*Worlds**

Hebrews 11:1-3 (1) Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.
(2) For by it the elders obtained a good report.
(3) Through faith we understand that the **worlds were framed by the word of God**, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.
Genesis 1:1-5 (1) In the beginning **God created the heaven and the earth.**
(2) And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.
(3) And God said, Let there be light: and there was light.
(4) And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness.
(5) And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day.
*"In the beginning", is sometime explained as long eons of time separate and apart from a normal day. This concept does not do scripture justice. However it is not uncommon to compromise the Biblical record of creation, portraying Genesis chapter 1 and Genesis chapter 2 as two different, and contradictory accounts. However, Jesus did not accept them as such. Consider if you will what Jesus had to say about the beginning. In **Matthew 19:4-5**, He tied Genesis chapters one and two together and used them to teach the people of His day; this is what Jesus had to say.*
(verse 4) "Have you not read that he who made them at the beginning made them male and female *[quoting Genesis 1:27],*
(verse 5) and said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh *[quoting Genesis 2:24]...." If these were indeed different, and contradictory accounts, Jesus did not present them as such. God said;* this is my beloved Son, hear ye him, (Matthew 17:5). *And in another place;* Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, (Hebrews 1:2). *Of interest is the fact that Jesus said;* at the beginning, *not millions of years "after the creation" as 'science falsely so called' contend.*

Mankind is not a "Johnny come lately." Man and woman, the pinnacle of God's creativity were made on the sixth day of the creation week, (Genesis1:26-31). Concerning the creation a proclamation was issued by EXECUTIVE ORDER. Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them (Genesis 2:1).
Only six days had transpired since God had created the heaven, the earth and everything therein, then He rested on the seventh. The evening and the morning are indicative of a normal 24 hr rotation of the earth on its axis. Evening is the language chosen to confirm the earth was first in darkness. About 12 hours later would be morning. Thus 12 hours of darkness + 12 hours of light = a 24 hour period called a day, and the evening and the morning were the first day. *The intended meaning of "day" is generally obvious by the context in which it is used. For example, in instances where the phrase "evening and morning" accompany the Hebrew word yom in the Old Testament (as it does in the days of Creation in Genesis), it always refers to an ordinary 24-hour day. Other examples of day can be found in Numbers 14:34 and Ezekiel 4:16. The Hebrew word for day (yom) occurs over 200 times in the Old Testament. A 24 hr day is conducive to plant and animal life and It would not take much alteration of this cycle to disrupt life on earth. For example, plants cannot survive a long cycle of darkness as plants are dependent upon the sun for photosynthesis to occur. From the beginning God designed the creation around a 24 hour rotation of the earth and each rotation He called a day. From a creation perspective, God, during the Creation week, predetermined the initial conditions of our solar system to provide a habitable earth. Then on day four God put a pendulum into place that would rule over the natural movements of time, for seasons, days and years;* And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for **seasons**, and for **days**, and **years** (Gen 1:14). *for an explanation of*;
***Seasons*--Jeremiah 33:20-21** (20) Thus saith the LORD; If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their **season**;
(21) Then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne; and with the Levites the priests, my ministers.

***Days and Years*--Exodus 34:21-22** (21) Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest: in earing time and in harvest thou shalt rest.
(22) And thou shalt observe the feast of weeks, of the firstfruits of wheat harvest, and the feast of ingathering at the year's end.
The covenant of the night + the covenant of the day in their season is unending until the trumpet is sounded. Seven complete rotations of the earth on its axis equals one week which is a record of speed, duration, or measurement of time. To put this in perspective; **{**the Earth is rotating on its axis at 1,000 miles per hour at the equator, while moving around the Sun at 70,000 miles per hour, while the Sun and its solar system are moving through space at 600,000 miles per hour in an orbit so large it would take over 220 million years just to complete a single orbit. Interestingly, however, as the Earth moves in its orbit around the Sun, it departs from a straight line by only one-ninth of an inch every eighteen miles. If it departed by one-eighth of an inch, we would come so close to the Sun that we would be incinerated; if it departed by one-tenth of an inch, we would find ourselves so far from the Sun that we would all freeze to death (Science Digest, 1981, 89[1]:124).**}**
It takes one year for the earth to complete its journey around the sun and during this time period it has completed about 365 and 1/4 rotations on its axis. Thus men say there are 365 days in a year. Every fourth year is called leap year and it has 366 days.
Thus the sun is assigned the task of keeping the earth in this orbit and is an integral part of timekeeping. Maintaining a stable orbit along with the 24 hr rotation of the earth on its axis is conducive to life itself, for both plant and animal. The earth is a planet created in the beginning, the first day, (Genesis 1:1). Other worlds were framed by the word of God also (Hebrews 11:3), but there is less detail of the other planets than there is of earth. However we do know a few things by which a comparison can be made. If the earth rotated more slowly than it does, we would have more extreme day and nighttime temperatures. Other planets have "days" which are many times that of the earth, producing scorching daytime heat followed by freezing nighttime cold. The normal daily routine of plants and animals would be impossible if the earth day were much shorter or longer than that of the present. The 24-hour day seems to be optimum, serving to evenly heat the earth.

Thus, we could hardly improve on the present arrangement of tilt and rotation, which seems to be planned for both comfort and economy. Our present tilt causes seasons with associated fluctuations in weather, producing a maximum amount of farmable land and pleasant seasons. The present rotation of the earth helps to uniformly heat its surface and cause winds and ocean currents. As Isaiah reported; For thus saith the LORD that created the heavens; God himself that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited: I am the LORD; and there is none else (Isaiah 45:18). *The Word refutes the naturalists insistence that planets were not created by an omnipotent God. All the planets, the stars, heaven and earth were created by Him. The planets, most likely, would have been created on day one or day four as those are the days when heavenly bodies were created, let's turn our Bibles to;*

Genesis 1:1-5 (1) In the beginning **God created the heaven and the earth.**

(2) And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

(3) And God said, Let there be light: and there was light.

(4) And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness.

(5) And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day.

Genesis 1:16-19 (16) And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: he made the stars also.

(17) And God set them in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth,

(18) And to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness: and God saw that it was good.

(19) And the evening and the morning were the fourth day.

