

# IS IT WORTH INVESTIGATING GOD?

Romans 1:18-25

## I. INTRODUCTION: I

1. **2** We live in the most wealthy and free society on earth; but it comes at a high price.
2. We wouldn't trade our lives for any another, but we are often uncomfortably busy and stressed.
  - A. As each year passes the world seems to bring more chaos than peace.
  - B. There never seems to be enough hours in the day to do everything we would like.
  - C. It becomes increasingly difficult to "stop and smell the roses."
  - D. As we deal with the daily turmoil of our lives we find it hard to set aside "quality time" to focus on life's most important and basic questions.
    - ☛ How did I get here?
    - ☛ Why am I here?
    - ☛ What's life really all about?
3. Let's take a few minutes and address those questions and whether...**3**

## II. DISCUSSION:

1. **4** How did I get here?
  - A. How did life begin on Earth? What produced the abundance and diversity of life we see?
    - (1) Only two major paradigms seek to explain the origin of life: *evolution* and *creation*.
    - (2) Evolution states all forms of life originated from the random interaction of lifeless chemicals that ultimately led to simple, one-celled organisms that, with the help of time, random mutations and natural selection, *evolved* into the vast array of highly complex plants and animals seen today. The "molecules to man" theory.
    - (3) On the other hand, creation states all forms of life, and the Universe in which they exist, were designed and created by a supernatural, all-powerful divine being, *God*.
  - B. Further, one of the paradigms, *evolution*, claims all its tenets are based on scientific evidence and accuse those believing in creation of rejecting science and acting out of "blind faith."
  - C. Is that the case? Do evolutionists have the scientific "high ground," and creationists are hopeless dimwits on par with those believing the earth is flat?
  - D. I readily agree many claiming to be Christians operate on the principle of "blind faith."
    - (1) However, one who truly follows God and His Word has a faith undergirded by solid, objective evidence.
    - (2) The Bible defines faith as "*the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.*" (Heb. 11:1)
    - (3) In the course of this lesson I will not ask you to "blindly" believe anything.
    - (4) On the contrary, I invite you to examine the scientific evidence and come to your own conclusion whether evolution or creation provides the most logical explanation to the origin of the Universe and all life on earth including you and I.
2. **5** Who's unscientific?
  - A. Where did the Universe come from?

- (1) Evolutionists say it began 13.7 billion years ago with the “Big Bang.”
  - (2) Renowned physicist Stephen Hawking speculates the Universe began from an infinitely small sphere where space-time-matter was compacted into ‘zero’ volume, the *singularity*.
    - (a) This *singularity* exploded and gave rise to the entire material Universe. Where did this *singularity* come from? What was its cause?
    - (b) To this we are given no logical answers or scientific data.
- B. However, the *Law of Cause and Effect* states every material effect, in this case the physical Universe, must have an adequate antecedent or simultaneous cause.
- (1) The *Law of Cause and Effect* (aka the *Principle of Causality*) has been investigated for millennia dating back at least to the writings of Aristotle and Plato (350-360 B.C.).
  - (2) Every student of logic knows this law or principle is the ultimate canon of all the sciences.
  - (3) Without the *Principle of Causality*, proven by millennia of empirical data, all the sciences would crumble to dust.
- C. **6** Creationists have absolutely no problem with the great truth of the *Law of Causality*.
- (1) The Bible articulated this principle long ago when the writer of the letter to the Hebrews stated “every house is built by someone, but He who built all things is God.” (Heb. 3:4)
  - (2) The Universe is the grand Effect and God is the grand Cause, for “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” (Gen. 1:1)
  - (3) Everyone knows a house cannot build itself; however, evolutionists are left in a dilemma trying to explain how the inestimably complex and unfathomably huge Universe could come into existence without a cause.
  - (4) **\*\*** Robert Jastrow, founder and former director of the *Goddard Institute for Space Studies* at NASA, an ardent evolutionist, wrote:  
*“The Universe, and everything that has happened in it since the beginning of time, are a grand effect without a known cause. An effect without a known cause? That is not the world of science; it is a world of witchcraft, of wild events and the whims of demons, a medieval world that science has tried to banish. As scientists, what are we to make of this picture? I do not know.”*
- D. **\*\*** Scientifically speaking, according to the well-accepted *Principle of Causality*, there had to be a cause and a beginning for the Universe.
- (1) Yet evolutionists are forced to admit a great effect without an antecedent great cause.
  - (2) Who’s being “unscientific”?
- E. **7** Second, other tenets of evolution are in conflict with the empirical science.
- (1) Years ago several brilliant scientists, including Louis Pasteur, proved *abiogenesis* false.
  - (2) *Abiogenesis* is the theory that non-living matter gave rise to living matter.
  - (3) For example, that flies could *spontaneous generate* from rotting meat.
  - (4) Without *abiogenesis* there is no starting point for the theory of evolution.
- F. Empirical evidence unequivocally proves *abiogenesis* is false; yet evolutionists are forced to believe it’s true: that at some point in the distant past lifeless chemicals, through random, unintelligent physical processes, made the unimaginable leap to form living creatures.
- (1) If evolution were true one would think this leap from non-living to living must have taken

