

Hasn't Science Disproven Christianity?

1. Texts to start from
 - a. **Romans 1:20** – God's eternal qualities are plain to us by what has been made. In other words, when we look at the world around us, it reveals that there is a creator. We can't know everything there is to know about him through creation, but as we explore our world it should actually lead us to see that there is a creator behind it.
 - b. **Psalm 19:1-4** – The Psalmist writes about how creation is literally speaking, as we look at it, telling us that there is a God of glory who it reveals.

2. Let's talk about the role of science. Today's culture seems to position science as opposed to Christianity – that the role of science is to create a naturalistic explanation for everything. Is that how science should be viewed?
 - Actually, prior to the past hundred years or so, all the great scientists – Newton, Galileo, Pascal, Kepler, etc. all approached science as a means to understand God and these people made many of the greatest discoveries in history.
 - To quote Sir Francis Bacon who invented the scientific method: "There are two books laid before us to study, first, is Scripture, which reveal the will of God; and second is the book of [science] which express his power."
 - The idea that science is somehow opposed to faith is a fairly recent phenomenon – past 160 years since Charles Darwin published The Origin of the Species
 - Atheists latched onto it as a means to explain life without a need for God.
 - Very recently, however, we've seen many scientific discoveries that bring us back to the idea of a creator and support the idea of God.

3. Can you give an example of one of these recent scientific discoveries?
 - The Big Bang – It was conclusively proved that the Universe began at a certain point in time.
 - Since the beginning of time, philosophers like Aristotle have debated this question and wondered if the universe was created or whether it has always existed.
 - Starting in the 1930's when Edwin Hubble observed changes in light patterns showing the universe might be expanding to 1990, when measurement of background radiation using satellites proved conclusively that the universe was expanding we now know the universe is expanding.
 - The implications were obvious – if you rewind in time, the universe had a definite beginning.
 - This discovery was a shock to the many in the scientific community found the idea of a God and a creation event distasteful.
 - In fact, Einstein when creating his formula on relativity found the idea so distasteful that he fudged his formulas. When presented with evidence by Edwin Hubble, he later announced that denying evidence of a beginning was "the greatest blunder" of his scientific career.

- The problem is if the universe had a beginning, then there had to be some catalyst or event that caused the universe to come into being.
- A beginning implies a beginner. Things don't just spontaneously happen in Physics. Every action has an equal and opposite reaction.
- If time, energy, space & matter were all created at the Big Bang which scientists all agree to, then there has to be a cause that transcends or is more powerful than time, energy, space and matter.
- Christians would call this cause God. Gen 1:1 - In the Beginning God created the Heavens and the Earth. The first verse in the Bible tells us that God CREATED time, energy, space and matter.
- To-date, science has yet to come up with an explanation for the cause of the Big Bang.

4. What about the universe itself? Is there anything in the universe that would lead one to believe that it had to be created as opposed to just existing naturally?

- The parameters of physics – things like the nuclear force, gravitational force, the expansion rate of the universe and dozens of other parameters are finely tuned for life to exist.
- The problem for scientists is as we've found out more about these variables, the more it's been realized they are very precisely tuned for the existence of life.
- It's like someone landing on Mars and finding a house with dozens of dials with each having 100 different settings and each is set just perfectly right for human life – things like the air mixture, the oxygen level, humidity, temperature, etc.
- You wouldn't assume the house just got there by accident. You would have to conclude that an intelligent being put it there and made it a perfect habitat for humans.
- The same is true in the universe. There are dozens of variables that are set just right. The problem for atheists is that each dial has more than 100 different settings – they have an astronomically high number of settings – often measured in quadrillion, quadrillion, quadrillion or more potential settings and if just one of these dozens of dials isn't set just perfect than the universe wouldn't exist or wouldn't be able to support life.
- The only logical conclusion is we live in an astronomically improbable universe which was put here for life to exist. The parameters are just too perfectly set to have happened by chance.
- As former Cambridge astrophysicist, Sir Fred Hoyle argued: "A common sense interpretation of the data suggests that a super-intellect has monkeyed with physics" to make life possible.
- Of course, the most logical explanation is it was designed by an intelligent creator. Just like finding a habitat built perfect for life on Mars and knowing it had to have been constructed by an intelligent person who took great care and effort to make it perfect for life, the same is true for finding a universe that is perfectly constructed.
- Atheists or naturalists know this, which is why atheists have had to resort to creating ridiculous theories like you see in modern superhero movies or TV shows that theorize that there are an infinite number of universes or multiverses. The idea being we just happen to be in the one perfect one as opposed to the quadrillions and quadrillions that wouldn't support life.