As to the greater light to rule the day, the sun is a star among countless others, but in many respects it stands alone. It is the perfect lighthouse for the one planet that we know harbors life. Rejoicing like "a strong man to run a race," it journeys across our sky each day, radiating its life-sustaining energy and declaring the glory of God. As

to the planets, I suppose the author of Genesis could have named each planet in our solar system and the day each planet was created, however such a volume was not necessary to explain the history and generations of mankind. Some within the scientific community would have you believe the earth is not a special planet. The fact is, the earth is the only planet known scripturally and scientifically to harbor life and that makes it special. And even if another planet should be found teaming with life, it would in no way change God's creation or His intent concerning mankind.

Earth: A Special Place by John D. Morris, Ph.D.

{On Day One He created space, time, and water, the raw materials from which He created all else. Water was essential for life, with all the right properties. Then He created light, the ongoing source of warmth, energy, and food. The unfinished planet was rotating under the light, with a speed of rotation and tilt to the axis calibrated so that each side of the planet received just the right amount.

Day Two saw the atmosphere created, with the precise amount of oxygen and carbon dioxide for animals and plants.

On Day Three God called the oceans together, and then formed the continents, complete with topsoil supporting plant growth, all necessary for the nourishment of animals and man.

The astral bodies were created on Day Four--the sun as a permanent source of necessary light, and the moon, stars, and planets as necessary adjuncts and protectors of earth. The sun, we now know, is near the center of the entire universe, just as earth is at the center of His attention. At just the right distance, the sun provides energy and warmth in precise amounts. If the sun were any closer, we would burn in unlivable heat; any farther, and we would be locked in ice. The moon's gravity causes the tides to continually circulate and freshen the oceans, without which life would not flourish as it does. The larger planets guard earth from incoming solar bodies. The heavenly bodies were also given for timekeeping and regulation of life.

Day Five saw the oceans filled with abundant life, with much creativity and variety, all enjoying harmony with the environment and each other, and each performing necessary functions which contributed to the well-being of the whole. The skies were alive with flying creatures, beautiful in plumage and song.

On Day Six God continued to display His creativity with land animals of all sorts and sizes, capable of marvelous things, and each one bringing glory to its Creator. All were necessary and existed in amazing balance. And then God recreated His very image in man, and placed him as steward over all creation, to shepherd it, embellish it, and use it wisely. (Institute of Creation Research)**}**

Many are those who insist that modern science and the Bible contradict each other. Atheists and evolutionists have long alleged that the God of the Bible does not exist, that the Universe was most certainly not created in six days, nor were the first human beings created by the Creator on the sixth day of Creation week. They scoff at the Bible's report of the worldwide Flood of Noah's day, insisting that the Bible is a book of fables authored by primitive men in antiquity. As a result, they maintain that it contains many scientific blunders, and that its claim to supernatural inspiration has been thoroughly discredited by the scientific community. It is true that during the dark ages the papal church was detrimental to scientific research as well as true Christian values. As a result many may see the Bible as an obstruction to scientific research and accept a 'science falsely so called,' such as evolution. But Evolution as a science is riddled with falsehoods. Take for example Peltdown Man. A battery of tests confirmed that the "discovery" had been a grand hoax. The cranium belonged to a human alright, but the jaw belonged to an equally modern orangutan. All the artifacts had been treated chemically to make them appear authentic. More importantly, evolution is not based upon empherial science but is based upon man's imagination. But what about the other side of the coin? Is it possible for a person to earn a science degree from an accredited educational institution, to master genuine principles of scientific inquiry, thereby becoming qualified as a legitimate practitioner of "science," and still retain belief in God, the Bible, and Christianity? ***Absolutely****. Can that individual then present scientific data that discredits both evolution and atheism?* ***Most certainly****. A person can attain the highest standards of academic achievement—equal to the world's most renowned atheists, skeptics, and evolutionists—and yet maintain the conviction that God exists, that He has communicated to us via the Bible, and the Bible's depiction of reality is accurate. Having said that, one must realize what his own short comings are*

compared to the Word of God. As thou knowest not what is the way of the spirit, nor how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child: even so thou knowest not the works of God who maketh all (Ecclesiastics 11:5). Then I beheld all the work of God, that a man cannot find out the work that is done under the sun: because though a man labour to seek it out, yet he shall not find it; yea further; though a wise man think to know it, yet shall he not be able to find it (Ecclesiatics 8:17). He hath made every thing beautiful in his time: also he hath set the world in their heart, so that no man can find out the work that God maketh from the beginning to the end (Ecc 3:11). *So it comes down to this, one can have faith in the Bible or vain jangling which is nothing at all. There is proof of God's handiwork. Just open your eyes and look.* **Big Bang -- The Bucks Stop There by Henry Morris, Ph.D.** {One main reason why most cosmologists accept the Big Bang theory of the origin of the universe is that it fits so well into the theory of total evolution. It begins with nothing, then matter evolves out of that nothing with a horrendous bang, then stars and galaxies evolve more or less simultaneously with the higher elements, then planets evolve around their stars, then simple life evolves, then more and more complex life forms, and finally humans evolve. (ICR)} *The Big Bang begins with nothing at all. That separates it from the Biblical narrative of power in an omnipotent God. In the past, many experts have reported planets orbiting distant stars, only to retract their claims with embarrassment later. Over the years, Barnard's Star, 61 Cygni, VB8B, and several other stars showed wobbles that were heralded as planet-caused. Each planet report was later debunked. In 1992, a planet was declared to be orbiting a nearby pulsar. Variation in the light signal was later shown to be caused by the earth's own orbital motion instead of a new planet. In recent months there has been a flurry of new planet reports. Computer and instrument improvements have greatly increased detection abilities. However in each case, no actual planet has been observed, only a slight variance in star light or wobble. The slight variance observed may be a planet or not. Can man actually know for sure without an actual sighting? It is difficult enough to observe distant Pluto in our own solar system; the unseen planets under consideration are 500,000 times more distant than Pluto. But in any case the planet would have been created by God in the beginning. The universe is*

estimated to be 20 billion light years in diameter, but that is an estimate so it means it's a guess. Modern Astronomers have been looking into the heavenly place for many years with no hope of ever going there. Expectations of Christians on the other-hand is heavenly. However, there is a difference, one is humanitarian and one is spiritual. Believers please turn to;

Hebrews 11:13-16 (13) These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.
(14) For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country.
(15) And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned.
(16) But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.

John 14:1-6 (1) Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me.
(2) In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.
(3) And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.
(4) And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know.
(5) Thomas saith unto him, Lord, we know not whither thou goest; and how can we know the way?
(6) Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.

I doubt the 'scientist falsely so called' believe this. But Jesus has gone to prepare a place for us. It is not on this earth. What we seek is an heavenly city and a place therein. Let's turn to;

Revelation 21:23-27 (23) And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof.
(24) And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it.

