

# Science Leads to God

5 February 2012

R. David Pogge

## Part 1

A careful examination of the theory of evolution necessarily leads to the conclusion that life cannot be the result of unguided natural processes. I know this because I was raised an atheist. I grew up believing that Christians were foolish people who made up stories about heaven because they were afraid of death. I was a straight A student who was fascinated with science for as long as I can remember. I always knew I would grow up to be a scientist, and spent my entire career of more than a third of a century working as an electronic engineer. I still love science—even more now than I did when I was a kid. Perhaps that's because science led me to God late in life.

Evolutionists try to paint creationists as being superstitious, ignorant, and anti-science. They claim that the only reason not to believe in evolution is because it is incompatible with the book of Genesis in the Bible. They portray creationists as ostriches with their heads in the sand, trying not to see the truth. In reality, evolutionists are the ones who refuse to see the truth.

Evolutionists would like you to believe that you can't be a real scientist and be a Christian, too. But Isaac Newton was a scientist who wrote more about religion than about physics. Newton was a real scientist. Ann Lamont's book, [21 Great Scientists Who Believed the Bible](#) devotes chapters to Newton and 20 other great scientists, including Kepler, Euler, Faraday, Joule, Kelvin, and Werner von Braun, who weren't ashamed to be called Christians.

These men were scientists because they were Christians first. They believed God designed an intricately crafted world. They wanted to learn about God by learning about the laws that governed that world. They turned to science to do that.

Science is a way to discover the truth using careful observation and experimentation. One observes a natural phenomenon, ponders how that phenomenon works, proposes a theory about how the phenomenon works, and devises an experiment that will confirm or deny the theory. After performing the experiment, the theory is accepted or rejected.

The wonderful thing about science is that it doesn't depend upon opinion or reputation. An apple always falls to the ground at the same speed regardless of whether or not you believe in gravity, and regardless of whether or not you are Sir Isaac Newton.

That's why I prefer science to philosophy and politics. You can argue all day about philosophical ideas or political candidates without coming to a definite conclusion. But if you disagree with another electrical engineer about the gain of a three-transistor amplifier, there is a simple way to resolve the argument. You just go to the lab, build it,

and test it. Science appeals to me because it is so unambiguous. You test the theory and accept it or reject it based on the results of an experiment.

Evolution never made much sense to me in school; but I figured it must be true because all my science teachers said it was true. It was always presented to me as something that I would understand when I got older. I was just supposed to accept it because it was too complicated for a child to understand. So, I accepted it without proof. Besides, I knew, the only real alternative to evolution is that foolish Christian superstition. Since God doesn't really exist, He could not have created life. Therefore, I reasoned, life must have evolved through natural processes.

What I didn't know then was that science has been hijacked by atheists. Science, which used to lead people to God, became a weapon against God. Atheists did this by changing the definition of science. Science is no longer the search for truth using the scientific method. There is a new definition of science that precludes God *a priori*.

Science has been replaced by naturalism. Science now presumes that there is a natural explanation for everything. There is no such thing as "the supernatural." Therefore, any explanation that involves God is unscientific by definition.

There are some things, such as the origin and diversity of life, that cannot be explained by natural processes. But since supernatural processes are excluded one must accept, by faith, that there are unknown natural processes that are responsible. One is not allowed to believe in God; but one must believe in unknown natural laws. One is not allowed to believe the Bible; but one must believe the consensus of atheists who have Ph.D. degrees.

Lacking experimental proof, evolutionists have concocted tall tales about how evolution must have happened. Everyone is supposed to believe the tall tales because they are told by scientists who are smarter than everybody else. But when you look at the theory of evolution from a truly scientific point of view, it falls apart.

One of the first things I learned in science class when I was a little boy was that fire requires three things. Fire needs fuel to burn, oxygen to burn it, and enough heat to keep the reaction going. You can put out a fire by removing any one of those three things. A candle goes out when all the wax has burned. A candle goes out if you cover it with a glass jar, preventing oxygen from getting to it. A candle goes out if you cool its wick by blowing the heat away from it.

The theory of evolution is like fire because it, too, depends upon three things. Remove any one of those three things, and the theory fails. Those three things are (1) the spontaneous origin of life, (2) creative mutations, and (3) a long time.

