



STUDY GUIDE

Romans 1:20 makes it clear that the knowledge of the Creator is so evident that all men are without excuse. Yet many believe 'In the beginning, the cosmos...,' rather than 'In the beginning, God....' How can Christians logically uphold the Biblical assumption that God exists, thus giving a reason for the hope they have (1 Peter 3:15)?

- 1. Standard apologetic for the existence of God:
 - a. Biblical claim: We are able to recognize evidence of design (intelligent input) when we see it (e.g. Mt Rushmore, a watch). The evidence of design in the creation is also apparent and implies there is a Designer.
 - b. Secular counter-claim: Things have evolved to fit their environment, so of course they will appear 'designed.'
- 2. New apologetic for the existence of God:
 - The molecule of heredity, DNA, contains the information necessary to build life. Where did the information come from?
 - a. The biochemical machines necessary to 'read' the information on DNA are also *built* by the information on the DNA. Both must be in place from the beginning in order to function properly.
 - b. Information scientists have found that information and code systems cannot arise from matter on their own, but must be organized by an intelligent source, ultimately. God, infinitely intelligent, is the source for the information and code systems necessary for life.
- 3. Reasons people don't believe in God:
 - a. 2 Peter 3:5—They are willingly ignorant of the truth, and committed to a materialistic worldview.
 - b. Jeremiah 17:9—The heart of man is deceitful above all things.
 - c. 2 Corinthians 4:4—They are blinded to the truth.
- 4. Logical extensions of each worldview:

NOTES





STUDY GUIDE

- a. Biblical creation (based on Genesis): God is Creator, therefore He has authority over His creation. We are accountable to Him.
- b. Secular ideology (based on evolution and 'millions of years'): There is no creator, and therefore no 'owner' of the universe. We are not accountable to anyone, and are able to determine our own 'truth.' There is no consistent basis for morality.
- c. Compromise positions: Those who add 'millions of years' to the Biblical account are, in essence, saying the Bible is not absolutely authoritative, and we are able to make the Bible mean whatever we choose.

CONCLUSION

The evolutionists who deny God have a blind faith—they have to believe something that is against real science—namely, that information can arise from disorder by chance. The Christian faith is not a blind faith, but is logically defensible, and explains the findings of real science.

NOTES

Answers... with Ken Ham



QUOTES

Carl Sagan, Cosmos, p. 4, 1980.

The cosmos is all that is or ever was or ever will be.

Richard Dawkins (a vehement atheistic evolutionist), *The Blind Watchmaker*, WW Norton & Co, New York, p. 43, 1987.

We have seen that living things are too improbable and too beautifully designed to have come into existence by chance.

Michael J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*, THE FREE PRESS, p.252-253, 1996.

Now it's the turn of the fundamental science of life, modern biochemistry, to disturb. The simplicity that was once expected to be the foundation of life has proven to be a phantom; instead, systems of horrendous, irreducible complexity inhabit the cell. The resulting realization that life was designed by an intelligence is a shock to us in the twentieth century who have gotten used to thinking of life as the result of simple natural laws. But other centuries have had their shocks, and there is no reason to suppose that we should escape them.

Michael J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*, THE FREE PRESS, p. 243, 1996.

The fourth and most powerful reason for science's reluctance to embrace a theory of intelligent design is also based on philosophical considerations. Many people, including many important and well-respected scientists, just don't *want* there to be anything beyond nature. They don't want a supernatural being to affect nature, no matter how brief or constructive the interaction may have been. In other words, like young-earth creationists, they bring an a priori philosophical commitment to their science that restricts what kinds of explanations they will accept about the physical world. Sometimes this leads to rather odd behavior.

Werner Gitt, *In the Beginning was Information*, CLV, Bielenfeld, Germany, pp. 64–7.

There is no known natural law through which matter can give rise to information, neither is any physical process or material phenomenon known that can do this.

Richard Lewontin (Harvard Geneticist), Billions & Billions of Demons, *The New York Review of Books*, p. 31, Jan. 9, 1997.

Our willingness to accept scientific claims that are against common sense is the key to an understanding of the real struggle between science and the supernatural. We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our *a priori* adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door. (Emphases in original.)

C O N T I N U E D . . .

Answers... with Ken Ham



QUOTES

San Diego Union-Tribune, November 5, 1993.

Some speculate that alien intelligence might beam vast streams of coded information, a virtual encyclopedia galactica, with insights into the origin of the universe or immortality.

Carl Sagan, *The Cosmic Connection: An Extraterrestrial Perspective*, Anchor Press, Doubleday, p. 224, 1973.

At this very moment the messages from another civilization may be wafting across space, driven by unimaginably advanced devices, there for us to detect them—if only we knew how. Or perhaps the messages are already here, present in some everyday experience that we have not made the right mental effort to recognize. The power of such an advanced civilization is very great. Their messages may lie in quite familiar circumstances. The message from the stars may be here already. But where?

Charles Darwin, The Morality of Evolution, *Autobiography*, Norton, p. 94, 1958.

A man who has no assured and ever-present belief in the existence of a personal God, or of a future existence with retribution and reward, can have for his rule of life, as far as I can see, only to follow those impulses and instincts which are the strongest or which seem to him the best ones.

Jeffrey Dahmer (serial murderer) in an interview with Stone Phillips, *Dateline NBC*, November 29, 1994.

If a person doesn't think there is a God to be accountable to, then—then what's—what's the point of—of trying to modify your behavior to keep it within acceptable ranges? That how I thought, anyway. I always believed the theory of evolution as truth, that we all just came from the slime. When we died, you know, that was it, there is nothing....





DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. What are some problems associated with using the standard 'design implies a Designer' argument for the existence of God?

2. How would you answer someone who claims there is no God?

3. What would you say to someone who claims the Christian must have faith to accept God exists?

RESOURCES

The (Revised and Expanded) Answers Book edited by Dr Don Batten

Is there really a God? by Ken Ham

In the Beginning Was Information by Dr Werner Gitt