(25) And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day: for there shall be no night there.
(26) And they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it.
(27) And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie: but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.
1Corinthians 15:40-49 (40) There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial: but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another.
(41) There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars: for one star differeth from another star in glory.
(42) So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption:
(43) It is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power:
(44) It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body.
(45) And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit.
(46) Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual.
(47) The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven.
(48) As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly.
(49) And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.
Jesus made that heavenly image possible, His purpose while on earth was establishing the salvation of grace through faith ordinance of baptism into Him for remission of sins. He accordingly has therein declared all men without distinction, who through faith, as obedient children, heed, follow, and practice what faith contains, to be His children and lawful heirs; thus excluding no one from the precious inheritance of eternal salvation, except the unbelieving and disobedient, the stiffnecked and those stubbornly resistant to moral influence, who despise faith, and incur this through their own sins, thus

making themselves unworthy for the book of life and eternal life. He, therefore, who neglects the life of the soul, casts away his present good; he who refuses to live to God, squanders all he has. Adhering to the strict observance of baptism, in 204 A.D. Tertullian wrote: "The church of Christ composed of baptized believers, does meet each Lord's day to partake of the Lord's Supper." *How true his statement then and now, about 2000 + years after it was written, that the Church is composed of baptized believers and have become adopted children in a prominent family, having attained full rights to all spiritual blessings in Christ. If one is God's child, he is not called to a spirit of fear, but of power, love and a sound mind (2Tim 1:7). Therefore he is to have good judgment, behave in a loving manner, and have faith in a power that can be called upon anytime or anywhere.* So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God (Romans 10:17). *Therefore faith in Christ is the effect of belief in His gospel, and the ordinance of baptism is the effect of that faith; the conclusion is; only those who have first believed the testimony of God unto faith; and by faith repent of their sins, and by faith confess Jesus is the Son of God, and by faith are baptized into His death, have the full and explicit testimony of pardon. This is the gospel and it is the power of God unto salvation. It's invitation is open, now is the time to obey. Do you believe? Then come repenting, confess Jesus Christ is the Son of God and be baptized into Him for remission of your sins. If any have a prayer request for other reasons, do not delay, in either case come while we persuade with song.*

This message approved by
Jack Warford
a minister for Christ

Is Evolution a "Fact" of Science? by Bert Thompson, Ph.D.

On November 5, 1981, the late Colin Patterson (who at the time was the senior paleontologist of the British Museum of Natural History in London, the editor of the professional journal published by the museum, and one of the world's foremost fossil experts) delivered a public address to his evolutionist colleagues at the American Museum of Natural History in New York City. In his speech, Dr. Patterson astonished those colleagues when he stated that he had been "kicking around" non-evolutionary, or "anti-evolutionary," ideas for about eighteen months. As he went on to describe it:

One morning I woke up and something had happened in the night, and it struck me that I had been working on this stuff for twenty years and there was not one thing I knew about it. That's quite a shock to learn that one can be misled so long. Either there was something wrong with me, or there was something wrong with the evolution theory.

Dr. Patterson said he knew there was nothing wrong with him, so he started asking various individuals and groups a simple question: "Can you tell me anything you know about evolution, any one thing that is true? I tried that question on the geology staff at the Field Museum of Natural History, and the only answer I got was silence." He tried it on the Evolutionary Morphology Seminar at the University of Chicago, a very prestigious body of evolutionists, and all he got there "was silence for a long time and eventually one person said, 'I do know one thing—it ought not to be taught in high school.' " He then remarked, "It does seem that the level of knowledge about evolution is remarkably shallow. We know it ought not to be taught in high school, and that's all we know about it."

Dr. Patterson went on to say: "Then I woke up and realized that all my life I had been duped into taking evolution as revealed truth in some way." But more important, he termed evolution an "anti-theory" that produced "anti-knowledge." He also suggested that "the explanatory value of the hypothesis is nil," and that evolution theory is "a void that has the function of knowledge but conveys none." To use Patterson's wording, "I feel that the effects of hypotheses of common ancestry in systematics has not been merely boring, not just a lack of knowledge, I think it has been positively anti-knowledge". ***(Apologetics Press)***

Planet Earth: Plan or Accident?
by Stuart E. Nevins, M.S.
Evidence for Creation › Evidence from Nature › The Earth Is Unique

From where did the earth come? By what process was it constructed? Did an ever-seeing Intelligence plan and direct the creation of our planet? Or, did the earth evolve by unguided chance processes without an overseeing plan? A person's answers to the above questions will significantly affect his personal viewpoint regarding the origin, purpose, and destiny of both the earth and man.

Since scientists agree that the earth has not existed eternally, simple logic dictates that no middle position exists on the important issue of plan versus accident. Either a superintending Mind planned and designed our planet, or it all originated by a fortuitous accident without a plan and design! To help resolve the matter let us consider some amazing facts about the earth.

EARTH'S SURFACE TEMPERATURE

The average temperature at the earth's surface depends upon several factors, the two most important being the distance of the earth from the sun and the tilt of the rotational axis of the earth. Of secondary importance to the earth's surface temperature is the area of the continents, the amount of earth covered by light- and heat-reflecting masses of ice (glaciers), and the amount of carbon dioxide and water vapor affecting the transparency of the atmosphere to both incoming and outgoing heat.

The most important factor affecting the surface temperature of the earth is obviously the distance from the sun. If the earth were moved a few million miles closer to the sun, the surface of the earth would become warmer causing our glaciers to melt. With a decrease in the area of ice the total reflectivity of our planet's surface would thereby decrease and more of the sun's heat would be absorbed. The melting of glaciers would produce a rise of sea level, and, apart from flooding most of our modern cities, would create a larger total ocean surface area. Since seawater absorbs larger amounts of solar radiation than equal area land masses, heating of the earth would again be promoted. Furthermore, after increasing the temperature of the oceans, much of the ocean's dissolved carbon dioxide would be added to the atmosphere along with large amounts of water due to increased evaporation. The increased carbon dioxide and water vapor level of the atmosphere would again bring about a significant temperature rise. All things considered, a minor decrease in the sun's distance would have a drastic heating effect on the earth's surface.

What would happen if the earth were a few million miles farther from the sun? The reverse of the previous situation applies. We would have more of our planet covered by ice, with associated increased reflectivity of the sun's heat. The ocean would cover less of the earth's surface and the important process of absorption of heat by seawater would be decreased. Since the ocean would be colder, evaporation would be less with less heat-trapping water vapor in the atmosphere. Much of the carbon dioxide from the atmosphere would become dissolved in the colder ocean. Calculations show that a decrease of carbon dioxide in the air to just one-half of its present level would lower the average temperature of the earth's surface by about 7.0 degrees Fahrenheit! Thus, increasing the sun's distance would have a profound cooling effect on our planet.

