they show a natural growth of complex systems?
 - No for several reasons
 - They were intelligently designed experiments
 - All subjects were doomed to extinction without constant intelligent tampering
 - None would survive in wild, all were in highly controlled environments
 - All had non-functioning systems not partially functioning ones
- So what is the last gasp of naturalism against Irreducible complexity?
 - They say it can't be trusted because it is non-falsifiable.

- Behe explains “The danger of accepting an effectively unfalsifiable hypothesis is that science has no way to determine if the belief corresponds to reality.”
- The irony is that Darwinism is effectively unfalsifiable and not irreducible complexity as Behe again states “The claim of intelligent design is that “no unintelligent process could produce this system.” The claim of Darwinism is that “some unintelligent process could produce this system.” To falsify the first claim, one need only show that at least one unintelligent process could produce the system. TO falsify the second claim, one would have to show the system could not have been formed by any of a potentially infinite number of possible unintelligent processes, which is effectively impossible to do.”

❖ Design inference

- Design inference is based largely on Demski’s work. This basically is a mathematical formula that explains how humans distinguish design from naturally occurring phenomenon. The key components are recognizable patterns, complexity, and probability of natural occurrence. According to his theory the complexity and probability of biological life is not possibly explained by natural causes and must therefore be designed. This gave scientist a much needed formula that could be used as a filter between naturally occurring phenomenon and truly designed ones. This is how we tell an artifact from a rock ie and arrow head.
 - An example would be if you see a rock formation on vacation that looks like a face and the guide tells you it was eroded by wind and water and just appears to look like a face. Upon further inspection (from a different angle) you see he is right. Now fast-forward to the part when you get to MT. Rushmore on the tour. If the tour guide tells you the same thing would you believe him? Obviously not, because no one in their right mind would think that the faces of four U.S. Presidents would be randomly etched into the side of a mountain by water wind, yet Scientists have made astronomically larger assertions in saying all the biological life we see around us is just a product of time, chance and natural processes.

❖ Anthropic constants and Fine Tuning

- Anthropic Principle comes from the Greek word meaning human or man. This is the argument based on mounting evidence that the universe was designed very specifically to support human life. So many laws and constants effect humans many specifically that it is beyond comprehension that it could ever be possible without design.
 - Some examples from Geisler and Turek's book *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist* are...
 - Earth Oxygen Level – 21% if higher than 25 or lower than 15 we die.
 - The Atmosphere Transparency – any higher we would be microwaved or lower we would not get enough sunlight either way we die.
 - Moon earth Gravity interaction – any more or less, mass chaos in tidal and weather life would be extremely difficult if not impossible
 - CO2 levels – high we burn, low we suffocate
 - Gravity – if gravity were altered
.000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,01% the sun could not exist
 - They go on to list 10 more like this and state that at least 120 examples have been given!
 - This amount of precision is not possible in the least not for all of them or even a couple. Yet they all had to happen with this amount of exactness for our lives to be here. Obviously naturalism is grossly lacking in the explanations department.

❖ Information Theory

- Information Theory is the theory that coded messages and language require an intelligent agent to write them. This is what S.E.T.I. operates on. They are sending out mathematical patterns and sequences in the hope that it will be answered similarly. If a recognizable pattern returns it is proof of intelligent life outside earth.

- SO why does it matter? Because of the discovery of D.N.A. As we study it more and more we learn that it is the very thing that allows life to exist. We classify all things as alive or not based on if it has D.N.A. or not.
 - D.N.A. is a highly structured and organized language or code that specifies every detail of the living cells. It is building instructions and manufacturing specifications. Where did this vast amount of information come from? Information is not a physical thing although DNA is. The order must be exactly correct or no life is possible. So how does a highly specified set of assembly instructions just pop into order without someone tampering? Why would it be proof of aliens if the same thing came from space but because we already have the proof of intelligence in our cells it is ruled out?
- If you were walking on the Beach and came upon a note in the sand reading “take out the trash John” you would never assume that the tide came in and out and the waves and crustaceans just happen to leave trails in the sand that spelled out the message. Yet we are expected to take the scientists word when they say that the highly specified messages contained in every cell, (which is the equivalent to many large volumes or messages) came to the order they are by similar natural causes, but they don’t even believe this as they know information from space would be intelligence. This point cannot be overstated; information cannot evolve or pop into existence. Only a mind can comprehend it and only a mind can conceive it. The method use to write it changes nothing. I can type it, scrawl it in crayon, arrange objects, use pen or pencil and the information content stays the same. The letters H E L P in order, made with logs and rocks on a beach tell us someone is in need of aid. Not that the tide made a random pattern.

Response of Naturalism

- ❖ Holes in evolution – Take your time, take a chance, how many worlds would you like sir?
 - Traditionally, scientists have answered the critics saying that given enough time and chances life would eventually arise and given enough time and chances again it would eventually end up with us. Well, just how much time would it take?

- For life to arise by natural causes the 'experts' say that for even a simple life to arise in 5 billion years is a 1 in 10 to the 10¹¹⁰ power. Literally impossible, but hey who is counting?
- To evolve to us Carl Sagen estimates 1 in 10 to the 2 billionth power (quarter toss)
- So here the experts say "yea the odds are seemingly insurmountable but we have all the time and chances we need. Don't we???"
 - No, Modern Cosmology has re-dated the universe at only 13.7 Billion years young. This is a huge beyond huge, cut from previous estimates and has caused severe trauma to the naturalism camp. This is because they no longer have all the time in the world, but only a few precious billion years. Which means the odds are now truly impossible in so short of time.
- So, add in Irreducible complexity and gaps in the fossil record (an issue that Darwin was aware of but thought that paleontology would eventually catch up with his theory, It never did) and what do you get? , A new model of evolution, with almost as many problems as the original. This new model is necessary because even the naturalist can see the growing issues with Darwinian Evolution. Naturalist such as Richard Dawkins goes as far as saying that natural processes give the appearance of design, but are in fact not designed. They believe this will answer the teleo arguments.
- ❖ This new model is called Punctuated Equilibrium. In short it states that there is no transitional forms because evolution happened by quick leaps. A lizard laid an egg and a bird popped out.
 - This theory has many of the same problems like where did the new D.N.A. come from?
 - How probable is it that, that many mutations were beneficial and Genetic?
 - How did the first life arise?
 - What came first the milk or the womb?
 - The naturalist must maintain that their only defense is that it merely looks, sounds, smells, tastes, feels and appears like things are designed but they really aren't. "Believe us."

Conclusion

- ❖ After surveying these arguments thus far I hope you have come to see as I have that the 'experts' are horribly lost, and confused. Satan has truly blinded their eyes and their own hearts have they hardened to truth. It is saddening, maddening and frustrating to see them flounder with their own existence. That is why apologetics is so important. We must do all we can to help them break free and accept the Gospel with mind and soul. Remember one day all will stand in Judgment before a Holy God. "Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men;"(II Cor 5.11a)