place millions, if not billions, of times before one “organism” finally survived and reproduced.

- (2) Evolutionists criticize creationists as being “unscientific,” but they must subscribe to a theory unequivocally invalidated by empirical science.

G. Who’s being “unscientific”?

H. **8** Although unknown by most, even by many who teach evolution as truth; many well-known and well-respected evolutionists recognize the insurmountable problem evolution has in regards to explaining the origin of life.

- (1) **\*\*** Sir Fredrick Hoyle, a famous English astronomer and fervent evolutionist said:

*“The likelihood of the formation of life from inanimate matter is 1 to a number with 40,000 noughts after it ( $10^{40,000}$ )...It is big enough to bury Darwin and the whole theory of evolution. There was no primeval soup, neither on this planet nor any other, and if the beginnings of life were not random, they must therefore have been the product of purposeful intelligence.”*

- (2) He also compared the probability of the spontaneous generation of life to the probability of  $10^{50}$  blind people each simultaneously solving Rubik’s cube.
- (3) **\*\*** He then said, “The notion that not only biopolymers but the operating program of a living cell could be arrived at by chance in a primordial organic soup here on earth is evidently nonsense of a high order.”

I. **9** Dr. Hoyle is not alone in his conclusions; Dr. Harold Morowitz who testified on behalf of evolution at the “McLean v. Arkansas” trial once wrote:

*“The probability for the chance of formation of the smallest, simplest form of living organisms known is 1 to  $10^{340,000,000}$ ...the size of this figure is truly staggering, since there are only supposed to be approximately  $10^{80}$  electrons in the whole Universe!”* (from Energy Flow in Biology)

J. **\*\*** The late Dr. Carl Sagan (host of the original PBS television series Cosmos) put the odds of the spontaneous generation of life even higher at  $10^{2,000,000,000}$ .

K. Dr. Emile Borel, the father of modern probability, stated that “the occurrence of any event where the chances are beyond  $10^{50}$  is an event which we can state with certainty will never happen, no matter how much time is allotted and no matter how many conceivable opportunities could exist for the event to take place.” (in Probabilities and Life)

L. **10** Despite these insurmountable odds evolutionists desperately cling to their theory. Why?

- (1) It certainly cannot be because science is on their side, for their theory requires a debunked theory, *abiogenesis*, to be true.
- (2) *Abiogenesis* is contrary to empirical evidence; it has been proven scientifically false over and over again.
- (3) However, Dr. George Wald provides an answer.
  - (a) The late Dr. Wald, an ardent evolutionist, was no scientific “light weight.”
  - (b) He was a professor of neurobiology at Harvard and received the Nobel Prize in Physiology (1967) for work in the neurophysiology of vision.
- (4) Here’s what he said: **\*\***

*“There are only two possible explanations as to how life arose: Spontaneous generation arising to evolution or a supernatural creative act of God...There is no other possibility. Spontaneous generation was scientifically disproved 120 years ago by Louis Pasteur and*

others, but that just leaves us with only one other possibility...that life came as a supernatural act of creation by God, but I can't accept that philosophy because I do not want to believe in God. Therefore, I choose to believe in that which I know is scientifically impossible, spontaneous generation leading to evolution." ("Origin, Life and Evolution" in *Scientific American*, 1978)

M. \*\* There you have it from the minds and tongues of leading evolutionists.

- (1) They cling to the theory despite the fact scientific evidence disproves its plausibility.
- (2) Who's being "unscientific"?