From this discussion we see that the earth is just the proper distance from the sun to maintain the right surface temperature suitable for life and the many important geologic processes! To the evolutionist the distance of the earth from the sun is a strange accident, but to the creationist it is a marvelous testimony of God's planning.

EARTH'S TILT AND ROTATION

The earth's axis of rotation is tilted 23 1/2 degrees relative to the perpendicular of the earth's plane of orbit. This tilt causes the four seasons. During the months of May, June, and July the northern hemisphere is pointed toward the sun, causing the hemisphere to warm and bringing on the season called summer. During November, December, and January the northern hemisphere is pointed away from the sun providing colder temperatures and the season called winter. Why is this tilt 231/2 degrees? Why not some other value?

What if the earth had no tilt, and the axis of rotation remained perpendicular to the plane of orbit? We would have no seasons and the surface temperature at any point on the earth would be the same during both July and January. The equatorial region of our planet would be intolerably hot all year and the poles would remain fairly cold. Ice would accumulate at the poles. The weather patterns would be stationary with permanently positioned warm and cold air masses. Some areas would continually be very humid while other areas would be quite arid. Only the mid-latitudes would be comfortable for human habitation and suitable for cultivation. Only about one half of our presently farmable lands could grow crops.

What would be the effect if the earth had double the present tilt? Temperature extremes between seasons would be much more pronounced. Even the mid-latitudes would have unbearable heat in the summer and frigid cold in the winter. Most of Europe and North America would experience very prolonged darkness in the winter and very prolonged daylight in the summer. Life on most of the earth's surface would become intolerable.

The earth rotates once every 24 hours producing the interval of time called "day". If the earth rotated more slowly, we would have more extreme day and night temperatures. Other planets have "days" which are many times that of the earth, producing scorching daytime heat followed by freezing nighttime cold. The normal daily routine of plants and animals would be impossible if the earth day were much shorter than that of the present. The 24-hour day seems to be optimum, serving to evenly heat the earth (somewhat like a turkey turning on a barbecue spit).

Thus, we could hardly improve on the present arrangement of tilt and rotation, which seems to be planned for both comfort and economy. Our present tilt causes seasons with associated fluctuations in weather, producing a maximum amount of farmable land and pleasant seasons. The present rotation of the earth helps to uniformly heat its surface and cause winds and ocean currents.

EARTH'S ATMOSPHERE

The earth's atmosphere is composed of four important gases. The most abundant gas is nitrogen (N2) which comprises about 78% of the atmosphere. Oxygen gas (O2) is the second most common ingredient, being present at 21%. Argon gas (Ar) is third at slightly less than 1%. Fourth is carbon dioxide gas (CO2), present at 0.03%.

In our study of the atmosphere we see that its gases can be divided into two main categories ¾ inert gases and reactive gases. Argon is inert and nitrogen is relatively inactive. These enter into very few chemical reactions. It is indeed fortunate that nitrogen gas does not readily combine with oxygen, otherwise, we could have an ocean full of nitric acid!

Oxygen gas is the most common reactive gas in our atmosphere. The presence of abundant oxygen is the feature which most distinguishes our atmosphere, for oxygen in more than trace amounts has

not been discovered in the atmosphere of any other planet.

Unlike nitrogen gas, oxygen gas readily enters into reactions with other gases, with organic compounds, and with rocks. The present level of oxygen seems to be optimum. If we had more oxygen, combustion would occur more energetically, rocks and metals would weather faster, and life would be adversely affected. If oxygen were less abundant, respiration would be more difficult and we would have a decreased quantity of ozone gas (O3) in the upper atmosphere which shields the earth's surface from deadly ultraviolet rays.

Carbon dioxide is also a reactive gas which forms an essential part of our atmosphere. Carbon dioxide is required by plants, serves to effectively trap the sun's radiation, and mixes with water to form an acid which dissolves rocks adding an important substance called bicarbonate to the ocean. Without a continuing supply of carbon from the atmosphere, life would be impossible.

Important as carbon dioxide is to the present earth and life, it comprises only a mere 0.03% of our atmosphere! This small amount, however, seems to be at the optimum value. If we had less carbon dioxide, the total mass of terrestrial and marine plants would decrease, providing less food for animals, the ocean would contain less bicarbonate, becoming more acidic, and the climate would become colder due to the increased transparency of the atmosphere to heat. While an increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide would cause plants to flourish (a beneficial circumstance for the farmer), there would be some unfortunate side effects. A fivefold increase in carbon dioxide pressure (the optimum level for organic productivity) would alone cause the average world surface temperature to be a few tens of degrees Fahrenheit warmer! Also, a large increase in carbon dioxide would so accelerate the chemical weathering of the continents that an excess of bicarbonate would form in the ocean, leading to an alkali condition unfavorable for life.

The total density or pressure of our atmosphere appears to be ideal. The density is very important for it acts as an insulating blanket protecting the earth from the coldness of space. If the earth had a greater diameter, holding a more dense atmosphere, the thermal blanketing effect would be enhanced, producing a much warmer climate. If the earth were of smaller diameter, holding a less dense atmosphere, there would be a colder climate. As suggested earlier, the earth has the correct surface temperature, showing that the atmosphere has the proper density and that the earth has the proper size!

The atmosphere also serves to filter out ultraviolet light and cosmic rays. Both are harmful to life and would be much more common at the earth's surface if the atmosphere were less dense. The atmosphere also burns up meteors. Long range radio communication is possible because the atmosphere is the correct density to reflect some radio frequencies. Furthermore, the atmosphere reflects unwanted stellar noise which could interfere with radio.

This analysis shows that our atmosphere has both the correct composition and density. How, except by divine planning and design, could our atmosphere have formed?

WORLD OCEAN

Water is an extremely rare compound in space. A permanent reserve of liquid water, a very unlikely occurrence in space, is known to exist only on the earth. Our planet possesses an abundant supply estimated at some 340 million cubic miles of liquid water.

Water in liquid form has many unique chemical and physical properties which make it ideal as the primary component of life and the solution of the world ocean. The solvent characteristic of water,

for example, makes it possible for all essential nutrients needed by life to be dissolved and assimilated. The fact that water is transparent to visible light makes it possible for marine algae to perform photosynthesis below the ocean surface and for ocean animals to be able to see through water. Water is one of only a few substances which expands when it freezes, preventing our ocean and lakes from freezing from the bottom upward.