The theory of evolution begins with a lifeless planet. Children in American public schools are taught that the Earth existed for billions of years before the first cell came to life somehow. The spontaneous origin of life is crucial to the theory of evolution because it is dead on arrival. The theory of evolution starts with a dead planet, upon which life

somehow originated through unknown natural processes. Without that first living cell, there is nothing to reproduce and evolve into all the different kinds of life on Earth today.

The problem for evolutionists is that there are only two documented cases of inanimate matter coming to life—Pinocchio and Frosty the Snowman! But these cases don't count because both involved supernatural elements. The Blue Fairy used her magic wand to bring Pinocchio to life; and “there must have been some magic in that old silk hat they found” that brought Frosty to life.

Even if some unknown natural process did bring all the right chemicals together in just the right way to form Frankencell, there still is no known natural process by which Frankencell could have come to life all by itself without help from a mad scientist and his deformed assistant.

Why do evolutionists believe that somehow chemicals naturally came together to form a living cell? They believe it because it had to have happened for evolution to have a starting point. In their minds, the fact that we are all here today is proof that it happened because if life didn't begin spontaneously, we would not be here to ponder the origin of life.

Despite decades of research by many scientists all over the world, nobody has come up with a plausible explanation for how life could have begun by purely natural processes. That's why the \$1,000,000 Origin of Life prize still hasn't been awarded. That's why Harvard has recently budgeted one million dollars for research to discover how life began. If there were a scientific explanation for how life could begin, then scientists would not still be looking for it.

The natural origin of life is called “abiogenesis.” Evolutionists will often argue that abiogenesis is not part of the theory of evolution. They do this because they know that abiogenesis is a scientifically bankrupt idea. That's why they don't want to debate it. They want to start any discussion of evolution with the premise that there was a primary living cell from which all other life evolved. They realize that without the first living cell, the theory of evolution is dead in the water.

The more one ponders the first living cell, the more questions arise. Once that cell came to life, how did it remain alive? What did it eat? How did its metabolism work? What made it reproduce?

There has never been a single scientific experiment that found an environment in which inanimate matter came to life. There have been numerous scientific experiments investigating proposed environments in which inanimate matter might come to life, and all have failed. Those failures have taught us many reasons why life cannot originate through natural processes.

Let me be perfectly clear. All the scientific research to date points to the conclusion that life could not have originated spontaneously through any known (or even imagined)

natural process. One does not believe in the natural origin of life because of scientific research. One has to believe in the natural origin of life IN SPITE of scientific research.

So, the theory of evolution is dead on arrival. The first of the three requirements for the theory of evolution to be true is not satisfied. But, just for the sake of discussion, let us suppose that life did somehow originate by a purely natural process. The next step is diversification of that first cell into all the living things on Earth today, and all the living things that once existed on Earth but are now extinct. That's an awful lot of different kinds of living things!

For life to evolve into so many different forms, it must be a common occurrence for some living creature to beget another kind of living creature. But our common experience is that dogs have puppies, and cats have kittens, but dogs never have kittens, or chicks, or tadpoles. Everything seems to reproduce after its kind. How then do new kinds of creature evolve?

Darwin correctly observed that all living things exhibit some degree of variation. Some cows give more milk than others. Some birds have short stout beaks, and others have long skinny beaks. He also correctly observed that more creatures are born than will live to maturity and produce offspring. He reasoned that those creatures with beneficial variations would be more likely to reproduce than those creatures without them. He thought the offspring would inherit the beneficial variations, which would continue to accumulate without limit. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when little was known about genetics, it sounded reasonable.

Scientists now know about DNA and the complexity of life. Darwin's belief that diet, exercise, and climate cause inheritable changes is known to be false. Random mutations have been proposed as an alternative mechanism for how DNA can change to produce new kinds of organs and radically different life forms. But countless experiments with fruit flies have shown that random mutations don't produce novel structures. Random mutations typically cause defects that make the fruit flies less suited for survival. The belief that every living thing is the result of countless lucky mutations is as silly as believing that every computer program is the result of random bit changes in a computer's memory.

The second premise of the theory of evolution is that living things can evolve into totally different living things. That isn't consistent with scientific observation. So, even if life did originate through some unknown natural process, it would still be the only form of life on Earth. Yes, living things exhibit some limited variation, but they don't change into other kinds of things.

Evolutionists admit that it is highly unlikely that chemicals could come to life by pure chance. They also admit that it is so rare that living things turn into other living things that it has never actually been observed. But that, they say, doesn't mean it didn't happen. It is unlikely that one could guess fifty times in a row whether heads or tails will

come up when a coin is tossed, but given enough time, sooner or later someone will do it. Therefore, the Earth must be very old for all these unlikely things to happen.

