

Unbiased Science: A Living God First Planned Then Created Life

By Timothy R. Stout (B.S. Physics, UCLA), Pastor of the Rock Baptist Church, Greenville, TX

Introduction to <http://ctotim.com>, a blog formed to provide open discussion on the Five Articles referenced below on the origin of life. Copyright by the author. This is open access under a Creative Commons (0) 1.0 license. It may be freely copied and distributed commercially and privately without notification to the author provided credit is given for its contents.

This is a "battle blog." It challenges anyone rejecting the assertions presented below to make his case on the blog. A few basic rules for posting are listed in the above menu.

I believe that science clearly leads to the understanding that a living God created the heavens, the Earth, and the physical life we see around us. Unbiased scientific analysis provides three independent trains of thought leading to this:

- 1) A cell needs to make its first appearance in fully-working form (Virchow's aphorism). The entire process needs to occur in minutes, not thousands or millions of years (dynamic self-organization of cellular structures and their rapid degradation outside a living cell).
- 2) Prebiotic processes convert their supply chemicals into a random mixture of products, not high concentrations of those specifically required for life. This has resulted in the failure of every experimentally tested step in abiogenesis.
- 3) The relationship between information and hardware in a computer parallels that in a living cell. Using principles of computer design and fabrication as a model, it appears that formation of a living cell is a two-step process: First, specify the tasks to be performed by the information and by cellular hardware as well as their interaction with each other. Then, arrange atoms and molecules to fabricate the specification. The nature of these steps leads to the conclusion that a living, Creator God was necessary to provide the first cells.

This material presented here is a summary of a detailed, documented analysis presented in the form of a Collection of Five Articles I have authored. It is posted and available free online at:

www.trbap.org/5articles-long.pdf and www.trbap.org/5articles-short.pdf

The long version is extremely detailed and written for the professional scientist. The short version skips over some of the more intricate scientific discussion. References to articles refers to these.

The above two articles as well as this one may be freely copied without further notice provided credit is given the author, in accordance with a license under Creative Commons 0 1.0 Universal.

The following is a more elaborate description of the above issues (in a different order):

A serious problem has been observed in origin-of-life studies (abiogenesis). It appears that every experimentally tested step in the field has failed. Reputedly thousands of experiments in abiogenesis have been performed over the past sixty years, testing plausible prebiotic processes from many possible angles. All of them consistently illustrate that a natural origin of life appears to be impossible. Not a single experiment has converted its feedstock into new products useful for an advance towards life and done this in a form that could actually be used by a subsequent step. The new products consistently have too much contamination for subsequent use. Also, any potentially useful products are in unusable ratios with each other. Thousands of failures with no successes present a serious problem.

The problem is worse than this: We understand why they fail and there is no known scientific basis to expect anything better. This issue is discussed in detail in Article 3. There are two challenges from this. Cite a successful experiment if you know of one. If you can't—and I have offered this challenge for over five years and no one has cited one yet—then at least explain why thousands of failed experiments with no successes should not be adequate to conclude that a natural origin of life would be impossible. I expect the blog to be silent on both issues. Most scientists will never even have considered these issues, because they contradict the materialistic mindset of modern science and therefore discussion of them is taboo. To them, the strength of the evidence is irrelevant. Challenges to materialism are not allowed regardless of their strength.

The problem is worse than this. It appears that the problems are not isolated and independent of each other, as is commonly presented. Instead, there appears to be a common principle leading to all of the failures—randomization. Prebiotic processes (i.e., natural processes that would be available in a pre-life setting) invariably produce an increasingly random assortment of new chemicals. Therefore, increasingly long periods of time do not lead to a higher probability of life appearing. Instead, the chemicals become more and more randomized, more and more remote from usefulness towards life. Extended periods of time work against a natural origin of life; they do not promote it. If you disagree with this, logically explain why. The blog is here for you to use.

Historically, whenever scientific investigation uncovers a unifying principle among what had previously been considered isolated behaviors, this has been considered a major advance in scientific knowledge and understanding. Unfortunately for abiogenesis theory, this new understanding teaches away from the possibility of natural processes turning raw, non-biological chemicals into a living cell. Sadly, this is suppressed, demonstrating that modern science is in truth fake science. I have personally experienced this with my Article 3, as discussed in Article 4.