One of the most remarkable properties of water is its high heat-capturing and heat-holding capacity. The ocean is less reflective than the land to incoming solar radiation and thereby absorbs more of the sun's energy than equal areas of land. It also takes much more heat to raise the temperature of a unit mass of seawater one degree than it does for an equal mass of the continents. Since the average temperature of the ocean is about 45 degrees Fahrenheit, the ocean will cool the hotter equatorial land portions of our planet and warm the colder polar regions. Furthermore, ocean currents caused by the earth's rotation serve to circulate seawater and prevent the equatorial seas from becoming too hot and the polar seas from becoming too cold and freezing completely.

The world ocean serves as a reservoir for some very important chemicals besides water. Most of our planet's carbon dioxide is dissolved in seawater, being in equilibrium with the atmosphere. The recent addition of large amounts of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere by burning of fossil fuels has not significantly raised the amount of that gas in the atmosphere. Most of the combustion-derived carbon dioxide has been absorbed by the ocean.

From our discussion it should be evident that the presence of an ocean on our planet is an evidence of God's planning and foresight. No other planet is known to have a permanent supply of liquid water. The chemical and physical properties of liquid water are necessary for life to survive. The world ocean regulates the earth's temperature and serves as a reservoir for many important chemicals.

EARTH'S CRUST

The continents which cover 29% of our planet's surface have a mean elevation of about 2,750 feet above sea level. The world ocean which covers 71% of the earth's surface has an average depth of some 12,500 feet! Why do we have such lofty continents along with such deep ocean basins? We would expect, using simple probability estimates, to have an earth of nearly constant elevation.

If we were to scrape off the continents and place them in the deeper parts of the ocean to make an earth of common elevation, we would have an earth covered with approximately 8,000 feet of water! No land areas would be exposed and terrestrial life could not exist. There would be no shallow coastal seas providing ecological zones in which most marine creatures could thrive. The ocean with a constant elevation earth would be nearly void of life.

There are two main reasons why the continents remain elevated above the sea floor. First, the continents are made up of rocks which, as a whole, are less dense than the rocks of the ocean bottom. Second, the continental crust is usually over twice as thick as the oceanic crust. The difference in density and thickness between continental and oceanic crust is just the right amount to maintain the present "freeboard" of the continents above the ocean bottom! To the evolutionist this is a peculiar accident. To the creationist, however, these facts show God's design.

Study of meteorites has revealed that the elements iron and oxygen are about equal in abundance on the average. From what is known about the density and structure of the earth, geologists suggest that iron is the commonest element in the bulk earth, being slightly more abundant than oxygen. However, when the crust of the earth is considered, geologists estimate that oxygen is about eight times more abundant than iron! Furthermore, the earth's crust has unusually large amounts of silicon and aluminum.

If we had larger amounts of iron and magnesium in the crust, oxygen from the atmosphere would be consumed to weather these elements and an oxygen-rich atmosphere would be impossible. Our present crust, unlike other planets and meteorites, is already highly oxidized and therefore permits an oxidizing atmosphere. Thus, the composition of the crust shows God's wisdom.

CONCLUSION
Two different conclusions can be drawn from the data which have been presented. The data indicate either that an omniscient Mind planned and designed our amazing planet, or that it originated by a fortuitous accident without plan or design. There is no middle ground! One must decide either God or chance!

The person who is a consistent evolutionist will attribute the many wonders of our planet (the earth's surface temperature, tilt and rotation, atmosphere, ocean, and crust) to the unguided chance. This conclusion, though not impossible, takes a great deal of faith in extremely improbable events. It is akin to supposing that the Mona Lisa came into existence from globs of paint hurled at a canvas.

The creationist, on the other hand, will recognize that the only rational deduction from the data is that the marvels of the earth owe their origin to the intelligence and handiwork of God. It was the psalmist who said:

"In His hand are the deep places of the earth; the strength of the hills is His also. The sea is His, and He made it, and His hands formed the dry land. Oh, come, let us worship and bow down; let us kneel before the Lord our maker" Psalm 95:4-6.

The Case for the Existence of God [Part II]
by Bert Thompson, Ph.D.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: Part I of this three-part series appeared in the May issue. Part II follows below and continues, without introductory comments, where the first article ended. Part III appeared in the July issue.]

One of the laws of thought employed in the field of logic is the law of rationality, which states that one should accept as true only those conclusions for which there is adequate evidence. This is sensible, for accepting as true a conclusion for which there is no evidence, or inadequate evidence, would be irrational. In establishing the prima facie case for the existence of God, theists present—through logic, clear reasoning, and factual data—arguments adequate to justify the acceptance of the conclusion that God exists. The approach is intended to be positive in nature, and to establish a proposition for which adequate evidence is available.

The evidence used to substantiate the theist's proposition concerning God's existence may take many forms. This should not be surprising since, if He does exist, God would be the greatest of all realities. His existence, therefore, could be extrapolated not from just a single line of reasoning, but from numerous avenues. As one writer of the past suggested:

> *The reality of such a Being can be firmly established only by concurrent reasons coming from various realms of existence, and approved by various powers of the human spirit. It is a conclusion that cannot be reached without the aid of arguments inadequate by themselves to so great a result, yet valid in their place, proving each some part of the great truth; proofs cumulative and complementary, each requiring others for its completion (Clarke, 1912, p. 104).*

The various arguments presented by theists, all combined, make an ironclad case for God's existence. Where one particular argument fails to impress or convince an inquirer, another will avail. Considered cumulatively, the evidence is adequate to justify the intended conclusion. It is my purpose here to present and discuss additional evidence substantiating the proposition: God exists.

DESIGN IN NATURE—THE TELEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT

In contending for the existence of God, theists often employ the Teleological Argument. "Teleology" has reference to purpose or design. Thus, this approach suggests that where there is purposeful design, there must be a designer. The deduction being made, of course, is that order, planning, and design in a system are indicative of intelligence, purpose, and specific intent on the part of the originating cause. In logical form, the theist's argument may be presented as follows:

> *If the Universe evinces purposeful design, there must have been a designer.*
> *The Universe does evince purposeful design.*
> *Thus, the Universe must have had a designer.*

This correct form of logical reasoning, and the implications that flow from it, have not escaped the attention of those who do not believe in God. Paul Ricci, an atheistic philosopher and professor, has written that "...it's true that everything designed has a designer..." (1986, p. 190). In fact, Mr. Ricci even conceded that the statement, " 'Everything designed has a designer,' is an analytically true statement" and thus requires no formal proof (p. 190). Apparently Mr. Ricci understands that one does not get a poem without a poet, a law without a lawgiver, a painting without a painter, or design without a designer.