Unfortunately, there is no foolproof way to determine how old the Earth is. Every method for estimating the age of the Earth depends upon some assumptions. Radioactive dating depends upon unverifiable assumptions about the initial concentrations of elements. Age estimates based on current processes (erosion, salt in the ocean, sediment in river deltas, etc.) depend upon accurate measurements of current rates of change, and the assumption that those rates have not changed over time.

Reasonable assumptions tend to yield ages of the Earth far less than the 4.6 billion years claimed by evolutionists. But even 4.6 billion years isn't adequate for impossible things to happen by chance. The odds that random mutations to lizard DNA will cause it to grow breasts that respond to hormonal changes after a live birth, and produce milk as a response, are so small that 10 billion years are not enough for it to happen. Furthermore, there is no fossil evidence that a lizard with mammary glands ever existed. But evolutionists insist that mammals evolved from reptiles. There's no physical evidence, it is absurd to think it could happen, but evolutionists believe it anyway.

If you look at the theory of evolution from a scientific point of view, you have to come to the conclusion that it isn't a plausible explanation for the origin and diversity of life on Earth. And if life cannot be the result of natural processes, then it must be the result of supernatural processes.

That's why evolutionists don't want any scientific criticism of the theory of evolution in public schools. If life can't be the product of natural processes, then it must be the result of supernatural processes. That means there MUST be some sort of God who created life. Science leads to The God Conclusion.

The scientific method is a reliable way to discover the truth. The theory of evolution is not based on the scientific method. The theory of evolution is based on philosophy. It is nothing more than the musing of intellectuals about how living things must have evolved, given the assumption that life had to evolve. The theory of evolution is merely the creation myth of atheism disguised as scientific fact.

There is no conflict between science and Christianity; but there is a conflict between evolution and Christianity because there is a conflict between evolution and true science.

Man didn't evolve through a series of scientifically impossible events. God created man, as David Tank sings, "By His Own Hand."

[music – David Tank, "By His Own Hand", <http://krsf.net/mp3s/LM0096.mp3>]

## Part 2

Contrary to what evolutionists say, there is no conflict between science and Christianity. Scientific examination of the world around us naturally leads to a belief in God. Ellen White explains why in chapter 14 of her book, Education. Here are some excerpts from that chapter.

Since the book of nature and the book of revelation [were written by the same author they must] speak in harmony. By different methods, and in different languages, they witness to the same great truths. Science is ever discovering new wonders; but she brings from her research nothing that, rightly understood, conflicts with divine revelation. The book of nature and the written word shed light upon each other. They make us acquainted with God by teaching us something of the laws through which He works.

Inferences erroneously drawn from facts observed in nature have, however, led to supposed conflict between science and revelation; and in the effort to restore harmony, interpretations of Scripture have been adopted that undermine and destroy the force of the word of God. Geology has been thought to contradict the literal interpretation of the Mosaic record of the creation. Millions of years, it is claimed, were required for the evolution of the earth from chaos; and in order to accommodate the Bible to this supposed revelation of science, the days of creation are assumed to have been vast, indefinite periods, covering thousands or even millions of years.

Such a conclusion is wholly uncalled for. The Bible record is in harmony with itself and with the teaching of nature. Of the first day employed in the work of creation is given the record, "The evening and the morning were the first day." Genesis 1:5. And the same in substance is said of each of the first six days of creation week. Each of these periods Inspiration declares to have been a day consisting of evening and morning, like every other day since that time. In regard to the work of creation itself the divine testimony is, "He spake, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast." Psalm 33:9. With Him who could thus call into existence unnumbered worlds, how long a time would be required for the evolution of the earth from chaos? In order to account for His works, must we do violence to His word?

It is true that remains found in the earth testify to the existence of men, animals, and plants much larger than any now known. These are regarded as proving the existence of vegetable and animal life prior to the time of the Mosaic record. But concerning these things Bible history furnishes ample explanation. Before the Flood the development of vegetable and animal life was immeasurably superior to that which has since been known. At the Flood the surface of the earth was broken up, marked changes took place, and in the re-formation of the earth's crust were preserved many evidences of the life previously existing. The vast

forests buried in the earth at the time of the Flood, and since changed to coal, form the extensive coal fields, and yield the supplies of oil that minister to our comfort and convenience today. These things, as they are brought to light, are so many witnesses testifying to the truth of the word of God.