The problem is worse than this. The particular principle underlying the prevalent, consistent failures in abiogenesis—randomization at the molecular level—is the same principle that prevents successful fabrication of perpetual motion machines and free-energy machines. As a result, the likelihood of natural processes overcoming randomness in an origin-of-life setting is about as likely as an engineer designing an ocean vessel which intakes ocean water, randomly separates the high and low energy water molecules into steam and ice, uses the steam to drive its turbines (without using an external fuel supply) and then dumps the remainder as ice cubes out its back end. This is impossible because of entropy. Entropy is a mathematical representation of

randomization. It has the same effect on molecular distributions in pre-life processes as it does in heat engines. Unless and until this assertion can be falsified, abiogenesis should be considered just as closed a field as the fabrication of free-energy machines. Note: there is no prebiotic process able to use uncontrolled energy to work around increased randomness in the various steps of abiogenesis. (Article 3)

The problem is worse than this. Living cells are information-driven systems. So are computers. Both of them feature hardware controlled by an extensive body of information. We understand computer design. The hardware and software are completely separate entities—hardware has physical existence, such as space and mass, whereas information is immaterial—it has no physical characteristics, although it is represented by arrangements of physical objects. Furthermore, information is an abstract relationship between a meaning and its representation. The relationships are completely arbitrary. Abstract relationships are characteristic of intelligent definition, not physical interactions from natural law. This implies that an information-driven machine is the product of intelligent design. The evidence here is strong. (Article 1)

In computer design we observe that the interactive relationships between software and hardware are so intricately intertwined that they need to be fabricated according to a predefined specification. A software command needs to be issued based on how the hardware will implement it. The hardware needs to understand how to decode an instruction and to carry out the intended task. Each needs to be designed based on the other at each step. The computer hardware is useless without software instructing it. The software is meaningless without a computer to implement it. A software program stored on a disk sitting on the shelf of a retail store is useless. It needs to be driving computer hardware before it has value. Both hardware and software need to make their first appearance simultaneously in working form. This prevents successful step-by-step progress.

The specification establishes the goals and purposes for the design and how to implement them. By contrast, if a person had an extensive supply of logic gates and a means of randomly connecting them together, it would be virtually impossible for a working computer suddenly and unexpectedly to appear out of the conglomeration. It would be particularly unlikely for a portion of the gates to randomly organize into a storage media that defined the software needed to operate the computer. Randomness works against the required organization appearing spontaneously for a computer to be fully functioning at first appearance. There are far too many wrong ways to arrange the gates for random processes to provide the required organization. Beyond this, the mere appearance of the required gates would not be plausible.

Computer design starts in the mind of an intelligent being with sufficient intellectual capacity to have a goal in mind, to understand the resources available to implement the goal, and to understand how to organize the resources to reach the goal. Computers do not suddenly, spontaneously appear.

A living cell is much more complex than a computer. The number of wrong ways to arrange atoms and molecules so that they do not make a living cell is far, far greater than the number of wrong ways to make a computer. If natural processes cannot randomly produce a computer, then it is even less likely for them to make a living cell. Computers provide a standard of reference for analyzing the complexity required to be overcome if a cell is to appear.

Computers do exist. The design methodology for producing a computer can be used as a model to suggest how to produce an information-driven machine. Since a computer requires a predefined specification in order to get the hardware and software to cooperate effectively, it appears that formation of a living cell would also require a predefined specification of information/cellular hardware relationships. Because of the extreme complexities of a living cell, the cellular specification must be designed by a being with intelligence far greater than man's. Since cellular hardware and information are so different, a separate specification needs to be defined for each as the overall specification is implemented. Since natural processes have no means to implement non-physical design specifications, fabrication of the cell requires the being also to have the ability to organize atoms and molecules into their predetermined, dynamic relationships with each other, working outside of the laws of nature to do this. Many design decisions had to be made in order to choose a specific specification out of a staggering number of suitable possibilities. This observation in turn leads to the understanding that the being has a will. He can make decisions and act on them without regard to the laws of nature.