He is in good company among his disbelieving counterparts. For example, atheistic evolutionist Richard Lewontin made the following admission in an article he authored for Scientific American:

Life forms are more than simply multiple and diverse, however. Organisms fit remarkably well into the external world in which they live. They have morphologies, physiologies and behaviors that appear to have been carefully and artfully designed to enable each organism to appropriate the world around it for its own life. It was the marvelous fit of organisms to the environment, much more than the great diversity of forms, that was the chief evidence of a Supreme Designer (1978, 239[3]:213, emp. added).

To be fair to both of these authors, and others like them, let me quickly point out that while they agree with the thrust of the theist's argument (i.e., that design leads inevitably to a designer), they do not believe that there is evidence warranting the conclusion that a Supreme Designer exists, and they therefore have rejected any belief in God. Their disagreement with the theist would center on statement number two (the minor premise) in the above syllogism. While admitting that design demands a designer, they would deny that there is design in nature providing proof of the existence of a Great Designer.

A good example of such a denial can be found in a book written by British evolutionist, Richard Dawkins. During the 1800s, William Paley employed his now-famous "watch argument." Paley argued that if one were to discover a watch lying upon the ground, and were to examine it closely, the design inherent in the watch would be enough to force the conclusion that there must have been a watchmaker. Paley continued his line of argumentation to suggest that the design inherent in the Universe should be enough to force the conclusion that there must have been a Great Designer. In 1986, Dawkins published The Blind Watchmaker, which was intended to put to rest once and for all Paley's argument. The dust jacket of Dawkins' book made that point clear:

There may be good reasons for belief in God, but the argument from design is not one of them.... [D]espite all appearances to the contrary, there is no watchmaker in nature beyond the blind forces of physics.... Natural selection, the unconscious, automatic, blind yet essentially nonrandom process that Darwin discovered, and that we now understand to be the explanation for the existence and form of all life, has no purpose in mind. It has no mind and no mind's eye. It does not plan for the future. It has no vision, no foresight, no sight at all. If it can be said to play the role of watchmaker in nature, it is the blind watchmaker (1986, emp. in orig.).

The disagreement between the theist and atheist is not whether design demands a designer. Rather, the point of contention is whether or not there is design in nature adequate to substantiate the conclusion that a Designer does, in fact, exist. This is where the Teleological Argument is of benefit.

Design of the Universe

Our Universe operates in accordance with exact scientific laws. The precision of the Universe, and the exactness of these laws, allow scientists to launch rockets to the Moon, with the full knowledge that, upon their arrival, they can land within a few feet of their intended target. Such precision and exactness also allow astronomers to predict solar/lunar eclipses years in advance, or to determine when Halley's Comet can be seen once again from the Earth. Science writer Lincoln Barnett once observed:

This functional harmony of nature Berkeley, Descartes, and Spinoza attributed to God. Modern physicists who prefer to solve their problems without recourse to God (although this seems to be more difficult all the time) emphasize that nature mysteriously operates on mathematical

principles. It is the mathematical orthodoxy of the Universe that enables theorists like Einstein to predict and discover natural laws, simply by the solution of equations (1959, p. 22).

The precision, complexity, and orderliness within the Universe are not in dispute; writers such as Ricci, Dawkins, and Lewontin acknowledge as much. But while atheists willingly concede complexity, and even order, they are not prepared to concede design because the implication of such a concession would demand a Designer. Is there evidence of design? The atheist claims no such evidence exists. The theist, however, affirms that it does, and offers the following information in support of that affirmation.

We live in a tremendously large Universe. While its outer limits have not been measured, it is estimated to be as much as 20 billion light years in diameter (i.e., the distance it would take light to travel across the Universe at a speed of over 186,000 miles per second; see Lawton, 1981, 89[1]:105). There are an estimated one billion galaxies in the Universe (Lawton, 1981, 89[1]:98), and an estimated 25 sextillion stars. The Milky Way galaxy in which we live contains over 100 billion stars, and is so large that even traveling at the speed of light would require 100,000 years to cross its diameter. Light travels in one year approximately 5.87 x 1012 miles; in 100,000 years, that would be 5.87 x 1017 miles, or 587 quadrillion miles just to cross the diameter of a single galaxy. If we drew a map of the Milky Way galaxy, and represented the Earth and Sun as two dots one inch apart (thus a scale of one inch equals 93 million miles—the distance between the Earth and the Sun), we would need a map at least four miles wide to locate the next nearest star, and a map 25,000 miles wide to reach the center of our galaxy. Without doubt, this is a rather impressive Universe.

Yet while the size itself is impressive, the inherent design is even more so. The Sun's interior temperature is estimated to be over 20 million degrees Celsius (Lawton, 1981, 89[1]:102). The Earth, however, is located at exactly the correct distance from the Sun to receive the proper amount of heat and radiation to sustain life as we know it. If the Earth were moved just 10% closer to the Sun (about 10 million miles), far too much heat and radiation would be absorbed. If the Earth were moved just 10% further from the Sun, too little heat would be absorbed. Either scenario would spell doom for life on the Earth.

The Earth is rotating on its axis at 1,000 miles per hour at the equator, and moving around the Sun at 70,000 miles per hour (approximately 19 miles per second), while the Sun and its solar system are moving through space at 600,000 miles per hour in an orbit so large it would take over 220 million years just to complete a single orbit. Interestingly, however, as the Earth moves in its orbit around the Sun, it departs from a straight line by only one-ninth of an inch every eighteen miles. If it departed by one-eighth of an inch, we would come so close to the Sun that we would be incinerated; if it departed by one-tenth of an inch, we would find ourselves so far from the Sun that we would all freeze to death (Science Digest, 1981, 89[1]:124). The Earth is poised some 240,000 miles from the Moon, whose gravitational pull produces ocean tides. If the Moon were moved closer to the Earth by just a fifth, the tides would be so enormous that twice a day they would reach 35-50 feet high over most of the Earth's surface.