N. There are many more aspects of the evolutionary theory that violate well-established scientific principles and evidence.

- (1) I do not have the space in this sermon to explore these important topics.
- (2) I would encourage you to investigate the vast volume of literature on these issues.
- (3) Some excellent books to begin with are: \*\*

- ☛ *Darwin's Doubts: The Explosive Origin of Animal Life and the Case For Intelligent Design*, Stephen Meyer
- ☛ *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*, Michael Behe
- ☛ *Darwin's Demise*, J. White and N. Comninellis
- ☛ *Signature in the Cell: DNA and the Evidence of Intelligent Design*, Stephen Meyer

### 3. **I I** Does God exist?

A. We've already established, according to the *Principle of Causality*, that something (the Universe) cannot come from nothing.

- (1) Matter is not eternal, thus, there had to be some grand Cause that brought all things into existence; and it had to be something beyond the bounds of space, time and matter.
- (2) We submit the great Cause is God.

B. Another important principle shedding light on this matter is: *Design demands a Designer*. In 1802 William Paley published his famous book *Natural Theology*.

- (1) In the book he made the following proposal: if a person were to stumble across a well-designed watch in the middle of the woods, the complexity of the watch would be evidence an intelligent designer made the watch.
- (2) Paley's analogy is an extension of the *teleological* argument for God's existence (i.e., if there is design in nature, that design demands the existence of a designer.).
- (3) The writer of the letter to the Hebrews used this exact line of reasoning when he wrote: "For every house is built by someone, but He who built all things is God" (Heb. 3:4).

C. **I2** Whether one is an evolutionist or creationist everyone recognizes this important principle (i.e., *design demands a designer*).

- (1) \*\* For example, in his book *Contact* (later made into a movie starring Jodie Foster) well-known and highly respected (rabid!) evolutionist Dr. Carl Sagan wrote a fictional story about SETI (*Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence*) scientists. ("The cosmos is all that is or was or ever will be.")
  - (a) SETI scientists actually exist and are radio astronomers that scan the heavens for radio signals from outer space in hope of detecting extraterrestrial life.

- (b) \*\* In the fictional book they received this radio signal over and over again: 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23, 29, 31, 37, 41, 43, 47, 53 ... (up to a total of 26 of these numbers).
- (c) \*\* If you recall basic mathematics these are *prime numbers* (i.e., numbers divisible, without a remainder, by only one and themselves).
- (2) Why did the fictional SETI scientists get so excited upon hearing this repeated message?
  - (a) \*\* Because it was a designed message and design is evidence of intelligence.
  - (b) They knew that it is impossible for such an ordered list of numbers to be generated purely randomly; it can't be done without intelligence.
- D. **13** Now let's make an application of Dr. Sagan's hypothesis.
  - (1) \*\* DNA contains the coded information needed for each of the ~100 trillion cells in the human body; every protein, every tissue, every organ, every organ system, absolutely everything needed for life.
  - (2) The same is true for every living organism in the plant and animal kingdoms.
  - (3) DNA is the most fantastic information storage and retrieval system in the Universe.
    - (a) How much information can DNA store? \*\*
 

*"One gram of DNA can store 700 terabytes of data. That's 14,000 50-gigabyte Blu-ray discs... in a droplet of DNA that would fit on the tip of your pinky. To store the same kind of data on hard drives — the densest storage medium in use today — you'd need 233 3TB drives, weighing a total of 151 kilos."* (Harvard University)
    - (b) Werner Gitt, an information scientist, said: \*\*
 

*"Not only is the amount of information in cellular DNA staggering, it's also incredibly compact. We marvel at computer storage disks with ever greater capacity. Yet the quantity of information that could be stored in a pinhead's volume of DNA is equivalent to the content of paperback books spanning the distance from the earth to the moon 500 times—each book being unique from the others."*
  - (4) \*\* How could DNA have possibly resulted from the unintelligent, undirected random collision of lifeless molecules? **Specified complexity**
    - (a) \*\* Dr. Sagan and fellow evolutionists get excited over a string of 26 prime numbers and attribute its source to intelligence, but deny DNA, a vastly more complex information source, is the result of intelligence.
    - (b) Who's being "unscientific"?