Unbiased scientific analysis leads to the understanding that living cells owe their original existence to the creative efforts of a living, personal Creator God. The fabrication of a living cell apparently needs to be the "handiwork" of an extremely intelligent being, one who has a will, and one who can miraculously arrange atoms and molecules as desired. This is the definition of a personal God. There is no other rational explanation. Computers exist. Living cells exist. Computers show us how to overcome the problems associated with the initial appearance of information-driven machines. It would take a living God to use the same methodology for cells. Unbiased science leads to this conclusion. There is no hint of any alternatives. (Article 1)
Calling on materialism doesn't help.

A fascinating observation. In one sense, it is not within the scope of science to say anything one way or the other concerning the existence of a living, personal Creator God. Science is based on controlling all of the variables affecting the outcome of an experiment and then analyzing how changes to the variables affect the outcomes. In science, observed patterns honestly interpreted become principles and laws. However, there is no experiment that can control God. Hence, on the one hand, science can neither affirm nor deny His existence. However, it is philosophically possible that an extremely brilliant Creator could design a creation so that science could reasonably lead a person to understand His existence and action. Indeed, the Bible claims this is the case (Romans 1:20).

So, how could God reveal Himself to a scientifically sophisticated age? One way would be to make living cells as a class of information-driven machine. Then, man could be allowed to invent computers, which show the steps required to design and then fabricate such a machine. Just as Genesis chapter 1 shows that God had a predefined plan as He worked through the days of creation, the design of information-driven machines apparently requires a predefined plan. In the case of living cells, the requirements would be so far beyond what man can do, that it should lead a person straight to the understanding that a living, Creator God first designed then fabricated the initial living cells.

Genesis 1 teaches that God also designed the initial living forms to reproduce. So, God miraculously worked outside of the normal laws of science and chemistry to form suddenly the initial appearance of living cells, which then had the capability of reproducing on their own.

Science shows a remarkable consistency with what the Bible teaches God did in Genesis 1 and what would be required for life to appear. I find this fascinating. (Articles 1 and 4)

Incidentally, I do not believe that God walked away from the creation after it was designed. The Bible reveals a God who is constantly intervening into the natural order we see. I experience this in my own life in my walk with Him. Natural order is extremely important. It provides consistency which greatly simplifies everyday living. We as created beings are bound by natural law. God isn't. The Bible reveals He has all kinds of plans and constantly intervenes to implement them.

The problems continue. There is another serious issue thwarting successful abiogenesis. A living cell must advance from simple building block chemicals to fully-working functionality in a matter of minutes, not thousands or millions of years. The reasons leading to this conclusion are very well known to modern biologists, but their significance is ignored—Virchow's aphorism and dynamic self-organization of cellular structures.

Rudolf Virchow was a German scientist in the middle 1800s. He summarized an observation that today is still the foundation of cellular theory: "All cells from cells." In other words, there is a certain minimal complexity required for a cell to maintain its existence and replicate. Anything less than this and a cell cannot sustain life. The ramifications of this are straight forward: a living cell needs to make a single-step, sudden appearance, because anything less than this doesn't survive. Unfortunately, this minimum level of complexity is extremely high. Scientists openly admit they have no clue how natural processes could provide such a degree of initial complexity.

Dynamic self-organization (DSO) is a second critical issue. DSO is an ingenious means of cellular fabrication. When man wants to make products, he works on them externally, either by hand or at workstations in an assembly line. Living cells are fabricated differently. They self assemble. This requires not only that the various chemicals do their specifically required tasks, but they also need to recognize other chemicals to bond with as well as when and not when to do this. This is all built into their molecular structure as defined in the genetic information stored in their DNA.

Self-assembly generally takes place in one of two possibilities, static or dynamic. Static relationships are permanent. Once formed they stay formed. This is typically called self-assembly. Dynamic relationships are temporary. The relationships here are typically called "self-organization." Dynamic self-organization takes energy to form and also consumes energy to stay formed. A dynamic structure forms as needed and then dissipates when not needed, but is ready to be reused when needed again and after being re-energized.