What would happen if the rotation rate of the Earth were halved, or doubled? If it were halved, the seasons would be doubled in their length, which would cause such harsh heat and cold over much of the Earth that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to grow enough food to feed the Earth's population. If the rotation rate were doubled, the length of each season would be halved, and it would be difficult or impossible to grow enough food to feed the Earth's population. The Earth is tilted on its axis at exactly 23.5 degrees. Were that tilt to be reduced to zero, much of the

Earth's water would accumulate around the two poles, leaving vast deserts in its place. If the atmosphere surrounding the Earth were much thinner, meteorites could strike our planet with greater force and frequency, causing worldwide devastation.

The oceans provide a huge reservoir of moisture that constantly is evaporating and condensing, thus falling upon the land as refreshing rain. It is a well-known fact that water heats and cools at a much slower rate than a solid land mass, which explains why desert regions can be blistering hot in the daytime and freezing cold at night. Water, however, holds its temperature longer, and provides a sort of natural heating/air-conditioning system for the land areas of the Earth. Temperature extremes would be much more erratic than they are, were it not for the fact that approximately four-fifths of the Earth is covered with water. In addition, humans and animals inhale oxygen and exhale carbon dioxide. On the other hand, plants take in carbon dioxide and give off oxygen. We depend upon the world of botany for our oxygen supply, but often fail to realize that approximately 90% of our oxygen comes from microscopic plants in the seas (see Asimov, 1975, 2:116). If our oceans were appreciably smaller, we soon would be out of air to breathe.

Can a person reasonably be expected to believe that these exacting requirements for life as we know it have been met "just by accident"? The Earth is exactly the right distance from the Sun; it is exactly the right distance from the Moon; it has exactly the right diameter; it has exactly the right atmospheric pressure; it has exactly the right tilt; it has exactly the right amount of oceanic water; it has exactly the right weight and mass; and so on. Were this many requirements to be met in any other essential area of life, the idea that they had been provided "just by accident" would be dismissed immediately as ludicrous. Yet atheists and agnostics suggest that the Universe, the Earth, and life on the Earth are all here as a result of fortuitous accidents. Physicist John Gribbin (1983), writing on the numerous specific requirements necessary for life on our planet, emphasized in great detail both the nature and essentiality of those requirements, yet curiously chose to title his article, "Earth's Lucky Break"—as if all of the precision, orderliness, and intricate design in the Universe could be explained by postulating that the Earth simply received, in a roll of the cosmic dice, a "lucky break."

For more than a decade and a half, British evolutionist Sir Fred Hoyle has stressed the insurmountable problems with such thinking, and has addressed specifically the many problems faced by those who defend the idea of a naturalistic origin of life on Earth. In fact, Dr. Hoyle described the atheistic concept that disorder gives rise to order in a rather picturesque manner when he observed that "the chance that higher forms have emerged in this way is comparable with the chance that a tornado sweeping through a junk-yard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein" (1981b, p. 105). Dr. Hoyle, even went so far as to draw the following conclusion:

> *Once we see, however, that the probability of life originating at random is so utterly miniscule as to make the random concept absurd, it becomes sensible to think that the favourable properties of physics on which life depends, are in every respect deliberate.... It is therefore almost inevitable that our own measure of intelligence must reflect in a valid way the higher intelligences...even to the extreme idealized limit of God (Hoyle and Wickramasinghe, 1981, pp. 141,144, emp. in orig.).*

Atheist Richard Dawkins was forced to admit: "The more statistically improbable a thing is, the less we can believe that it just happened by blind chance. Superficially, the obvious alternative to chance is an intelligent Designer" (1982, p. 130, emp. added). That is the very conclusion theists have drawn from the available evidence—in keeping with the law of rationality. The statistical improbability of the Universe "just happening by blind chance" is staggering. The only alternative

is an Intelligent Designer—God.
Design of the Human Body

Many years ago, the ancient scholar Augustine observed: "Men go abroad to wonder at the height of mountains, at the huge waves of the sea, at the long course of the rivers, at the vast compass of the ocean, at the circular motion of the stars; and they pass by themselves without wondering." Indeed, while we stand in amazement at so many stunning scenes from our unique Universe, we often fail to stand equally amazed at the marvelous creation of man. According to those who do not believe in God, the human body is little more than the result of a set of fortuitous circumstances credited to that mythical lady, "Mother Nature." Yet such a suggestion does not fit the actual facts of the case, as even evolutionists have been forced to recognize from time to time. The late George Gaylord Simpson of Harvard once suggested that in man one finds "the most highly endowed organization of matter that has yet appeared on the earth..." (1949, p. 293). Another evolutionist observed:

When you come right down to it, the most incredible creation in the universe is you—with your fantastic senses and strengths, your ingenious defense systems, and mental capabilities so great you can never use them to the fullest. Your body is a structural masterpiece more amazing than science fiction (Guinness, 1987, p. 5).

Can one reasonably be expected to conclude that the "structural masterpiece" of the human body—with its "ingenious" systems and "highly endowed organization"—is the result of blind chance operating over eons of time in nature as atheism suggests? Or would it be more in keeping with the facts of the matter to suggest that the human body is the result of purposeful design by a Master Designer?

For organizational purposes, the human body may be considered at four different levels (see Jackson, 1993, pp. 5-6). First, there are cells, representing the smallest unit of life. Second, there are tissues (muscle tissue, nerve tissue, etc.), which are groups of the same kind of cells carrying on the same kind of activity. Third, there are organs (heart, liver, etc.), which are groups of tissues working together in unison. Fourth, there are systems (reproductive system, circulatory system, etc.), which are composed of groups of organs carrying out specific bodily functions. While we will not have the space in this article to examine each of them, an investigation of these various levels of organization, and of the human body as a whole, leads inescapably to the conclusion that there is intelligent design at work. As Wayne Jackson noted: "It is therefore quite clear...that the physical body has been marvelously designed and intricately organized, for the purpose of facilitating human existence upon the planet Earth" (1993, p. 6). In light of the following facts, such a statement is certainly justified.

A human body is composed of over 30 different kinds of cells (red blood cells, white blood cells, nerve cells, etc.), totalling approximately 100 trillion cells in an average adult (Beck, 1971, p. 189). These cells come in a variety of sizes and shapes, with different functions and life expectancies. For example, some cells (e.g., male spermatazoa) are so small that 20,000 would fit inside a capital "O" from a standard typewriter, each being only 0.05 mm long. Some cells, placed end-to-end, would make only one inch if 6,000 were assembled together. Yet all the cells of the human body, if set end-to-end, would encircle the Earth over 200 times. Even the largest cell of the human body, the female ovum, is unbelievably small, being only 0.01 of an inch in diameter. Cells have three major components. First, each cell is composed of a cell membrane that encloses the organism. Second, inside the cell is a three-dimensional cytoplasm—a watery matrix containing specialized organelles. Third, within the cytoplasm is the nucleus, which contains most of the

genetic material and serves as the control center of the cell.