#### 4. **14** Has God revealed Himself?

- A. Yes! First, by looking at the material Universe we understand from the scientifically proven *Principle of Causality* that something cannot come from nothing.
  - (1) \*\* Every effect must have a cause, therefore, the material Universe (effect) had a cause.
  - (2) \*\* Further, the Universe is not eternal, which demands something had to exist prior to the Universe coming into existence (something independent of time, space, and matter).
  - (3) \*\* Also, to bring something into existence requires *power*; thus there had to be a power in existence prior to the material Universe.
- B. \*\* It was a power that existed independent of *time*, *space* and *matter*; therefore, this power had to be an *eternal power*.

- C. \*\* There's more: This *eternal power* possesses an intelligence far exceeding that of men.
- (1) Thus, whatever brought the Universe into existence must be of a different classification, a different order of intelligence if you will, than the things it brought into existence.
  - (2) I submit to you that if anyone will take the time to look at the material Universe about him and use the powers of observation given each of us, we can deduce there must be an *eternal power* that possesses the quality of *deity*.
  - (3) \*\* The apostle Paul spoke of this in Romans 1:19-20, when he wrote: "...*what may be known of God is manifest in them [i.e., to human beings, ct], for God has shown it to them. For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead...*"
  - (4) In other words, by simply looking at the great Effect, the Universe, any logical and reasonable person should conclude a being exists that is the great Cause of the Universe and possesses the qualities of *eternal power* and *deity* (i.e., godhead, divinity, or divine nature).
  - (5) God requires no cause since He is a spiritual, not a material, being (John 4:24) who has always been and always will be—"Before the mountains were brought forth, Or ever You had formed the earth and the world, Even from everlasting to everlasting, You are God." (Psa. 90:2)
- D. **15** Second, this being who possesses *eternal power* and *deity* has communicated His existence and will to man through the Holy Bible.
- (1) The Bible is highly criticized and marginalized by many in today's society.
  - (2) However, it deserves our careful consideration. Why?
  - (3) Because it is the most reliable book of antiquity.
- E. How reliable is the Bible as an ancient book?
- (1) There are two primary methods used to measure the reliability of ancient books.
    - (a) First is the time span between the original writing (autograph) and the first existing copy (manuscript, mss).
      - (i) The nearer the earliest manuscript to the autograph the greater the reliability. How does the Bible stack up against other ancient texts?
      - (ii) In regards to the New Testament there are portions of manuscripts that are less than 50 years from the autographs.
      - (iii) There are several fully complete manuscripts that are less than 250 years from the autographs.
      - (iv) By comparison the writings of well-accepted ancient writers such as Plato, Aristotle, Sophocles, Pliny, Tacitus, Homer, etc. are 1,200 years, or more, from the autograph until the earliest manuscript.
    - (b) The second measure of reliability is the number of manuscripts.
      - (i) The greater the number of early manuscripts the more reliable a text is considered.
      - (ii) Also, the greater the number of manuscripts the more "cross checking" can be done to determine accuracy.
      - (iii) How does the Bible stack up against other ancient texts?

- ☛ There are over 25,000 early manuscripts containing all, or substantial portions, of the New Testament.
  - ☛ Compare that to only seven manuscripts for the works of Plato, five for the works of Aristotle, and seven for the plays of Sophocles, 643 for Homer's *Iliad*.
- (iv) \*\* In light of this, John Warwick Montgomery, recipient of 11 earned degrees including PhD, ThD and LLD, rightly said, *"to be skeptical of the resultant text of the New Testament books is to allow all the classical works of antiquity to slip into obscurity, for no documents of the ancient period are as well attested bibliographically as the New Testament."* Isn't such a book worthy of your investigation and careful consideration?

### III. CONCLUSION: 16

1. What will you do?
2. In the beginning of this lesson I asked you to examine the evidence.
3. I've offered just a small amount of evidence to stir your interest and suggest to you God is worthy of your careful investigation. Will you investigate Him?!
4. Invitation: \*\* (for each)
  - ☛ Hear: Rom. 10:17
  - ☛ Believe: Heb. 11:6; Jn. 8:24
  - ☛ Confess: Rom. 10:10; Acts 8:37
  - ☛ Repent: Acts 17:30
  - ☛ Baptism: Acts 22:16; Gal. 3:26-27
  - ☛ Saved: Acts 2:47; Col. 1:20-23