For a simple comparison between dynamic and static relationships, think of how to exert a force against a wall. A spring could be mounted to give a constant, static force of a certain value at a certain point on the wall. By contrast, a fire hose could spray a stream of water against the spot and also exert a force on it. However, the flowing water exerts a dynamic force. Once an individual molecule exerts its force on the wall and gives up its kinetic energy in the process, it needs to be replaced by another molecule which is still moving towards the wall and still has its kinetic energy. The only way to maintain a force on the wall is to maintain a steady stream of energized water molecules hitting the wall. It takes energy to maintain this kind of force. The force dissipates when the energy disappears.

Many critical cellular components are dynamically self-organized. Basal metabolism is the minimum energy it takes to keep me and you alive. This represents the minimum energy needed to maintain DSO in the cells of our body. Here is the problem: the cell needs to form with its dynamic relationships already active. There is no other way to assemble them. Abiogenists are stumped at actually implementing the first step of abiogenesis—using a pre-life process to provide amino acids with sufficient purity that they could be used to make a static string of proteins. They are also stumped at the second step—getting pure proteins to spontaneously link together into a string to form even a small protein of undefined sequence. Yet, the appearance of a living cell requires large proteins composed of hundreds of amino acids which dynamically self-organize to do a specific task when needed and then dissipate when they are no longer needed. All of the functionality needs to be functional at the cell's first appearance. Yet, natural processes are "stumped" at the initial stages. There is no known manner in which DSO could be introduced into protein structure.

In summary, a cell at normal temperatures will typically die in minutes if its metabolism stops. When it dies, its dynamic self-organization dissipates and it degrades beyond repair: it is dead. Therefore, the entire cell with all of its various required components, all of its required information stored in a genome, and the required organization between its components must appear fully formed within a span of minutes. Virchow's aphorism and DSO work together to require a virtually instantaneous appearance of the entire first cell. There is no observed scientific evidence to suggest how natural physical and chemical process could accomplish this, but much showing it to be virtually impossible. Furthermore, until a living cell is already alive and functioning, there would be no means for natural selection to help. Everything needs to appear fully functional from the beginning. If I am misrepresenting something here, show me and the world how and why. (Article 3)

Yet another problem. Extremely complex feedback capability needs to be built into a cell to implement DSO. Feedback control is another function leaving scientists clueless. There is no known means for natural processes to create and store the genetic information required to provide it. There is no known means to build a protein with DSO capabilities until the information already exists.

Yet another problem. There is yet another problem. There is no means available for natural processes to "debug" an almost working initial cell.

I spent most of my professional career as an industrial design engineer. Two decades were spent in electronics hardware design, most of this working with software engineers in building information-driven systems. I have at one time or another designed almost every hardware component used in a computer. I understand the design of information-driven systems very well. Design is the easy part. Debug of problems in the design is the hard part. In a truly complex system, it could easily take four to five times as long to identify and fix unintended design errors as to do the initial design. In order to find an error in order to debug it, first we needed to have available the initial specification as a target for what we wanted to accomplish. We would also have schematics representing what we wanted to build in order to implement the specification. We would have specialized test equipment which would allow us to observe the behavior of specific parts of the fabrication under very controlled conditions. The goal was to discover why the system crashed. Many times it was difficult to determine initially if a problem was in hardware, software, the specification itself, or some combination of these. I always hoped a

problem about which management was unhappy would be someone else's fault. Sometimes it was; too many times it wasn't.

It is important to realize that it took highly trained engineers to identify and solve these problems. If the only debug method available would have been to pick a random component or a random connection to it and randomly change this to something else, and observe the effect, this would normally be fruitless—particularly if the fabrication was “dead on arrival” and actually had a large number of fatal problems. There would be no way to know if a change in a non-working machine helped or not. Anyone who has ever written a software program understands the intellectual effort required to debug it as well as the tools required. Software debug does not happen spontaneously. Neither does hardware.

Computer debug requires people, tools, and pre-defined specification. None of this would be available for use in abiogenesis to help to make the first instance of a cell. There would be no means for prebiotic processes to figure out what to change and no time available for them to make it. An entire living cell exhibiting metabolism, dynamic self-organization, and a genome of sufficient capacity to define the components used to operate and replicate the cell needs to make a working first appearance virtually instantly. The available fabrication time frame of minutes at the most would not allow time for debug even if a means were available.