The lipoprotein cell membrane (lipids/proteins/lipids) is approximately 0.06-0.08 of a micrometer thick, yet allows selective transport into, and out of, the cell. Evolutionist Ernest Borek has observed: "The membrane recognizes with its uncanny molecular memory the hundreds of compounds swimming around it and permits or denies passage according to the cell's requirements" (1973, p. 5).

Inside the cytoplasm, there are over 20 different chemical reactions occurring at any one time, with each cell containing five major components for: (1) communication; (2) waste disposal; (3) nutrition; (4) repair; and (5) reproduction. Within this watery matrix there are such organelles as the mitochondria (over 1,000 per cell in many instances) that provide the cell with its energy. The endoplasmic reticulum is "believed to be a transport system designed to carry materials from one part of the cell to the other" (Pfeiffer, 1964, p. 13). Ribosomes are miniature protein-producing factories. Golgi bodies store the proteins manufactured by the ribosomes. Lysozomes within the cytoplasm function as garbage disposal units.

The nucleus is the control center of the cell, and is separated from the cytoplasm by a nuclear membrane. Within the nucleus is the genetic machinery of the cell (chromosomes and genes containing deoxyribonucleic acid—DNA). The DNA is a supermolecule that carries the coded information for the replication of the cell. If the DNA from a single human cell were removed from the nucleus and unraveled (it is found in the cell in a spiral configuration), it would be approximately six feet long, and would contain over a billion biochemical steps. It has been estimated that if all the DNA in an adult human were placed end-to-end, it would reach to the Sun and back (186 million miles) 400 times.

It should also be noted that the DNA molecule does something that we as humans have yet to accomplish: it stores coded information in a chemical format, and then uses a biologic agent (RNA) to decode and activate it. As Darrel Kautz has stated: "Human technology has not yet advanced to the point of storing information chemically as it is in the DNA molecule" (1988, p. 45, emp. in orig.; see also Jackson, 1993, pp. 11-12). If transcribed into English, the DNA in a single human cell would fill a 1,000 volume set of encyclopedias approximately 600 pages each (Gore, 1976, p. 357). Yet just as amazing is the fact that all the genetic information needed to reproduce the entire human population (about five billion people) could be placed into a space of about one-eighth of a square inch. In comparing the amount of information contained in the DNA molecule with a much larger computer microchip, evolutionist Irvin Block remarked: "We marvel at the feats of memory and transcription accomplished by computer microchips, but these are gargantuan compared to the protein granules of deoxyribonucleic acid, DNA" (1980, p. 52). In an article he authored for Encyclopaedia Britannica, Carl Sagan observed that "The information content of a simple cell has been estimated as around 1012 bits [i.e., one trillion—BT]..." (1974, 10:894). To emphasize to the reader the enormity of this figure, Dr. Sagan then noted that if one were to count every letter in every word of every book in the world's largest library (over ten million volumes), the final tally would be approximately a trillion letters. Thus, a single cell contains the equivalent information content of every book in the world's largest library of more than ten million volumes! Every rational person recognizes that not one of the books in such a library "just happened." Rather, each and every one is the result of intelligence and painstaking design.

What, then, may we say about the infinitely more complex genetic code found within the DNA in each cell? Sir Fred Hoyle concluded that the notion that the code's complexity could be arrived at by chance is "nonsense of a high order" (1981a, p. 527). In their classic text on the origin of life,

Thaxton, Bradley, and Olsen addressed the implications of the genetic code found within the DNA molecule.

We know that in numerous cases certain effects always have intelligent causes, such as dictionaries, sculptures, machines and paintings. We reason by analogy that similar effects have intelligent causes. For example, after looking up to see "BUY FORD" spelled out in smoke across the sky we infer the presence of a skywriter even if heard or saw no airplane. We would similarly conclude the presence of intelligent activity were we to come upon an elephant-shaped topiary in a cedar forest.

In like manner an intelligible communication via radio signal from some distant galaxy would be widely hailed as evidence of an intelligent source. Why then doesn't the message sequence on the DNA molecule also constitute prima facie evidence for an intelligent source? After all, DNA information is not just analogous to a message sequence such as Morse code, it is such a message sequence....

We believe that if this question is considered, it will be seen that most often it is answered in the negative simply because it is thought to be inappropriate to bring a Creator into science (1984, pp. 211-212, emp. in orig.).

The complexity and intricacy of the DNA molecule—combined with the staggering amount of chemically-coded information it contains—speak unerringly to the fact that this "supermolecule" simply could not have happened by blind chance. As Andrews has observed:

It is not possible for a code, of any kind, to arise by chance or accident.... A code is the work of an intelligent mind. Even the cleverest dog or chimpanzee could not work out a code of any kind. It is obvious then that chance cannot do it.... This could no more have been the work of chance or accident than could the "Moonlight Sonata" be played by mice running up and down the keyboard of my piano! Codes do not arise from chaos (1978, pp. 28-29).

Indeed, codes do not arise from chaos. As Dawkins correctly remarked: "The more statistically improbable a thing is, the less we can believe that it just happened by blind chance. Superficially, the obvious alternative to chance is an intelligent Designer" (1982, p. 130, emp. added). That is the exact point the theist is making: an intelligent Designer is demanded by the evidence.

CONCLUSION

Atheistic philosopher, Paul Ricci, has suggested that "Although many have difficulty understanding the tremendous order and complexity of functions of the human body (the eye, for example), there is no obvious designer" (1986, p. 191, emp. added). The only people who "have difficulty understanding the tremendous order and complexity" found in the Universe are those who have "refused to have God in their knowledge" (Romans 1:28). Such people can parrot the phrase that "there is no obvious designer," but their arguments are not convincing. One does not get a poem without a poet, or a law without a lawgiver. One does not get a painting without a painter, or a musical score without a composer. And just as surely, one does not get purposeful design without a designer. The design inherent in the Universe is evident—from the macrocosm to the microcosm—and is sufficient to draw the conclusion demanded by the evidence, in keeping with the law of rationality. God does exist.

Revised; 09042019
Ref. Institute for Creation Research
Missouri Association for Creation
Answers in Genesis 1:26
Apologetics Press

The message 'Worlds' presented to; BaronOk-April2011/ WestvilleOk-March2017/PineMtAr.-March2017/WestvilleOk-Oct2019/