



- xx. Proton Stability
- xxi. Size of our sun
- xxii. Age of our sun
- xxiii. Color of our sun
- xxiv. Distance from the earth to the sun
- d. Even many atheists admit the evidence of design related to the Anthropic Principle requires intelligence to have fine-tuned the universe to support life (pg. 107)
- e. Multi-Universe Theory
  - i. Are there an infinite number of alternate universes, and do we just happen to live in the one that accidentally allows life to exist?
  - ii. No evidence for this (and there never can be)
  - iii. Infinity and physical reality are not compatible. God is infinite, but within the finite universe, there is no such thing as infinity.
  - iv. Multi-Universe does not resolve the original problem of the Cosmological Argument (an uncaused first cause), and it does not resolve the precision with which this universe reveals a precise and fine-tuned design.
  - v. It is just a desperate attempt to avoid the implications of design, namely that all designs require a designer, but extreme evidence requires extreme theories to attempt to explain it away (pg. 108)
- f. Want to know God more? Look to the heavens
  - i. The heavens declare the glory of God (Psalm 19)
  - ii. "Who is My equal? Says the Holy One. Lift your eyes and look to the heavens." (Isaiah 40:25)
  - iii. Only by looking to the heavens (or in God's word) can humans begin to understand the glory, majesty, power and size of their Creator.
  - iv. His invisible but glorious attributes can clearly be seen by anyone willing to look up and acknowledge God in heaven, the great designer of everything we can perceive, so that all are without excuse (Rom 1:20)

## **2. Chapter 5: First Life**

- a. The supreme problem for Darwinists is explaining the origin of the first life (pg. 115)
  - i. Where did the source materials come from?
  - ii. How did they survive the harsh earth atmosphere?
  - iii. Did water exist?
  - iv. Did oxygen exist?
  - v. How did long chains of amino acids form in just the right sequence to become the building blocks for the first life?
  - vi. Which came first, the DNA that produces proteins, or the proteins, which make up DNA?
  - vii. Where did the information programming for DNA come from?
  - viii. Can random chemical processes produce complex genetic codes necessary for the system to live and reproduce?

- b. An amoeba (a “simple,” single-cell living organism) has enough coded instructions in its DNA to fill more than 1,000 encyclopedias with specific information, not just random letters from the DNA code (pg 116).
- c. If even simple messages all around us result in a conclusion that an intelligent source authored a phrase, then we rightly conclude that a much more complex message coded into every DNA molecule must have come from an intelligent source. In fact, the source would be supremely intelligent since we have been studying the DNA molecule for decades and have only partially discovered the total information it contains.
- d. Science, with all of the intellectual and technological resources available, has never produced even the source material necessary for life. Certainly science has never demonstrated the mechanisms for producing life from nonliving materials, despite decades of trying to do so. If all the collective intelligence of humanity has failed to produce life or its essential components, how rational is it to believe that unintelligent and unguided forces produced any aspect of living systems as the atheists postulate?
- e. Good Science vs. Bad Science
  - i. The “Just-so” story (pg. 120-121)
    - 1. No evidence to support the theory
    - 2. No empirical observation
    - 3. No forensics applied to reach a conclusion
    - 4. They can only invent a story that is consistent with their biases since it is undeniable that life actually exists.
    - 5. Too much speculation chasing after too few facts
  - ii. When top evolutionists have to resort to aliens to explain the origin of life on earth, you can begin to understand just how complex that first life form is (was).
  - iii. Darwinists are acting on blind faith with their spontaneous generation claims.
  - iv. “The belief that life on earth arose spontaneously from nonliving matter is simply a matter of faith in strict reductionism and is based entirely on ideology.” Hurbert Yockey, Physicist and information scientist (pg. 122)
  - v. Conversely, creationists and Intelligent Design proponents are simply making a rational inference from the evidence which leads to an intelligent cause for the effect of life on earth
  - vi. Materialism must be protected as the only mechanism for atheists who cannot allow a divine foot in the door of explaining life (pg. 123)
  - vii. Darwinism / materialism is false philosophy disguised as science
- f. Give time and chance a chance
  - i. Darwinists trust implicitly in the idea of probability and long time periods to accomplish their unfounded, false philosophies and bad science.
  - ii. Adding more time does not produce actual results. In fact, it makes spontaneous generation more challenging because the Second Law of Thermodynamics increases disorder over longer periods of time.

- iii. The probabilities Darwinists want others to accept as scientific fact are astronomically (ridiculously) small
  - 1. The chance of correctly selecting a single grain of sand in the Sahara desert by random chance, and then doing it three times in a row! And that's just the mathematical odds that have been calculated by Darwinists to achieve spontaneous generation of a single protein molecule. You then need to get another 200 protein molecules to combine in a very specific order in order to approach the complex first life form coming together without intelligent purpose doing so.
- iv. Chance is not a legitimate cause of anything (pg. 125)
  - 1. It is a word used to describe mathematical probabilities
  - 2. The word "chance" is used to cover their ignorance of not knowing all the factors and causes that produce the resulting effect (coin flip).
  - 3. If atheists do not know (or refuse to admit) all of the factors that and conditions that caused the first life to come into existence, they should admit it instead of using the word chance to cover their ignorance. Rather than admit their ignorance or accept intelligence as a cause, they make chance / probabilities their "god" to which they place their faith.
- v. Science is a slave to philosophy
  - 1. Secular naturalism as a starting belief system results in scientists ignoring the empirically detectable scientific evidence for design
  - 2. Good science is a source of truth, but it is not the only source of truth.
  - 3. Good science results in verifiable truths; bad science advances bad philosophies (pg. 128)
    - a. Science cannot be done without philosophy. Science requires the use of philosophical systems like logic and reasoning to help discover truth
    - b. Philosophical assumptions dramatically impact scientific conclusions
    - c. Science doesn't really say anything, scientists do
  - 4. Materialism makes reason impossible (pg. 128)
    - a. Specified complexity (messages that carry meaning) cannot be explained by their material components
    - b. Human thoughts and theories are not comprised of only materials. Humans are both material and immaterial.
    - c. If life was only the result of the material components, scientists could easily make new life by putting together raw materials. They cannot. For example, what combination of materials results in consciousness?

- d. Spiritual experiences cannot and should not be dismissed as a merely psychological phenomenon
  - e. If materialism were true, reasoning would be impossible. Because we reason in our minds and come to conclusions, good or bad, materialism cannot be true.
5. Reasoning requires faith in what is not yet known / provable
  6. Two possible sources for reasoning (pg. 130)
    - a. Preexistent intelligence who gave us the capacity
    - b. Mindless chemicals, which can offer no reasoning capacity
  7. Darwinists have the wrong box top / worldview
    - a. If all the pieces of a worldview that can be verified by truth, logic and reasoning don't fit together with a particular worldview, then you have the wrong worldview
    - b. The correct box top is not a matter of preference or taste
    - c. Ruling out Theism has proven to be both bad philosophy and bad science. The discoverable truths in the world clearly lead to a Theists worldview box top