This means that the design and fabrication of the cell need to work properly from the beginning without requiring debug. The intellect required to do this is beyond anything man can comprehend. There is simply no conceivable basis for natural processes to fabricate a living cell on a step-by-step basis.

It appears that God not only is the direct Creator of the physical life we see around us, but He also created it in such a way as to make it clear that He did it (Article 1).

A ludicrous choice. We have seen how one problem after another characterizes abiogenesis. What do abiogenists currently propose concerning how natural processes worked through the various stages of development in order to produce the original cells? There is complete chaos here, exactly as one would expect when people deliberately restrict themselves to options that are actually impossible to begin with. Since they refuse to acknowledge God as the Creator, whatever they propose will be wrong. Thus, the chaos.

There are four different camps within abiogenesis. Some scientists propose that information came first (RNA), because without information there is no replication. With no replication, improvements can't be built on. Some propose metabolism—the production of energy—came first, because without a source of energy nothing useful can take place. Some propose that “compartmentalization” came first. This is the provision for some means of keeping chemicals together that need to work together. Otherwise, useful chemicals spread out from each other and can't interact. Some acknowledge all the problems and are trying to figure out how all of the above could appear simultaneously. This has its own issues. So, which camp is best? Different scientists favor different choices among the four options. Each scientist tends to be vocal about all the fatal problems characteristic of the other options. Concerning the problems of his own particular choice, he typically believes that they do not have as many fatal issues as the other options. This is ludicrous. Abiogenesis is the only widely recognized field of science in which a scientist identifies with the approach which he believes has the fewest fatal problems associated with it. Normally, if a person receives a fatal shot from a gun, it does not matter how many more

potentially fatal ones he receives. It only takes one fatal shot to be fatal. Alas! Materialists are so entrenched in limiting scientific analysis to solutions compatible with materialistic philosophy that no amount of evidence can get through to them. It is hard to imagine a clearer example of pseudoscience in science than what is observed in abiogenesis.

The one conclusion all camps agree on is that God cannot be allowed into the picture. Psalm 2 talks about how kings set themselves against God. They will not submit to His authority. God's response is that He laughs at them. He actually holds them in derision. Then, in His anger they will be destroyed. Nonetheless, He offers them a chance to repent up until the destruction begins. This is actually a prophetic passage which is talking about a specific event which will take place in the future, just before the battle of Armageddon described in the book of Revelation in the Bible. However, the rebellious attitudes and God's perspective of them are actually common throughout history. I believe the Psalm actually describes God's perspective of what is taking place in origin-of-life studies today. This is only an indirect application of the passage; nevertheless the principles appear to have applicability. When God sees the chaos experienced by those trying to deny Him at all costs, He laughs; He holds them in derision. However, in time this laughter will turn to wrath unless repentance comes first. I personally would rather have a false scientist laugh at me and be angry with me than the living, Creator God laugh at me and be angry with me. His response is eternal.

Extension to bacteria-to-man evolution. If life cannot appear spontaneously, materialism is dead. If there are no living cells to evolve, then general evolution cannot take place. However, the problem goes beyond this. The problem with abiogenesis is that there is no mechanism to implement it. The laws of physics and chemistry work against it--not for it--at the molecular level. It appears plausible that these same issues would also prevent natural, prebiotic processes from creating the new information needed to transform bacteria into men. The first task of evolutionary theory should be to address this problem. Otherwise, the theory fails at its most essential step: no mechanism. If there is no mechanism, historical science is meaningless because of too many unknowns. (Article 4)