Akin to the theory concerning the evolution of the earth is [the theory concerning] the evolution of man, the crowning glory of the creation.

When consideration is given to man's opportunities for research; how brief his life; how limited his sphere of action; how restricted his vision; how frequent and how great the errors in his conclusions, especially as concerns the events thought to antedate Bible history; how often the supposed deductions of science are revised or cast aside; with what readiness the assumed period of the earth's development is from time to time increased or diminished by millions of years; and how the theories advanced by different scientists conflict with one another, -- considering all this, shall we, for the privilege of tracing our descent from germs and mollusks and apes, ... cast away that statement of Holy Writ, so grand in its simplicity, "God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him"? ...

Rightly understood, both the revelations of science and the experiences of life are in harmony with the testimony of Scripture to the constant working of God in nature.

...

As regards this earth, Scripture declares the work of creation to have been completed. "The works were finished from the foundation of the world." Hebrews 4:3.

But the power of God is still exercised in upholding the objects of His creation. It is not because the mechanism once set in motion continues to act by its own inherent energy that the pulse beats, and breath follows breath. Every breath, every pulsation of the heart, is an evidence of the care of Him in whom we live and move and have our being. From the smallest insect to man, every living creature is daily dependent upon His providence.

...

The mighty power that works through all nature and sustains all things is not, as some men of science claim, merely an all-pervading principle, an actuating energy.

God is a spirit; yet He is a personal being, for man was made in His image. As a personal being, God has revealed Himself in His Son. Jesus, the outshining of the Father's glory, "and the express image of His person" (Hebrews 1:3), was on

earth found in fashion as a man. As a personal Savior He came to the world. As a personal Savior He ascended on high. As a personal Savior He intercedes in the heavenly courts. Before the throne of God in our behalf ministers "One like the Son of man." Daniel 7:13.

The apostle Paul, writing by the Holy Spirit, declares of Christ that "all things have been created through Him, and unto Him; and He is before all things, and in Him all things hold together." Colossians 1:16,17, R.V., margin. The hand that sustains the worlds in space, the hand that holds in their orderly arrangement and tireless activity all things throughout the universe of God, is the hand that was nailed to the cross for us.

...

It was the Maker of all things who ordained the wonderful adaptation of means to end, of supply to need. It was He who in the material world provided that every desire implanted should be met. It was He who created the human soul, with its capacity for knowing and for loving. And He [will not] leave the demands of the soul unsatisfied. [On the other hand,] No intangible principle, no impersonal essence or mere abstraction, can satisfy the needs and longings of human beings in this life of struggle with sin and sorrow and pain. It is not enough to believe in law and force, in things that have no pity, and never hear the cry for help. We need to know of an almighty arm that will hold us up, of an infinite Friend that pities us. We need to clasp a hand that is warm, to trust in a heart full of tenderness. And even so God has in His word revealed Himself.

He who studies most deeply into the mysteries of nature will realize most fully his own ignorance and weakness. He will realize that there are depths and heights which he cannot reach, secrets which he cannot penetrate, vast fields of truth lying before him unentered. He will be ready to say, with Newton, "I seem to myself to have been like a child on the seashore finding pebbles and shells, while the great ocean of truth lay undiscovered before me."

The deepest students of science are constrained to recognize in nature the working of infinite power. But to man's unaided reason, nature's teaching [can] be contradictory and disappointing. Only in the light of revelation can it be read aright. "Through faith we understand." Hebrews 11:3.

...

"For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse. " Romans 1:20, [NIV]. But their testimony can be understood only through the aid of the divine Teacher. "For who among men knows the thoughts of a man except the man's spirit within him?"

In the same way no one knows the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God. " 1 Corinthians 2:11, [NIV].

"When He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth." John 16:13. Only by the aid of that Spirit who in the beginning "was brooding upon the face of the waters;" of that Word by whom "all things were made;" of that "true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world," can the testimony of science be rightly interpreted. Only by their guidance can its deepest truths be discerned.

Only under the direction of the Omniscient One shall we, in the study of His works, be enabled to think His thoughts after Him. <sup>1</sup>

[music – Creation Hymn]

---

<sup>1</sup> Ellen White, Education, Chapter 14, "Science and the Bible", <http://www.whiteestate.org/books/ed/ed14.html>