5. OK, but what about life itself? Doesn't the theory of evolution conflict with the idea that God created mankind?

- I think it's important when discussing evolution to define what we're talking about.
- Micro-evolution is the idea that a species can change over time through mutation and natural selection. We know this happens. We can observe it. Humans, for instance, have grown taller over the centuries through better nutrition and selective breeding or natural selection – the idea that women tend to prefer taller guys leads to taller children and so on.
- But that's not the root of Darwin's theory. Darwin's book was titled the "On the Origin of Species". The core thesis is that one could explain all the species of the world through evolution. That all life evolved from a simple organism. This is called macro-evolution.
- There are several key problems with this idea:
 - First, evolution doesn't explain how the first life got here in the first place. Evolution only works with mutation and natural selection. It ASSUMES that there is already a life form that is capable of reproducing for it to work. Survival of the fittest doesn't explain the arrival of the fittest.
 - Despite countless attempts, mankind has never been able once to create life – even the simplest bacteria - from non-life.
 - Second, unlike micro-evolution which we have observed over time, there has never been one observed case of macro evolution or one species evolving into another species.
 - Over the past century, scientists have bombarded everything from bacteria to fruit flies with radiation and other means to try and cause macro-evolution, but today there still has not been one observed case of macro-evolution.
 - The reason for this is pretty simple - as we've learned more about the cell, we've learned it's incredibly complicated. The cell itself is a complex factory that produces proteins, takes in nutrients, expels waste and is managed by a complex instruction set called DNA.
 - The point is, when Darwin created his theory of evolution, none of this was known – the cell was just a tiny blob, but as microscopes have gotten better over time, we now know that one species cannot change into another species. To do so would require a lot more genetic information and more mechanisms than mutation and natural selection alone can provide which are the only things evolution has.
- Another problem is with Mutation.
 - Mutation is almost always harmful to the organism
 - Mutation doesn't add genetic information which is what you would need to add new function to a creature. It can 'flip switches', but it doesn't add new ones.
 - There isn't enough time in the universe to get the number of mutations you would need to make an organism even if it could add genetic information.
- The reason Darwin's theory caught on, is because it's the only theory that's been presented to explain the variety of life on this planet independent of a God.
- Today, scientists know Darwin's theory can't explain the origin of complexity of life so in 2016 the Royal Society of London held a conference focused on identifying alternatives to evolution.

6. Let's talk more about that. I've heard it said that DNA is the best evidence for God. Why is that?

- The discovery of DNA in 1953 and subsequent discoveries have completely changed our knowledge of life.
- What we've learned is that DNA is very similar to computer code – it provides instructions to the cell on how to work.
- To quote Bill Gates: "DNA is like a software program, only much more complex than anything we've ever devised".
- He's right but think about that quote: Microsoft has hundreds of thousands of programmers working on code and Bill says DNA is more complex than anything Microsoft has ever devised.
- It turns out by some estimates a single cell has about 60 times the "lines of code" of Windows.
- The question, of course, is where did all this biological computer code from? You need something more than 60 times smarter than hundreds of thousands of Microsoft software engineers.
- Christians can explain DNA as the product of a vastly intelligent God.
- Evolutionists have no explanation for this. There is simply no theory today about how chemical evolution have created this type of information.
- This is why the discovery of DNA the human genome is probably the most powerful argument for an extremely intelligent creator because information (or computer code) can only produced by an intelligent being. Just pounding on a computer keyboard randomly for a long time will never produce Windows 10, just like randomly assembling DNA molecules will never produce a human being.
- "Signature in the Cell". Information or software only comes from an intelligent source. That's why I believe DNA is the best evidence for God.

7. What about fossils? Don't they prove that evolution happened?

- Actually, the fossil record shows the opposite.
- If Darwin's theory were true, would you expect to see in the fossil record? Evolution works with very small changes over very long periods of time.
- What you would expect to see is a very gradual change in species transforming from one to the next with all variants in between. You would expect to see millions and millions of part one species, part another showing up in different levels of the earth.
- To quote Darwin: "Nature takes no leaps".
- But that's not what you see when you look at the fossil record. Three Issues:
 - First, you see distinct species in the fossil record with no intermediate life forms. You see unique species of fossils rather than millions upon millions of these transitional species.
 - Second, you see species showing up fully formed and functional when they first appear in the record.

- Third, you see is most all of the known species all show up geologically speaking all at once.
- This is known as the Cambrian Explosion where many experts believe ALL of the living species may have originated.
- To put this in perspective, if you were to compress all of Earth's history into 24 hours, the Cambrian explosion would consume only about a minute of time.
- This is the complete opposite of what Darwin predicted, but exactly how the Bible describes the creation event.
- Darwin actually knew this and said that the lack of a supporting fossil record was "the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory". He assumed that over time as more fossils were discovered, they would support his case, but the opposite has been true.

8. All of this is great, but what does it mean for Christianity? What should we take away from it all?

- First, I think we should acknowledge that faith and science are not in conflict. In fact, the more we learn about the universe, DNA, the Big Bang and other recent discoveries, the more one has to conclude that they support the Biblical account rather than stand opposed to it.
- Second, I think we should encourage Christians to discuss and explore science. Just like Galileo, Kepler, Newton, etc. made their biggest discoveries trying to get a glimpse into the nature of God, so too, we Christians shouldn't shy away from learning about and talking about science.
- Finally, I think we should have confidence. The more we learn about our universe, the more we learn it supports the idea of an extremely intelligent, extremely powerful, personal and creative God. God showed great care and creativity in designing his creation. I think that's something we should celebrate and take comfort in.