Modern evolutionary science is fake science; it is a counterfeit. Very few people have heard the kinds of arguments presented in the above analysis. I suggest it is because at its root evolutionary science is fake and mocks and suppresses evidence against anything challenging it. It does not deal with contrary evidence openly and honestly. A Christian has no business having anything to do with this. Even theistic evolution is inexcusable. Theistic evolution accepts the validity of most of the claims of atheistic materialists and then attempts to resolve the conflict by claiming "God did it." I suggest this is a cop-out which pleases neither materialists nor God. Ever since the days of Thomas Huxley, a contemporary of Charles Darwin, evolutionary science appears to have been primarily a tool used to promote materialism, not to provide an open discussion of the evidence. Materialism is the philosophy that natural process such as those we see at work in physics and chemistry are considered adequate to explain everything that exists, including the origin of all of the life forms we see around us. Any evidence that purports to challenge the adequacy of materialistic processes to accomplish this is rejected as false without further examination. However, this rejection is based on the ASSUMPTION that materialistic processes are adequate. Huxley's approach was to ignore any challenges by creationists and others concerning the sufficiency of materialistic solutions. He claimed that it was fruitless and a waste of time to discuss what they said. Subsequently, Huxley's approach was to attack

vociferously anyone who dared to challenge materialism, violently slandering him personally. The attack was then used as an excuse to ignore the comments. Huxley claimed he had strong arguments, when in truth he did not. The intricacies we now understand in biochemistry and information theory were not anticipated in Darwin's or Huxley's day. Instead of natural, materialistic processes being adequate to form physical life, it now appears that the evidence teaches very clearly against it.

A proper subject of scientific investigation is to determine the scope and limits of physical and chemical processes. It is therefore proper to compare what science teaches about what is required to fabricate a living cell and to what extent observed natural processes could accomplish this. However, Huxley merely assumed that natural processes were adequate to the task and did not allow discussion of their limits. Instead of discussing potentially damaging evidence, he suppressed it and then mocked and slandered the person of those who disagreed with him. This is discussed extensively in Article 4, with lots of quotes from his own writings. This is fake science. Sadly, this has become the methodology of scientists today. This means they, too, are fake when it comes to their representation of anything related to materialism or the evidences for evolution.

A question: Is it an overstatement to state that modern scientists place allegiance to materialism ahead of honest, open discussion of issues exposing the inadequacies of materialism? Materialists claim there are no arguments by their detractors worthy of discussion. I believe the above discussion exposes the error of this practice. Extremely strong testimony has been presented teaching against the plausibility of a natural origin of life. Yet, modern scientists assume its possibility to be a matter of fact and refuse even to consider evidence to the contrary. Why? Materialism demands abiogenesis to be true and the actual evidence is considered irrelevant. If the above arguments I have presented are so weak as to make them unworthy of discussion, which is the "official" position of modern science, then it should be trivial to show why. This blog is available as a challenge for you to do it. I do not believe you can. This is a battle blog. Are you up to it?

If you reject the above arguments and conclusions, my challenge in this battle blog is for you to do one of two things. First, show specifically why the arguments I have presented in Articles 1 and 3 are so flawed they are not even worthy of discussion. If you cannot do this, then, since both Articles 1 and 3 are in pre-print, they could be updated and submitted to a standard science journal. Show me one which provides open discussion for arguments challenging materialistic science when the arguments are worthy of discussion. Let me cite this blog in the submission. My evaluation is that if my arguments against materialism are worthy of discussion and no major science journal (such as *Nature*, *Science*, *PNAS*, publications of the British Royal Society, etc.) is willing to publish articles challenging materialism, then modern science is fake science. Explain why this conclusion is wrong.

vArticle 4 in the above collection discusses this issue extensively. In fact, because of its significance it constitutes almost half of the material in the short version of the Five Articles. If a materialist can imagine the possibility that a future scientific discovery might possibly be able to explain away actually observed evidence which challenges the validity of materialism, the imaginary evidence is given priority over the observed evidence. This tradition started with Darwin, as discuss in Article 4. It was copied by Huxley. It is now copied by modern scientists. This attitude makes all of them fake scientists. Abiogenesis has made little true progress since its

beginnings with Stanley Miller's spark experiment in 1953. I suggest it is because the field is beating a dead horse. Another 600 years or 6,000 years will not solve known problems which are the result of bad chemistry. Abiogenesis will plausibly still be stuck at the initial step, not getting any further than did Miller. The unwillingness of materialists to acknowledge this is why they do not represent legitimate science. They may control the journals. They may control grants of research funds. They may control jobs at major academic institutions. But, this does not justify their suppression of valid scientific observation.

Proverbs 18:17 says, "The first person to plead his case seems right until his neighbor comes and examines him." As discussed above, it is a matter of policy for materialistic evolutionists to stifle open discussion of problems and their implications. They do not want their neighbor examining them in open dialogue. We have seen that there is no willingness to acknowledge the implications of thousands of experiments whose results consistently teach against abiogenesis. So, with this mindset, why should a person believe an evolutionist when he claims that the evidence concerning evolution on the scale of bacteria-to-men is strong? Is the supposedly strong evidence so distorted and controlled as to be meaningless? I believe this is exactly the situation. (Article 4)

I believe God allows no legitimate, strong arguments against Him. From His perspective there are no valid reasons to reject Him or His Word. (Article 2)

This is a "battle blog." I am putting my neck on the chopping block with these claims and challenging people with far more education than I have to chop it off. Show how the claims are scientifically wrong. However, I was saved over fifty years ago after a discussion on Biblical apologetics. I have had extensive interest in these issues for five decades. Over 700 journal articles were examined in preparation for Article 3. So, I do have some familiarity with the issues. I am bold because I believe the material in the Five Articles represents how a living God reveals Himself through His creation. I do recognize that as a pastor, it is far easier for me to deal with these issues openly than someone whose career depends on him conforming to the agenda of atheistic materialists. Yet, a person claiming to be serving the Living God needs to place pleasing his God above man's opinion. This has been a challenge for believers throughout history.

As mentioned, although I have a B.S. in physics from UCLA, I am currently a Baptist pastor. The material presented here is written as a pastor/evangelist disturbed at the compromise that is becoming so commonplace in our society today. I believe that God used the same care and exercised the same wisdom and power in His breathing-out (inspiring) the Bible as He did in planning the construction of the entire universe and then forming it step-by-step according to a predefined plan. Thus, the Bible is accurate and truly represents what God wanted said and how He wanted to say it. I am unaware of a single instance recorded in Scripture where a man in rebellion challenged God in what He said and God honored Him for doing this. By contrast, the Bible gives consistent testimony for the disastrous consequences coming on those who deny either Him or His Word.

God hates idolatry. This theme runs throughout both Old and New Testaments. God is a jealous God and He judges idolatry severely (Deuteronomy 4:24-29, Romans 1:18-2:5). He will not give His glory to another (Isaiah 42:8, 48:11). In traditional idolatry, physical objects are worshiped instead of God. He hates this. In modern society a physical process—natural selection—is worshiped. All the wisdom and creative power God used to plan and make the various life forms

around us is not acknowledged. Instead, all of the credit is given to a mindless process, natural selection. Modern idolatry is more subtle and dangerous than traditional. Physical objects have no power, yet can get a powerful grip on a person's mind. Natural selection is claimed to have such great power that it can account for the appearance of all of the various life forms around us. Since, according to Romans 1, natural man wants to suppress truth about God and turn to idolatry, the hold of evolutionary theory on unsaved man is potentially even stronger than traditional idolatry. Sadly, unsaved man wants idolatry to be true. From Romans 1, God's wrath is aroused by the worship of any form of idolatry. He alone is worthy of worship. This natural bias for idolatry is a spiritual issue to be fought against.

I believe theistic evolution in all of its various forms is an abomination to God. It attempts to mix idolatry and Biblical theology. It gives false credence to the supposedly "strong reasons" for the new idolatry. Yet, In Isaiah 41 God calls idolater's supposed "strong reasons" *nothing*. Theistic evolution is the equivalent of those in the Old Testament that attempted to mix Baal worship and worship of the Lord. The Babylon captivity of the Jews and the destruction of Solomon's temple show how angry God became by the mixing of these. In Deuteronomy 4:29 referenced above, God holds out forgiveness for those idolaters who turn from their sin and who seek Him with their whole heart. Otherwise, there is severe judgment. I believe this holds out hope for the Christian who has been a theistic evolutionist, recognizes that at its heart it condones idolatry, and seeks God's forgiveness for His sin. But, woe to the person's heart is so hard that He is unwilling to repent.

A literal understanding of Genesis chapters 1 – 4 is second only to the Gospel in its significance. Chapter 1 proclaims that the God of the Bible directly created the heavens, the Earth, and the life we see on Earth. Chapter 2 declares that as Creator He has the right to establish rules for man's behavior and to judge him if he disobeys. Chapter 3 demonstrates that God exercises His right to rule and to judge. Chapter 4 reveals that God is willing to be reconciled to man through a proper offering—but only on the terms He establishes. The importance of these chapters makes them a target.

Unsaved man has no desire to submit His will to a holy God. In line with the promise Satan made to Eve in the Garden, man wants to be his own god, determining for himself what is right and wrong. Jesus said that "He who sins is a slave to sin (John 8:34). An unsaved man does not have a personal, living relationship with God; to him God is merely one who takes offense to the things that to him make life worth living and to which he is enslaved. In an effort to soothe his conscience about God, he vociferously attacks the legitimacy of the opening chapters of Genesis. He finds that the standards of a holy God are too stifling and too restricting for him to live by. Those who claim to be believers and yet reject a literal understanding of these chapters imply that God was not accurate in these chapters, even though they are so essential to everything that follows. They implicitly agree with atheistic materialists that the arguments for materialism are stronger than those for a literal interpretation of these chapters. As a pastor, I believe this offends God greatly.

Most universities today, even those calling themselves "Christian," teach against a literal interpretation and application of Genesis chapters 1 – 4. As a pastor, I believe this is dangerous. Those doing this place themselves at great risk with long lasting, eternal consequences. From His perspective, the arguments of those denying His Word are "nothing" (Isaiah 41-42) (Article 2). My commission and authority to go into the world and make disciples of Jesus Christ is given

directly by Christ Himself (Matthew 28:18-20). Since materialists have effectively used their fake science to attack God and the Bible, exposing their fake claims is a major task needed for making true disciples. Ephesians 5:11 tells me, “Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather expose them.” In other words, among other things don’t be a theistic evolutionist. Likewise, In 1 Peter 3:15 God tells us to be properly prepared to defend our faith in Him and His word against challengers, “Always be ready to give a defense to everyone who asks you a reason for the hope that is in you...”

If you are a student at a reputedly “Christian” university, if you believe in the literal account of Genesis 1 – 4, and if you have a professor who is attempting to get you to repudiate this position, I suggest you hold him accountable before God to answer the assertions in the above discussion and as expanded in the Five Articles. Challenge him to post his answers publicly on this blog along with his credentials. If he truly has answers, let him tell the world, doing so in an open setting.

If your professor cannot or is unwilling to answer the basic, fundamental issues presented here and in the articles, then challenge him with what right he has to attempt to get you to deny your faith. You are more accountable to God than to him. Why isn’t he leading the way to expose the fake methodology of the materialists, even as Scripture commands? Why is he promoting the new idolatry instead of pure worship of the Holy God? Sadly, in most Christian universities today, the spirit of compromise has become so ingrained that many if not the majority of professors give higher credence to atheistic materialists than to the God of the Bible they claim to serve! God can create a galaxy in an instant, placing every atom and molecule wherever and however He chooses. He can do this without even getting tired. Woe to the man who defies Him or His Word. The consequences are severe and they are eternal.

God is a God of love. He demonstrated this in sending Christ to die for our sins. But, Christ Himself spoke about eternal judgment in Hell more than almost any other issue. It is foolish for someone to claim to rely on Christ for salvation while rejecting what He taught. This shows he still hates the light (John 3:16-21). God sets standards for salvation and His love provided a means of reconciliation to those who want reconciliation—but He also reveals that salvation is only available under His terms (Genesis 4). His love does not provide an excuse for the behavior of those who in their hearts still reject Him and His Word, wanting Him to submit to their terms. This was the mistake of Cain in Genesis 4. Woe to the one who in his heart believes that the arguments presented by those who reject God are stronger than what God has given us in His Word and for His Word. Woe to leaders who teach others these things even while claiming to be His servants. Give the living Creator God glory by believing Him and His Word!